

# Appendix G: Planning Process Documents

## Contents

### 1. Meeting Minutes

- a. Steering Committee Meeting Notes, May 27, 2014
- b. Steering Committee Meeting Notes, October 29, 2014
- c. Steering Committee Meeting Notes, May 5, 2015
- d. Hazard Mitigation Strategy Workshop Notes, October 1, 2015
- e. Steering Committee Meeting Notes, June 28, 2016
- f. Steering Committee Meeting Notes, August 11, 2016
- g. Steering Committee Meeting Notes, October 11, 2016
- h. Steering Committee Meeting Notes, December 15, 2016

Note: See section **3 Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment** and **Appendix C: Local OEM Hazard Analysis Scores** for information on the Hazard Analysis Workshop on June 1, 2016, and the final local hazard scores.

### 2. Other Planning Documents

- a. Example of one-on-one meetings between Multnomah County Emergency Management and each jurisdiction
- b. Action Prioritization Steps

## **G.1.a Steering Committee Meeting Notes, May 27, 2014, 1-3 p.m.**

**Location:** Troutdale Police Facility, Community Room, 234 SW Kendall Ct., Troutdale, OR 97060

**Attendees:** Mike McBride, Multnomah County Facilities Management; Laureen Paulsen, Portland Bureau of Emergency Management (PBEM); Craig Ward, Troutdale; Scott Anderson, Troutdale Police Department (PD); Adam Barber, Multnomah County Planning; Joe Rizzi, Multnomah County Emergency Management (MCEM); Todd Felix, Gresham Emergency Management (EM); Chris Strong, Gresham Department of Environmental Services (DES); Joel Wendland, Troutdale PD; Mark Gunter, Wood Village; Allison Boyd, MCEM

### **1. Welcome and Introductions**

- Joe Rizzi, director of MCEM, welcomed the group and asked everyone to introduce themselves.
- Joe discussed some of the benefits of multi-jurisdictional collaboration and planning, including more efficiently including stakeholders in one countywide process versus multiple separate planning processes.

### **2. Proposed Multi-Jurisdictional Organizational Structure**

- Allison Boyd, resilience planner for MCEM, gave an overview of the proposed committee structure and annual meeting process.
- The group discussed this proposed structure and brought up several valid concerns, including: (1) the number of stakeholders to involve in subcommittees will be a large effort to coordinate; (2) the subcommittees proposed currently address only natural hazards, but we want to add additional human-caused hazards to the program; and (3) the additional stakeholders category will include almost everyone.

### **3. Steering Committee Roles and Responsibilities**

- Allison led a discussion around the role of the steering committee as a decision-making and program administration body that has representation from all jurisdictions that adopt hazard mitigation plans. Responsibilities would include overseeing plan updates, stakeholder involvement, and making decisions concerning grant applications. The main concern that was voiced was that each jurisdiction have one vote when a vote is needed.
- The membership of the steering committee was discussed, and it was agreed that each jurisdiction should have up to three designated members, generally representing the disciplines of emergency management, community planning, and public works/facilities. Some jurisdictions will have fewer than three representatives. Wood Village anticipates having fewer and Portland will have only an emergency management representative, at least until their concurrent planning effort is complete.

#### 4. Pursuing a Goal of a Countywide, Multi-Jurisdictional Plan

- The timing of each jurisdiction's plan update was discussed. Todd Felix, Gresham emergency manager, informed the group of the City of Gresham's 2013 plan update, and that they anticipate merging their plan into the countywide plan before their next five-year update. Lauren Paulsen, PBEM, explained that the City of Portland is in the process of updating their 2011 plan and are awaiting funding from a grant that they were awarded. They are currently unsure if they will participate in a countywide plan for the next iteration.
- The cities of Fairview, Troutdale and Wood Village all have an update approval deadline of January 2016, which means the plans will need to be submitted to the state and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for review processes no later than August 1, 2015. Multnomah County's deadline is July 2017, but the county will work toward meeting the cities' January 2016 deadline so the plans can be merged.
- The plan update/merging process was discussed, and more follow up will need to be done to determine if we need an intergovernmental agreement or a memorandum of understanding (MOU) to establish expectations for the multi-jurisdictional effort. This will be worked on over the summer along with a scope of work for the plan update.

