

Policy Committee Meeting Minutes

April 29, 2016

9:00 – 11:00 am

TVFR Command and Business Operations Center

11945 SW 70th, Tigard, OR



RDPO

Regional Disaster Preparedness Organization

Unified. Prepared. Resilient.

Policy Committee (PC) Members Present: [Quorum met: 11 of 14 members]

1. Steve Novick, Commissioner, City of Portland and PC Vice Chair (Chaired the meeting.)
2. Rich Allen, Councilor, City of Troutdale
3. Lacey Beatty, Councilor, City of Beaverton
4. Ed Bejarana, Councilor, City of Fairview
5. Sam Chase, Councilor, Metro (proxy for Kathryn Harrington, Councilor, Metro)
6. Vince Granato, Chief Operating Officer, Port of Portland
7. John Ludlow, Commissioner/Chair, Clackamas County
8. Harry Saporta, TriMet Representative
9. Dick Schouten, Commissioner, Washington County
10. Jeanne Stewart, Councilor, Clark County
11. Bill Turlay, Councilor, City of Vancouver

Policy Committee (PC) Members Absent:

1. Tony Hyde, Commissioner, Columbia County and PC Chair
2. Loretta Smith, Commissioner, Multnomah County
3. Harry Saporta, Safety and Security Executive, TriMet
4. Karylenn Echols, Councilor, City of Gresham

Steering Committee Members Present:

1. Bob Cozzie, Past Chair and Public Safety Communications Representative
2. Ray DiPasquale, Public Works Representative
3. Jason Gates, Law Enforcement Representative
4. Mike Mumaw, Emergency Management Representative
5. Scott Porter, Past Chair and Washington County Representative
6. Rebecca Geisen, Regional Water Providers Consortium Representative

Other RDPO and Guests:

1. Denise Barrett, RDPO Manager
2. Adrienne Schmidt, RDPO Project Assistant
3. Mike Lewis, Emergency Response and Continuity of Operations, Clark County
4. Daniel Nibouar, Disaster Debris Planner, Metro
5. Kelle Landavazo, Gresham Emergency Management
6. Timur Ender, Commissioner Steve Novick's Office, City of Portland
7. Tootie Smith, Commissioner, Clackamas County

1. Welcomes and Introductions– Vice Chair Novick

- a. In the absence of Chair Tony Hyde (Columbia County Commissioner), Vice Chair Steve Novick (City of Portland Commissioner) chaired the meeting. He began by welcoming new members: Lacey Beaty, Councilor, City of Beaverton; Ed Bejarana, Councilor, City of Fairview; and Bill Turlay, City of Vancouver. He also introduced Metro Councilor Sam Chase, proxy for Metro Councilor Kathryn Harrington.
- b. Mr. Novick asked for all Policy Committee members and others in the room to introduce themselves.

2. Administrative Matters

- a. Mr. Novick called for a motion to approve the minutes from the Policy Committee’s January 29, 2016 meeting. Commissioner Schouten called for the minutes to be approved as written. Commissioner Ludlow seconded the motion. Councilors Stewart and Turlay abstained from voting. With no additional comments or changes needed, the remaining nine members (still a quorum) gave their unanimous approval of the minutes.
- b. Vice Chair Novick then asked RDPO Manager Denise Barrett to review the Policy Committee SOP (i.e., bylaws) update.
 - i. Ms. Barrett said that she and Scott Porter finalized the revision of the SOP, based on the feedback given by committee members at the January 29, 2016 meeting. She reminded the committee that in addition to making changes preferred by the committee itself, such as to the eligibility and term limits of committee leaders, the SOP needed to be updated to be in alignment with language and concepts in the RDPO Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA).
 - ii. Among the changes:
 1. Each chair and vice chair shall serve a two-year term. A Nominating Committee would be stood up at the time an election is due. Incumbent chair and vice chair may be re-elected or new leaders can be elected based on the committee’s preference.
 2. Committee composition in the SOP update now reflects the RDPO IGA – i.e., any jurisdiction signing the RDPO IGA may appoint a representative to the committee. Ms. Barrett reminded the committee that there are 14 member jurisdictions currently on the committee, but another six have signed. Those six were offered a seat but decided they did not have the bandwidth to offer a representative. They, therefore, cannot vote on any RDPO matters. The SOP also reflects the way the IGA has defined decision-making processes.
 3. Scott Porter added that in terms of representation and voting at meetings, the updated PC SOP allows alternates and proxy voting. Alternates must match in title ranking (i.e., elected official).
 - iii. Vice Chair Novick then called for a motion to approve and adopt the updated SOP. Commissioner Ludlow motioned for the updated SOP to be approved as written. Councilor Bejarana seconded the motion. No other discussion was needed. The SOP Update was approved unanimously. Ms. Barrett said she will ask Chair Hyde to sign the SOP Update at the next meeting.