#### 5. Upcoming Grant Opportunities

- The grant application window for Federal Hazard Mitigation Assistance Grants for FY 2014 is currently open. While these grants are nationally competitive, the state expects to receive \$250,000 that will not be competitive and plans to use this to fund Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan (NHMP) updates for six counties, including Multnomah County. The Multnomah County Office of Emergency Management (MCEM) will contract with the Oregon Partnership for Disaster Resilience to provide technical assistance to the counties in updating their plans. They just released a pre-application to the counties, which is due June 6. They will decide based on the pre-application how to divide the funding between counties. There is a 25% match for the grant that we will cover with documentation of in-kind services.
- The grant performance period most likely will start between January 2015 and May 2015, so this needs to be considered in the technical assistance requested since the plan update needs to be drafted by July 2015. Questions were raised about the time period that in-kind match can be gathered; Allison will ask Dennis Sigrist, Oregon Hazard Mitigation Officer.
- The group discussed what priorities to include in the pre-application: (1) human-caused hazards (need to check state policy on this), (2) merging of plans and creation of new committees, (3) common understanding of hazard priorities across jurisdictions, (4) public education strategy.
- Allison also updated the group that post-disaster mitigation funds from the Winter Storm Declaration are all obligated to projects within the designated counties. It was discussed that we should continue to consider "shovel-ready" projects for situations when post-disaster grant funding could open up due to lack of ready projects or match in other communities. Project lists also should include planning projects, as there is also 5% post-disaster funding designated for planning projects.

**6. Next Steps**

- Allison and Tina Birch, MCEM, may request more information over the next week for the pre-application. Allison will send out the completed application next week prior to submission, but there will only be a day or so for comments.
- The next steering committee meeting will be in the fall. Allison and Tina will be in contact regarding IGA/MOU, plan update scope of work, and stakeholder lists between now and then. Each jurisdiction should designate their steering committee membership before the next meeting.
- We will pursue holding a wildfire subcommittee meeting this summer with the stakeholders from the Community Wildfire Protection Plan.

**7. Meeting adjourned approximately 2:40 p.m.**

## **G.1.b Steering Committee Meeting Notes, October 29, 2014, 1-3 p.m.**

**Location:** Portland Emergency Coordination Center, Coffey Conference Room, 9911 SE Bush St., Portland, OR 97266

**Attendees:** Allan Berry, Fairview; Chief Johnson, Fairview; Jonna Papaefthimiou, PBEM; Craig Ward, Troutdale; Todd Felix, Gresham EM; Chris Strong, Gresham DES; Mark Gunter, Wood Village; Bill Peterson, Wood Village; Mike McBride, Multnomah County Facilities; Adam Barber, Multnomah County Planning; Allison Boyd, MCEM; Tina Birch, MCEM

### **1. Welcome, Introductions, Agenda and Minutes Review**

- Allison Boyd welcomed the group and asked attendees to introduce themselves.
- Committee reviewed and approved minutes from the previous meeting.
- Committee reviewed and approved agenda for this meeting.

### **2. Program Organization Development**

- The structure proposed will be multi-jurisdictional, with the steering committee as the lead organizational group. The steering committee will have designated membership from each participating organization.
- The time frame for this planning period is shorter and will necessitate a quicker planning process versus the future process of annual review and hazard-specific updates.
- The process to identify subcommittee members for specific hazards should begin soon. Participating organizations should provide key contacts from their respective organizations for specific hazards. We will also need to check for “umbrella” organizations that may be a central organizing source for contacts.

### **3. Updates on Grant Status**

- MCEM has received a \$40,000 grant through the State Homeland Security Program for human-caused and technological risk assessment. The grant was written so that we have the option of including this information in NHMPs, but we are able to pick and choose what we want to include. Contractor selection will not be a full request for proposals (RFP) process. We are asking for a basic scope of work, incorporation of geographic information system (GIS) capabilities, and a gap analysis for all of the various plans that various agencies have done.
  - The committee listed the following human-caused and technological hazards as priorities: hazardous materials, transportation, infrastructure failure, public utilities. They requested the following be addressed only summarily: workplace/school/university violence, civil disorder, terrorism.
  - There may be a need to restrict public access to areas of the document due to sensitive information around protected critical infrastructure and other sensitive areas. Separate documents for internal use and public release will be created.