3. Presentation: Policy Implications of the Napa Earthquake on Seismic Retrofitting of Buildings in Our Region – Carmen Merlo, Director, Portland Bureau of Emergency Manager, and Immediate Past Chair of the RDPO Steering Committee

- a. Ms. Barrett thanked Carmen for stepping in at the last minute when Tripp Robinson called to inform her he was unable to attend to give a debrief of his late February trip to Washington, D.C., to participate in the White House Summit on Earthquake Resilience and conduct Intel and RDPO Advocacy on Capitol Hill.
- b. In early April, Carmen attended the Earthquake Engineering Research Institute (EERI)'s annual conference, which was held in San Francisco, with a field trip to Napa.
- c. EERI is known for sending reconnaissance teams to countries around the world after an earthquake (e.g., Chile, Japan, Haiti, Nepal and Ecuador). They are able to conduct immediate post-earthquake observations and derive lessons learned, as well as document the damages.
- d. The conference took them on a walking tour to experience the damage from the magnitude 6.0 Napa Earthquake, which occurred on August 24, 2014 at 3:20a.m. Carmen said it is believed the time of day contributed to why there weren't more deaths and injuries. One woman died due to a falling TV. Other key points about earthquake impacts:
 - i. The earthquake caused 14 KM of surface rupture. California is very heavily instrumented, unlike Oregon, and there were eight strong motion sensors that captured the peak ground accelerations. Three of the sensors were in Napa; one sensor was in a retrofitted unreinforced masonry building -- "Downtown Joes" -- which was about to open later that day.
 - ii. FEMA and EERI surveyed 68 buildings (all within 1,000 ft. radius of Downtown Joe's motion sensor).
 - iii. Many one-story, commercial and retail buildings; 41% were URMs. Confirmed that URMs don't typically do well in earthquakes. Retrofitted buildings did quite well. Twenty percent of retrofitted buildings were red tagged compared to 70% of those URMs that had never been retrofitted.
 - iv. Non-structural damage was the primary cause of business interruption. This includes interior damages due to fire sprinklers going off. The Napa County office building was closed for 6 months after fire sprinklers were triggered and dumped about 7,500 gallons of water. Important to have a fire sprinkler shut off policy and procedure to prevent this from happening.
 - v. A damaged two-story URM in Napa caused a neighbor's retrofitted buildings to be red tagged due to the damaged building's falling debris.
 - vi. Post-earthquake barricades/cordons: no consistent practice. Yellow caution tape is not effective or safe enough. Larger, ridged barricades and/or fencing off the area works better. Best practice: cordons should be one and a half times horizontal the height of the building because of falling hazards. This is difficult because that much space blocks economic and transportation mobility (right of way, street etc.).
 - vii. Councilor Turlay asked Carmen to clarify the distance of the cordon from the damaged building. Carmen: if your building is 50 feet tall, you want to make sure the cordon is placed 75-feet out from the base of the damaged building.