- MCEM has received preliminary notice that a possible Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant of \$40,000 to \$50,000 may be available, but this has not yet been confirmed. The work to be done with this funding was dependent on the timeframe in which it was received. This work will be contracted by OEM through the University of Oregon's Oregon Partnership for Disaster Resilience (OPDR). The grant includes 25% in-kind services. This can include meetings, time spent on work (including staff rates), etc., but cannot include federally funded/grant-funded staff. The primary area of work for this grant will be to update and enhance the action plan, merge jurisdiction-specific plans and improve usability, build the multi-jurisdictional organizational structure, and update and expand the risk assessment.

#### **4. Proposed Scope of Work for Plan Update**

- The committee reviewed and discussed the draft scope, planning deadlines, stakeholder participation and public involvement.
- The plans for the cities of Troutdale, Fairview and Wood Village are due in January 2016. This means that ideally a draft plan needs to be completed by August 31, 2015. This gives a large buffer for review by both OEM and FEMA. Each needs around 45 days for their review processes.

#### **5. Goals and Objectives Review**

- The committee discussed updating goals and objectives in the plan. Though both are included in current plans, we are required only to do goals. We will want to update our prioritization process. And since the individual groups are merging, there will need to be consensus on the priorities.
- Actions in the current plans will need to be updated in the future plan, including reasoning behind inclusion and why they haven't yet been completed. There are no consequences for not completing action items.

#### **6. Other Updates/Questions/Concerns**

- The committee discussed some of the various data updates that will be included in the plan: landslide data, flood zones, changes in development in hazard zones, liquefaction zones, changes in hazard or disaster occurrences, levee recertification, and social vulnerability analysis/most vulnerable populations. Need to look into assistance from OPDR and what analysis update we can do in-house.
- County staff will be handling most of the merging of plans and general editing. We will be looking for plan review and inputs on changes from participating organizations. County staff will also assist with providing presentations to city councils.

#### **6. Next Steps**

- Keep in mind information that will need to be gathered from each jurisdiction: public outreach opportunities, stakeholders, plans/reports to review, action updates.
- Review goals for revising at next meeting.

#### **7. Meeting adjourned on time.**

## **G.1.c Steering Committee Meeting Notes, May 5, 2015, 1-4 p.m.**

**Location:** Multnomah County Yeon Annex, Columbia Room, 1600 SE 190th Ave., Portland, OR 97233

**Attendees:** Ben Harper, Multnomah County GIS; Ken Johnson, Fairview, Danielle Butsick, Portland; Angela Carkner, Multnomah County Drainage District (MCDD); Mike McBride, Multnomah County Facilities; Mark Gunter, Wood Village; Chris Strong, Gresham; Tina Birch, MCEM; Allison Boyd, MCEM

### **1. Welcome, Introductions, Agenda and Previous Meeting Minutes**

- Allison Boyd welcomed the group and asked attendees to introduce themselves.
- Committee reviewed minutes from the previous meeting.
- Committee reviewed and approved agenda for this meeting.

### **2. Review Timelines and Tasks**

- The group reviewed the planning process timeline included in the meeting slides.
- The focus for the month of May will be data updates. Items that must be updated will be looked at in detail.
- Plan goals and mitigation actions will need updating. The steering committee will need to meet again during the summer months to continue work on this.
- Public and stakeholder outreach will take place mostly during the summer.

### **3. Updates on Grants Implementation**

- MCEM is a recipient of technical assistance through a Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant administered by the state and contracted to the University of Oregon's OPDR program. The primary area of work for OPDR in our planning process will be assistance with action planning, public involvement and community profiles.
- MCEM received grant funding through the State Homeland Security Program for a human-caused and technological risk assessment. The contracting process was just completed. Atkins is the selected contractor. The grant funding has a September deadline which aligns with our overall planning timeline.

### **4. Risk Assessment Updates for 2015**

- The state has received a sophisticated wildfire risk model. It provides additional detail to consider with the previous analysis used in the 2011 Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP). A multi-criteria analysis was used for the modeling, including factors such as slope, vegetation, weather, community impact, emergency responder response times and historic fire events. The CWPP stakeholders group will be convened to review the maps.
- HAZUS-MH 2.2 includes updated census data for analyzing earthquake and flood scenarios. The basic modeling can be customized to include local data, such as essential facilities, building stock and land use information. We have been assessing at what point in the future we will be able to do these more advanced analyses and what our data availability is currently. The Regional

Disaster Preparedness Organization (RDPO) recently approved a project for HAZUS earthquake analysis that we will find out more about to ensure our analyses will complement this future work.

- MCDD added that they are also working on modeling for levee breaches. Their input will be included into the NHMP update.
- Oregon Health Authority has just completed a social vulnerability analysis for climate change. The analysis is consistent with what the county was planning to conduct for disaster vulnerability, so we will be using the same data sets and include this in the plan.
- Other hazard risk data included in the plan is being reviewed to determine if there is readily available new data that we can use in the update.

## 5. Plan Format

- The multi-jurisdiction plan format will follow FEMA guidance and will address each jurisdiction specifically. Because the current plans for Multnomah County, Troutdale, Wood Village and Fairview were all developed by the same consultant, the format is already the same and will make merging the plans easier.
- It is difficult to create a brief, reader-friendly plan due to the extensive federal requirements for documentation and need for comprehensiveness on all hazards. To combat this issue, we are going to create community summaries that include only the pertinent information and hazard analysis for each jurisdiction/unincorporated communities to provide an alternative, shortened format. The goal is to make the community summaries easy to read, graphically and visually appealing, and informative for general public use. Community summaries will include:
  - A community profile
  - A brief summary for each hazard including:
    - hazard overview
    - hazard risk/vulnerability assessment
    - hazard maps and other visuals
    - historical hazard data
  - Mitigation actions
    - actions identified in the plan
    - actions that can be taken in the home/business
  - Additional community information resources
- Community summaries will be created for the following areas:
  - City of Troutdale
  - City of Fairview



- It was discussed at the meeting that including the Interlachen community in the Fairview summary may not be politically acceptable, so we will most likely separate Interlachen into its own summary.
- City of Wood Village
- East County Unincorporated – Areas S/SE of Gresham and east of the Sandy River (we may break this into two areas)
- West Hills/Sauvie Island

## **6. Public and Stakeholder Participation**

- MCEM has scheduled outreach events within each of the focus jurisdictions/unincorporated communities (Fairview, Troutdale, Wood Village, Corbett, Sauvie Island). The strategy is to reach out to the public via pre-identified events and community meetings.
- It was suggested that libraries may be another place to do public outreach. Interlachen has an annual meeting but it may already have occurred. Friends of Fairview also has events.
- MCEM will distribute the list of stakeholders for review and requests input for any additional stakeholders that may have been overlooked. Given the short timeframe for planning, we will be conducting targeted outreach to many stakeholder groups and meeting with them individually for input and review rather than holding large mitigation-specific meetings. Stakeholder outreach will also include engagement with groups at their meetings whenever possible, e.g., attending Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC), etc.

## **7. Goals and Objectives Review**

- The planning process includes an update of the plan goals. The current plan goals are lengthy, and revised goals should align with state NHMP goals and other related local plan goals. One of the goals is slightly out of the scope of the mitigation plan and more appropriate for emergency response plans. The 2010 plan also includes objectives with the goals. These are not required, and to be more reader-friendly, we may ensure that the intent of the objectives is included in the goals and then remove the objectives.
- Social vulnerability and historic and cultural preservation goals should be included.
- Goals should be linked to planning elements and actions.