- viii. The danger of URMs: they lack steel and other structural reinforcement. Tend to collapse catastrophically, have enough structural failure to impact life safety, interrupt business activity and displace residents and businesses.
- ix. Carmen said that Portland does have a mandatory retrofit policy in place, but it's a passive trigger. Only gets activated when changing occupancy or use, reroofing the building, or doing significant renovations. In the 20 years since that the policy was put in place, less than 20% of Portland's 1,800 URMs have been demolished or retrofitted. At this pace, it would take at least another 80 years to address these kinds of dangerous buildings. Many of these buildings are in Downtown, Old Town/China Town and along major transportation routes. Post-earthquake: this means there will be a lot of debris clearance to handle before emergency responders will be able to easily ply the streets.
- e. Carmen then shared the City of Portland's URM policy development work.
 - i. In late 2014 Commissioner Novick directed PBEM, the Bureau of Development Services (Buildings and Permits), and the Portland Development Commission to embark on the development of a revised mandatory retrofit policy for URMs.
 - ii. First step was to get an update on the extent of the problem. In 1994, the Bureau of Development Services in partnership with Portland State University Engineering School did an inventory of the URM buildings and came up with the figure of around 1,800.
 - iii. During the updating of the inventory found that some of those buildings were incorrectly labeled as URMs and other buildings should have been labeled as URMs. The updated count was a little over 1,800 URMs, of which 77 are owned or financed by the City of Portland. There has been little done to significantly remedy the risk posed by these buildings. Around 100 have been demolished; little over 200 have had partial or full retrofitting done.
 - iv. What does it mean to retrofit these buildings? Tying the parapet to the roof; attaching walls to the floor and the roof; adding more horizontal bracing to attach the walls to the structure; adding steel to the inside/outside; diaphragm bracing to strengthen the floor; etc.
 - v. The City convened a Retrofit Standards Committee to determine whether or not it was feasible to retrofit these buildings and then come up with a prioritization scheme based on the use and occupancy of the buildings. A five-tier classification has emerged. Class 1 – for essential facilities – fire stations, hospitals, 911 centers, etc. Should be retrofitted to an operational level, top standard of post-earthquake performance. Four performance standards for designing a building: 1) Collapse Prevention; 2) Life-Safety; 3) Operational/Immediate Occupancy; 4) Essential; and 5) Low Occupancy – 1 or 2 story buildings.
 - vi. Requirements: Many buildings simply require parapet bracing and tying the walls to floor and the roof. At a higher level some additional engineering is required to make sure they can be used post-earthquake.
 - vii. Timeline for transforming the URM landscape:
 - 1. Class 1 buildings: all must be fully retrofitted within next ten years.

2. Lower level, low occupancy: 25 years with the potential for a five-year extension for demonstrated hardship.
- viii. Benchmarks: Everyone within three years must complete a seismic assessment of their facilities. Within ten years see some immediate improvements made/mitigate risk to the public.
 - ix. Cost: level of retrofit dictates the amount of money. For example:
 1. Class 1 buildings – about \$109 a square foot to retrofit.
 2. Class 5 – about \$20 a square foot to retrofit.
 3. Includes hard and soft costs. Soft costs include business disruption, relocation and moving expenses, permitting etc. In total, to retrofit every URM in Portland, it would be about \$1.1 billion.
 4. The city itself would be liable for about \$68 million (\$30 million outright for city-owned property; \$38 million for city-subsidized property.)
 - x. Financial incentives: City of Portland convened a seismic support committee to look at what some incentives might look like.
 - xi. Researched everything from low cost loan programs, federal and state tax rebates, density bonuses for seismic retrofits, permit reviews, and early adopter programs. Still working out what might work best for the Portland context.
 - xii. URMs are just one kind of dangerous building. There are others, in particular non-ductile concrete that lack steel reinforcement and are vulnerable to collapse.
 - xiii. Carmen said the City intends to notify tenants of these building so they are aware of the risk posed. Ask for real estate transfer disclosure. Add building plaques indicating whether the building has been retrofitted or not.
 - xiv. The U.S. Resiliency Council has passed a building rating system. The building is rated based on the life safety features, cost of repair and how soon it can be reoccupied after the earthquake. It is rated on a one- to five-star system. The City of Los Angeles has adopted this system for all of its city facilities. Broad educational campaign needed to educate the public about the risks.
 - xv. Challenges:
 1. On one hand we want to preserve the historic fabric and character of the buildings, however, doing nothing means these buildings will likely end up being demolished.
 2. Affordable housing creates challenges because many of these buildings house the most vulnerable people in our community and it is hard to move these sometimes medically frail tenants and find them alternative housing.
 3. Carmen expressed concern that the costs of retrofits will exacerbate the already crisis situation Portland has with the lack of affordable housing property.
 4. Many places of worship provide other community functions like childcare, food and other community services. Displacing all of these functions, along with it being a place to worship, may be difficult.
 5. Portland Public Schools (PPS) passed a bond measure to seismically retrofit many high schools. However, the standards to which the City would be