## **8. Actions Review**

- Action items from the 2010 plan need to be reviewed and updated. Many of the actions are identical across plans and are not specific enough to be easily implemented. Moving forward, we will be working to make actions more specific with a timeline within the scope of the plan (i.e., one to five years) and have a specific person/position as a contact for each item. Each jurisdiction must have actions relative to its risks included in the plan, but we will also be opening up the action planning to other stakeholder groups within the county.
- The action items spreadsheet will be sent out to everyone and will include guidance on reviewing and updating the actions. Tina and Allison are available to assist with questions or meetings concerning updates of the actions.

**9. Human-caused and Technological Hazards Risk Assessment**

- Ryan Wiedenman from Atkins gave an introductory project presentation via a webinar and discussed the methodology options for the risk analysis. The PowerPoint will be made available.
- Meeting participants weighed the usefulness of a Priority Risk Index (PRI) vs. an asset-based prioritization. No decision was made at this meeting, although consensus leaned toward doing both but perhaps limiting the number of assets analyzed to fit the scope of work.

**10. Hazard Prioritization Process**

- The discussion on hazard prioritization was continued, also considering needs outside of the human-caused risk assessment project. OEM requires a hazard prioritization be done every 10 years as an Emergency Management Performance Grant requirement. The county's last prioritization was conducted in 2008, so it is not due yet. Public health and hospital stakeholders are also required to prioritize hazards annually and have expressed interest in basing their assessment on a countywide methodology. The NHMP is not required to "score" or rank hazards, however, much of the information needed to do rankings is required to be assessed as part of the Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment of the plan.

**11. Other Updates/Questions/Comments**

- No updates

**12. Next Steps**

- Convene a steering committee meeting in July/August prior to draft plan submission
- Identify stakeholders and input on actions
- Action status reporting

**13. Meeting adjourned on time.**

## **G.1.d Hazard Mitigation Strategy Workshop Notes, October 1, 2015, 1-3 p.m.**

**Location:** Multnomah County East Building, 1st Floor Chinook Room, 600 NE 8th St., Gresham, OR 97030

**Attendees:** Adam Barber, Multnomah County Planning; Allison Boyd, MCEM; Tina LeFebvre, MCEM; Mark Gunter, City of Wood Village; Todd Felix, NW Natural; Steven Bullock, MCEM; Susan Denavit, Red Cross; Craig Ward, City of Troutdale; Mike McBride, Multnomah County Facilities; Angela Carkner, MCDD; Tim Lynch, Multnomah County Sustainability; Daniel Nibouar, Metro; Steph Sharp, Port of Portland; Justin Ross, Oregon Health & Science University (OHSU); Allan Berry, City of Fairview; Roy Iwai, Multnomah County Transportation; Harry Saporta, Trimet; Kelle Landavazo, City of Gresham

### **1. Welcome**

- Allison Boyd welcomed the group and asked attendees to introduce themselves. An update on the planning process to date was given. The purpose of this workshop is a critical component of the process – to develop the action plan.

### **2. Vision and Goals**

- The proposed draft of the vision and goals for the 2015 NHMP update was introduced. The draft was the result of prior steering committee input, review of local and state goals, and review of national guidance and best practices. The attendees reviewed the vision and agreed to it as presented. The attendees then reviewed each goal and its objectives individually and the following comments were provided by the group:
  - Obj. 3.1: Benefit-cost analysis (BCA) is very specific and could mean extensive technical analysis by economists. Suggestions were to either specify that this is referring to a specific FEMA methodology for BCA or reword so that the concept can be implemented in a less technical manner.
  - Obj. 3.2: Provide a footnote definition of “underserved” and “underrepresented” communities.
  - Obj. 3.4: Include language that reflects community goals of universal design and accessibility.
  - Obj. 4.1: Include universal design and accessibility in reconstruction.
  - Under Goal 4: Include an additional objective that addresses equal access to funds post-event and public outreach on mitigation opportunities post-disaster.

### **3. Considerations for Actions and Prioritization Criteria**

- A definition of mitigation action was given, noting that the focus is on long-term reduction of risk and less so on preparedness and response actions. The handout defining action categories was referenced. The metadata necessary for each action to be implemented was reviewed and included responsible organizations, participating jurisdictions, timeframe, capacity/funding needs, potential funding source and implementation mechanism.
- A question was asked about the plan expiration deadline (January 30, 2016, for Fairview, Troutdale and Wood Village): because the county has a later deadline and the cities are merging

plans with the county, would they be out of compliance to wait and meet the county's deadline? It was believed they would, but it could be looked into. It was mentioned that since the planning process is short to meet the deadline, the county is treating this as the first phase of what will hopefully become a more incremental planning process, with portions of the plan worked on annually rather than once every five years.

- The screening criteria for determining if an action should be included in the plan was reviewed, and the following comments were provided:
  - No adverse social impacts: change “no” to “minimal” since there could be ways to mitigate the impacts; use “equity” instead of “adverse social impacts” to stay consistent.
  - No adverse environmental impacts: change “no” to “minimal” since there could be ways to mitigate the impacts.
  - Add screening criteria for financial impacts and cost effectiveness.
- The prioritization criteria was reviewed and the following comments were provided:
  - Benefit-Cost Ratio: change to “does not/may not meet the benefit cost ratio or may need more information.”
  - Ensure safety is considered vs. cost-effectiveness (safety should be considered as a benefit).
  - Include risk as a category. How to do this was discussed as there is not a consistent methodology yet among the organizations within the county for ranking one hazard over another, and the county's hazard rankings (using the state-required methodology) have not been updated yet. The risk would also vary by jurisdiction. There are some implications of prioritizing hazards that may result in some jurisdiction's actions being prioritized lower just because they are not exposed to that hazard. Further suggestions included considering high frequency or high severity.
  - Timing: If risk is included as a criteria, then we may be able to remove timing criteria.
  - It was also suggested that we could weigh certain criteria to be more important than others.
- A brief review of equity considerations was provided, and the county's Equity Lens tool as well as questions and objectives from the Climate Action Plan were provided as references.

#### **4. Hazard Risks**

- The results of informal polls at public outreach events were graphically presented. At each event, attendees were asked to pick the hazards that were of most concern to their families over the next 20 years. Earthquake was the most popular response in each community.
- A quick overview of major issues for each hazard included in the plan was presented. Hazards include earthquake, flood, wildfire, volcano, landslide, and severe weather.

## 5. Action Ideas

- Before reviewing the action ideas, the stakeholders were asked to watch for gaps, such as each jurisdiction's risks and priorities being addressed and including actions to address the built environment.
- The attendees began discussing the action ideas and had the following comments:
  - **Action Idea #1:**
    - Red Cross would be a participating organization.
    - Are the current outreach programs not already addressing this?
    - Are there groups already working on this, e.g., the RDPO Messaging Work Group, that could have a mitigation representative added to ensure these topics are covered?
    - Should neighboring counties like Clackamas be included?
    - Current programs focus on homeowners.
    - Education on what specific disaster impacts to expect in a particular community is needed.
    - Action needs to be explored further and reworded.
  - **Action Idea #2:**
    - Jurisdictions are not interested in going to other jurisdictions for assistance or review of their comprehensive plan policies.
    - Needs to be reworded to be an individual jurisdictional effort to incorporate hazards into comprehensive plans.
  - **Action Idea #3 was skipped due to more time needed for discussion.**
  - **Action Idea #4:**
    - Jurisdiction representatives agreed to participate in action.
    - General consensus to keep the action.
    - Estimated to be a "big ticket" item in terms of cost/capacity.
    - Sooner the better for implementation.
  - **Action Idea #5:**
    - General consensus to keep the action; jurisdictions present agreed to participate.
    - MultCo Facilities could use courthouse project as a pilot for documenting the process.
    - Port is also doing similar work.

- **Action Idea #6:**
  - General consensus to keep the action; jurisdictions present agreed to participate.
- **Action Idea #7**
  - General consensus to keep the action.
- **Action Idea #8**
  - General consensus to keep the action; jurisdictions present agreed to participate.
  - Concern was raised over not having this already included in the implementation plan, but due to short timeframe of planning process we will not be able to get into the specific resource availability within each of our partners.
- In order to adjourn on time, the action idea discussion ended at #8.