- requiring buildings to be retrofitted are higher than the current standards to which PPS has retrofitted their schools.
6. Right now the Oregon Constitution prevents blending of the public entities lending of full faith and credit to private property owners, meaning that unlike California, which was able to pass a bond measure to help pay for the seismic retrofit on their URMs, Oregon could not do something similar.
 7. Where we are in the process? Convened our Retrofit Standards Committee. Completed the work of our Finance and Incentives committee. Now convening a Policy Committee, which includes many URM property owners, as well as engineers, architects, and historic preservation advocates. Timeline is to introduce standards to council for adoption in the next three to four months. We'll also conduct a few public hearings.
- f. The presentation sparked a couple of key areas of questions, answers and other discussions.
- i. Councilor Bejarana asked if new standards apply to URM apartment houses and single-family residences. Carmen clarified that while they do apply to multi-family dwellings (e.g., apartment buildings), they will not apply to one- and two-family residential homes. She said the standards committee considered but decided not to recommend requiring residential homes, to brace chimneys, as they pose a unique hazard. Homeowners will need to be educated about that issue and make a decision on their own.
 - ii. Councilor Bejarana then asked if the City has studied the impact on property taxes when a building is tagged as unsafe. He said the concern would be that when the resale value goes down the assessed value goes down with it (and the City's income to help support retrofit programs).
 - iii. Carmen replied that the finance committee had not looked at that issue and that she would bring it to their attention.
 - iv. Vince Granato asked which earthquake scenario forms the basis to which the standards for retrofitting apply? Carmen replied: a probabilistic seismic assessment based on the ground motions likely to be experienced at that site for a Cascadia event, for a Portland Hills event and all other possible earthquakes. She clarified that the new standards apply only to URMs, and so the Port of Portland is in the clear having no facilities of that type.
 - v. Councilor Bejarana expressed concern if some building owners on a block retrofit their buildings in a timely manner and others do not. The impact could be a drop in the assessed value of all buildings on the block.
 - vi. Commissioner Novick replied that the City likes the idea of the market reacting more to the danger of these buildings.
 - vii. Commissioner Ludlow shared that as a real estate broker, one of the best things is to require the seller's property disclosure. He asked if the City can require disclosure without going through the State of Oregon first.
 - viii. Carmen replied that disclosure was not a popular recommendation among property owners, as they felt their properties are already disclosed based on the construction type so why have to double disclose? So that may not be one that we adopt as a permanent recommendation.

- ix. Commissioner Ludlow recommended checking with the Oregon Real Estate Division, because whenever you're touching property and requiring some kind of disclosure the state is going to be involved in that.
- x. Councilor Chase shared that in the affordable housing arena Metro is dealing with a very similar issue because for example there is a bond measure in November that those properties would have to be developed by a government entity so there is interest in what can move administratively through the state to be more flexible. There might some potential alliance there in terms of trying to create some more flexibility around the bonding resource part of it.
- xi. Councilor Chase then asked: How many of the highest risk URMs are owned by government beyond the City of Portland?
- xii. Carmen replied that when we talk about government-owned, these are ones owned by the City of Portland. Among these a large portion are the schools. The largest portion of the 1,800 URMs are privately-owned.
- g. With no more questions, Vice Chair Novick transitioned to the next agenda item.

4. RDPO Legislative Agenda Development – Vice Chair Novick and Denise Barrett, RDPO

- a. Vice Chair Novick opened this item by recalling that the Policy Committee had started talking at the last meeting about developing a State and Federal Legislative agenda and having the committee start operating as an advocacy entity.
- b. Ms. Barrett provided an update on research conducted, discussions held and actions taken since the last meeting. She said that she and Carmen Merlo met with City of Portland's Government Relations team, who advised that it is a little premature to conduct a Washington DC visit this spring. They advised that the RDPO Policy Committee finalize its legislative agenda and raise its profile among with our Congressional delegations.
- c. Ms. Barrett recalled other actions taken during the time between meetings, including asking RDPO jurisdictions to sign on to three letters.
 - i. The first two letters were for the Homeland Security funding, in response to the President having proposed cutting the Homeland Security Grant Program by 40% in the fiscal year 2017. Eleven of 14 jurisdictions signed on to that letter which went to House and Senate appropriations committees.
 - ii. ODOT reached out to RDPO for the first time asking for a letter supporting their proposal to retrofit the I-205 Abernethy Bridge. Thirteen of 14 jurisdictions signed on.
 - iii. Councilor Stewart: in the proposal there was the Abernethy Bridge but other bridges were indicated in there as well. All major structures that need consideration in the major corridors in 205 and i-5, other bridges in the region. Commissioner Ludlow replied that this was in regards to a Fast Grant so it was specific to the Abernethy Bridge.
- d. Ms. Barrett continued her report by sharing that she had spoken with Jay Wilson, specifically asking about what the Policy Committee should be thinking about and helping OSSPAC with in the upcoming 2017 Oregon State Legislature session. Jay said it would be helpful if the RDPO Policy Committee would support:

- i. Oregon Resilience Officer: first round recruitment resulted in Governor Brown not getting support for the candidate. We need to advocate that the position be taken more seriously. [Note: in the weeks following this meeting, it was announced that Mike Harryman, Oregon Health Authority, was appointed to the position for an interim period of one year. There is still a need to advocate for this position to be supported for the long-term and that it has a level of influence to ensure the effective implementation of the Oregon Resilience Plan.]
 - ii. Senate Bill 808: Got all the way up to appropriations committee but hasn't passed yet. Will be reissued in 2017. Aim is to create a seismic resilience task force to take stock of and improve preparedness efforts (e.g., response plans and mitigation) for mass displacement in an event like the Cascadia Subduction Zone earthquake.
 - iii. Advocating for Statewide Post Disaster Building Assessment program. California has a very robust disaster assessment program; Washington State has adopted the program.
 - iv. Councilor Stewart: As much as Clark County wants to be a full partner in the region and RDPO, there may be times where specific Oregon State Legislature items aren't related to Clark County. Overall as a region the goal is to support one another, but if Clark County does not sign on to something it doesn't mean they feel it's not viable it may just not be something they are able to relate to. Ms. Barrett assured they will do their best to see if there would be impacts on her county. Many people live here (Oregon) and work there (Washington), or work there and live here.
 - v. Councilor Stewart: Same issue with the list of bridges, I-5 and 205 are valuable and critical to all of us. We need to do anything we can to support that. Ms. Barrett: We welcome support from our Washington-based partners.
 - vi. Councilor Turlay: Also like to talk about trying to influence the federal government. The National League of Cities held its national conference in March; all kinds of advocacy initiatives going on there. He suggested the RDPO partner with the NLC when they go up on the Hill and talk to the congress. Ms. Barrett said that connecting with the League of Cities and Association of Counties is in the plan.
- e. Policies considered for advocating at the State and Federal level: Vice Chair Novick recalled that at the last meeting (January 29, 2016) the Committee started going through issues and potential legislation to create an agenda. He referred to the handout, 'Developing an RDPO Legislative Agenda.'
- i. Vice Chair Novick asked if PC members felt comfortable with going to Governor Brown to advocate for the issues on the list. What questions do people have or information do they need?
 - ii. Commissioner Schouten replied that for him two to three weeks is usually more than enough time to touch base with staff and colleagues.
 - iii. Councilor Turlay: concerning I-5 through Oregon and Washington, there is a tremendous amount of work that needs to be done. This group would start out advocating for certain things but then can use additional help from those south on the I-5 corridor. Important to find out what other communities are doing, give opportunity for larger groups. Vice Chair Novick replied that contact could be made with counterparts in Lane and Marion Counties.

- iv. Councilor Bejarana asked if the RDPO has a planning template for small cities to use to plan for the immediate aftermath of a large disaster, such as a Cascadia Subduction Zone Earthquake. Multnomah County’s Emergency Management Director Chris Voss offered to will talk with Councilor Bejarana after the meeting to answer his questions.
- v. Vice Chair Novick re-asked the questions about specific items to take to Governor Brown.
- vi. Commissioner Schouten said that all topics on the list are good, but he needs more background to be able to say yes at this time. Suggests having briefings from some of the representatives, cross sampling of jurisdictional staff people, and people who can give informed analyses. He said he would then take these analyses and positions back to the Washington County Board of Commissioners for review and approval before agreeing to go to Governor Brown.
- f. **It was then suggested to hold a meeting this summer to continue working on developing the legislative agenda. Ms. Barrett said she would send the Committee a Doodle poll, targeting a late July or August meeting date. She said she would also work on compiling more background information on the topics, as well as begin to draft some position statements and invite some key speakers who can inform/educate the committee.**
- g. Councilor Stewart: Said she would like to add to the RDPO list support for levees, flood mitigation on the Columbia. **Ms. Barrett said that the Levee Ready Columbia team will present to the RDPO Steering Committee on August 1. She will share the minutes of that meeting with the Policy Committee.**

5. RDPO Strategic Planning – RDPO Steering Committee Vice Chair Mike Mumaw and RDPO Manager Denise Barrett [Accompanying document: Prioritized Vision Elements/Outcomes 2017-2021.]

- a. Ms. Barrett gave a brief PowerPoint presentation on strategic planning in the RDPO. She said that when she came aboard in August 2011 to set up RDPO and get things running, the region had in place the Portland Urban Area Homeland Security Strategy (PUAHSS), which was completed in 2011, and had dozens of goals and objectives. The plan was a requirement under the UASI grant.
- b. She said that as the RDPO was being established, it was important to take stock of what had been accomplished in the PUAHSS and prioritize unfinished work. The 2014-2016 RDPO Strategic Priorities emerged, which the Policy Committee approved in October 2013.
- c. Ms. Barrett shared some examples of RDPO achievements since 2013, including:
 - i. Multi Agency Coordination System Development (RMACS): regional coordination system used for emergencies and disasters that pushed jurisdictions beyond regular mutual aid, into decision-making on prioritization of incidents; scarce resource allocation; and to de-conflict issues being faced; recommend common policies; and ensure consistent public messaging.
 - ii. She reminded the committee that the RMACS Concept of Operations Plan was completed in 2014 and accepted by all five counties by early 2015. In the last year a task force has recruited and set up the Regional MAC Group, which comprises high-level representatives from five counties and several discipline groups. A support organization has also been put into place. In the last couple of weeks, the group did

their first table top exercise, though it was really more complex than a normal table top.

- d. Other RDPO achievements on the 2013-2016 strategic plan:
 - i. Completed THIRA, working to use the tool to identify capability gaps.
 - ii. Achieved the RDPO and a sustainment strategy for the RDPO (following the loss of funding in 2013).
 - iii. Some work to strengthen the TITAN Fusion center, which supports intelligence gathering and sharing in the region.
 - iv. Regional Disaster Debris Management took a lot of steps forward thanks to Metro and Daniel Niboaur, who leads the initiative in the region.
 - v. Medical Surge planning has moved forward in the region thanks to the efforts of the NW Health Preparedness Organization, a member of the RDPO.
 - vi. The ‘Stranded Workers Agreement’ is a no cost project initiated through REMTEC; great leadership from Robin Holm, Multnomah County Public Health. Robin has worked with partners in the region to create an inter-governmental agreement that allows for workers in one jurisdiction to work in another in the event of a disaster that prevents them working in their home jurisdiction. Centers on EOC staff only. Scott Porter added that the agreement is nearly ready for signature, and while it centers on EOC staff, it could be adapted for other disciplines.
 - vii. Regional Disaster Preparedness Messaging Task Force been in place for a couple years, starting to produce and work on common preparedness messaging.
 - viii. Regional Fuel Contingency Planning not lifted as high as intended; anticipating we will in the next year go a little bit further in figuring out what needs to be done on a regional level following the execution of an exercise.
- e. Then Ms. Barrett shared those projects ‘on hold – still under consideration as regional priority’.
 - i. Mass care and shelter planning: Steering Committee was waiting to find the regional nexus based in part by learning from Multnomah County’s planning efforts.
 - ii. Spontaneous volunteer planning, donations management planning and damage assessment planning: still need to answer the question for all three of these: Is there a regional nexus?
 - iii. Ms. Barrett gave a rapid review of some of the capabilities the RDPO has helped build and maintain in the region, including several specialty teams and equipment.
 - iv. She also shared that the last couple of years has seen some important new initiatives, such as the Disabilities, Access and Functional Needs Assessment. She said Scott Porter is in charge of the current project: five jurisdictions (four counties and the City of Portland) are having their emergency management programs assessed for compliance with ADA and civil rights legislations. Key question: How are we meeting the needs of people with disabilities?
 - v. Disaster sanitation planning: working to develop preparedness messaging for the first 30 days after a major event, such as a Cascadia Subduction Zone earthquake, on sanitation best practices for the public.

- f. Mr. Mumaw then shared the Steering Committee’s draft 2017-2021 vision and outcomes. He said that he was presenting on behalf of Steering Committee Chair Nancy Bush, who was traveling.
 - i. Mr. Mumaw explained where the Steering Committee (SC) is in the planning process. The SC started last fall and will continue into late fall, towards the end of the calendar year. Said the SC would appreciate input from the Policy Committee (PC) now. He said the PC will approve the final draft document this fall.
 - ii. Mr. Mumaw explained that Steering Committee, Program Committee and work groups are trying to translate the outcomes into actual action items (projects and initiatives). The items are broken into tiers: Tier 1 being the highest; Tier 3 being the lowest.
 - iii. Near the top there is a public, private and nonprofit sector in preparedness response recovery. Have areas we are already doing this but should be doing more.
 - iv. Good examples underway: working with private sector utilities under the regional utility coordination plan, working with Red Cross and other community based organizations in preparedness. Looking to build additional partnerships.
 - v. Policy committee is doing a great job of developing on and acting on advocacy of the legislative agenda, including their support for legislation that advances the Oregon Resilience plan.
- g. Mr. Mumaw said the goal for today is to have the Policy Committee review the items and consider these questions: Are any of the statements unclear? Any visions concepts missing? Are there any in the wrong place? Too low or too high?
- h. Mr. Mumaw then asked the committee to take a few minutes to review the document. He reconvened the group 10 minutes later and asked the third question first.
 - i. Councilor Stewart said she fully agrees with the comment on Outcome 3.3 (re: more robust relationships between law enforcement and private sector) that it should be moved higher.
 - ii. Councilor Bejarana: 3.1 (Re: larger jurisdictions helping smaller ones) goes in line with the immediate preparedness plan in Fairview and should be Tier 1. He then said he wanted to promote that smaller jurisdictions become more self-reliant in the aftermath of a major disaster.
 - iii. Commissioner Ludlow: in regards to resources, do we currently maintain a list of who has what assets? Quick availability of resources, especially for small cities. Ms. Barrett replied: Not for all assets. But the Public Works Work Group keeps an updated list of equipment in all of the jurisdictions, but just for what Public Works owns and maintains. May be lapsing in other areas. PBEM as the administrator/fiscal agent of the UASI grant maintains an assets register of all UASI-purchased equipment with a value \$5,000 and above. Oregon Water/Wastewater Agency Response Network (ORWARN) has a user-managed inventory that works really well for participating agencies to share resources.
 - iv. Councilor Stewart asked: Can you tell us how 3.3 got put into a third level? What was the discussion? Mr. Mumaw responded that the Steering Committee members voted through Survey Monkey on the entire list, using a priority scale, then the results were totaled and the outcome statements ranked. Part of voting had to do

with perception: if an SC member thought the outcome was already being done well it tended to be voted a little lower.

- v. Councilor Stewart replied that the communication between agencies is key to preventing these disasters from happening in the first place. It is always the upstream approach, anything and everything to prevent bad things from happening. In this category it is primarily human injury not building injury so it seems like a high priority.
- vi. Councilor Lacey asked if the RDPO has contacted the state labor commissioner to get a list of privately held companies and their assets. Ms. Barrett replied that this action has not been taken.
- vii. Commissioner Ludlow said he is interested in what might be regionally located. Relying on just the state agencies and governmental agencies is the wrong approach.
- viii. Councilor Lacey said that the Beaverton Council will direct staff to use City equipment and other resources to help out members of the public, where a private help company might help a little bit beyond.
- ix. Councilor Lacey continued: 3.1 depends on where you sit. Should a larger city in making their preparedness plan include neighboring cities? At what point is it their responsibility to look out for smaller cities?
- x. Councilor Bejarana replied that he doesn't believe that it is the larger city's responsibility at all. He clarified that what he is proposing is for smaller cities to build self-reliance for the immediate post-disaster, at minimum hours 0-72, or whenever the outside resources can reach them. Not looking for other cities to save them.
- xi. Councilor Lacey shared that she believes Beaverton has ways they could help and share with smaller jurisdictions.
- xii. Councilor Allen explained that since one never knows just when or how impactful a disaster will be, jurisdictions should prepare for a wide range of scenarios. "At times when magnitudes are greater and the regional resources just aren't enough," he said, "that's when the governor and the National Guard get engaged." He concluded that the National Guard really needs to know who you are and you need to have a relationship with them.
- xiii. Mr. Mumaw cautioned that if you go through the military you might end up with the bill. Important to look at what is available out there in the way of mutual aid agreements.
- xiv. Commissioner Ludlow, referring to Outcome 2.5, said that nothing is more important than communication – you cannot operate without good solid information. He encouraged moving this outcome to Tier 1.
- xv. Vice Chair Novick said Tier 1 items look process-driven and that one that seems less so is the outcome for enhanced mass care and shelter capability in the region. He said he thinks that one would be one of the top three. He also said he believes that having a regional inventory of capabilities should be in the top five outcomes.
- xvi. Vince Granato said that Outcomes 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4 and 1.5 all sound the like the same thing. He advised that the Steering Committee figure out a way to merge

them together to avoid having too many Tier 1 outcomes. Many other Policy members agreed with this statement.

- i. Mr. Mumaw then asked if the Committee needed any additional clarification of the outcomes.
 - i. Commissioner Schouten: 2.1 is not completely clear; would be helpful to list examples (i.e., “such as”). Mr. Mumaw replied that this outcome would include things like regional air assets, water distribution and treatments equipment, specialty teams, etc.
 - ii. Mr. Mumaw asked if the Committee had any other feedback at this time. Hearing none, Vice Chair Novick thanked Mr. Mumaw and Ms. Barrett and then asked Ms. Barrett to proceed with providing the RDPO updates.

6. RDPO Updates – Denise Barrett, RDPO Manager

- a. Ms. Barrett said she is trying a new approach to giving updates: the RDPO Index [handout]. She proceeded to give some of the highlights:
 - i. The first number is 2,659,152, which is the total dollar value of the projects the Steering Committee has recently approved for UASI 16 grant
 - ii. Within that was \$164,000 in local jurisdiction support for the City of Gresham to purchase a mobile water treatment plan and disposable potable water bags to distribute water to the public in an emergency. She thanked the RDPO contributing members for contributing to the organization’s projects.
 - iii. She then shared that ‘66’ is the number of budget lines in the Regional Citizen Corps project, valued at \$190,000. Project benefits many volunteer training programs across the region, including CERTs/NETs.
- b. Denise asked if there were questions.
 - i. Councilor Turlay asked which jurisdictions participate in the Metropolitan Air Support Team. Ms. Barrett replied: Multnomah County, City of Portland Police (in cooperation with Clark County), Washington County, and Clackamas County all have air assets that are used specifically in the air support team role. They work together, develop SOPs together, and when there is an emergency or disaster of law enforcement nature, MAST assets deploy in the sky to help support the ground response.
 - ii. Denise continued: RDPO/UASI has been helping to provide funding for specialized technology equipment. This was a priority of the law enforcement work group to get these planes as updated as possible.
 - iii. Denise mentioned that UASI Fy’16 just supported more than \$500,000 dollars of specialized equipment that helps the pilot relay pictures that are being taken from the sky, down to law enforcement and EOC.
 - iv. Councilor Turlay shared that he attended a meeting where he was briefed about Civil Air Patrol, and until then was unaware of all of the assets they have. He thinks it would be good to talk to them to avoid redundancy of equipment or missions.
 - v. Ms. Barrett replied that she will find out if the MAST team coordinates with Civil Air Patrol. She also informed the group that the RDPO has never funded unmanned aerial vehicles (A.K.A. drones).

- vi. Councilor Stewart asked how general aviation resources are incorporated into local and regional plans. Ms. Barrett replied that the RDPO is beginning to track the potential use of these assets through the THIRA process, adding that she is unaware of any response plans in the region that incorporate those assets.
- vii. Mr. Granato said that our region will know we have arrived at coordination when we have coordinated all the way down to the emergency response teams (tactical level). Ms. Barrett added: strengthening operational coordination on the regional level remains one of the top priorities for the RDPO. It is humbling work, and there is always new practice, new technology, more work to do and gaps to fill.
- c. Vice Chair Novick indicated that time had run out for this discussion and then transitioned the meeting to the Good of the Order.

7. Good of the Order – Vice Chair Novick/All

- a. Ms. Barrett asked if the group would like to meet earlier than October/November. Councilor Stewart suggested meeting before the new legislative session in case there is some new legislation they want to promote. The consensus was to meet in July. The body will go through the concepts talked about at this meeting and have a more in depth discussion with more information. It was recommended that Ms. Barrett invite Oregon Senator Debbie Boone, who is a prime champion of the Oregon Resilience Plan and the work of OSSPAC.
- b. Last item shared: Commissioner Schouten said that both Clackamas and Washington Counties have important 911 equipment bonds up for public vote during the May primaries.

8. Adjournment: Having no other business before the Committee, Vice Chair Novick adjourned the meeting at 10:59 a.m.