#### **6. Additional Action Suggestions**

- The attendees were asked if they had any additional actions they wanted to suggest. Angela Carkner from MCDD suggested adding an action for jurisdictions to include levee review zones into their comprehensive plan updates. She also suggested that the Levee Ready committee could be an entity to consider for action implementation.
- The group was encouraged to think of other ideas and to continue providing feedback.

#### **7. Next Steps**

- More feedback on the remainder of the actions and prioritization will be needed. Much of this will likely be done in small group meetings and phone calls to stakeholders. Updates will be forthcoming.

#### **8. Meeting adjourned on time.**

## **G.1.e Steering Committee Meeting Notes, June 28, 2016, 1-4 p.m.**

**Location:** Kellogg Community Room, 234 SW Kendall Ave., Troutdale, OR 97060

**Attendees:** Adam Barber, Multnomah County Land Use Planning; Lisa Corbly, Multnomah County Emergency Management (MCEM); Tricia Sears, MCEM; Chris Voss, MCEM; Chris Blanchard, MCEM; Craig Ward, City of Troutdale; Mike McBride, Multnomah County Facilities; Nolan Young, City of Fairview; Scott Sloan, City of Wood Village; Bill Peterson, City of Wood Village; Danielle Butsick, PBEM; Tim Couch, Sauvie Island Drainage District.

### **1. Welcome**

- Lisa Corbly welcomed the group and asked attendees to introduce themselves. The group, also referenced as the steering committee, agreed to forfeit breaks in order to adjourn 15 minutes early, at 3:45 p.m. The agenda and handouts were provided to all. Cookies were available as brain fuel.

### **2. Proposed Timeline**

#### **• Timeline and deliverables**

- Steering committee members agreed that the schedule on the NHMP Update – Timeline was acceptable.
- Craig noted that the NHMP came up in discussion at the 6/27/16 public meeting regarding the revised FEMA flood maps. He will need to have a NHMP work session with the Troutdale City Council, possibly more than one. Lisa will work with Craig on the details of those meetings.
- Steering committee members noted that each jurisdiction will need to provide public notice about the NHMP (e.g., newspaper, posting it online, mailed information, and so forth); each jurisdiction can determine best approach for their community.
- Adam noted that we had discussed briefing the Planning Commission and asked if we plan to brief the county commissioners. Chris Voss responded that he will talk with each county commissioner and determine the appropriate steps.

#### **• Steering committee schedule: determine standing meeting time**

- The steering committee meetings targeted for August, October and December were agreed as acceptable. Members suggested avoiding meeting dates on Fridays. Best times for members to meet will be identified by either a Doodle poll or a When2Meet poll coordinated by Lisa.

#### **• Hazard Management Grant Program (HMGP) projects?**

- No one identified any HMGP projects. Lisa mentioned that MCDD may have a project related to levees. Lisa is working with MCDD and OEM to determine the eligibility of this project per federal requirements.

- **Conflicts?**

- No conflicts with the proposed timeline and deliverables were identified. Questions were discussed and described in the “timeline and deliverables” section above.

### 3. Table of Contents

- The Table of Contents was discussed . Lisa noted this update is a blend of the five current NHMPs for Multnomah County and the cities of Gresham, Fairview, Troutdale and Wood Village, and yet this update retains unique information about each jurisdiction. The Table of Contents is color coded in four categories: draft complete; draft in progress, almost complete; draft in progress; and not yet started. A draft copy of the risk assessment will be sent to steering committee members in July.

### 4. Mitigation Strategy

- **Review vision, goals, action types and criteria**

- Lisa refreshed the group on prior decisions made regarding the Mitigation Strategy. This included a review of the vision, goals and objectives for the NHMP as well as types of mitigation actions.

- **Discuss process to complete action updates**

- The group was reminded of the federal requirement that each jurisdiction identify at least one action to address each hazard to which it is subject. Additional requirements for each action include: aligning actions to the NHMP goals, determining a lead agency, prioritization, listing funding source(s) and identifying implementation mechanisms
- The goal of this meeting is to continue to update the actions — this action update process began at the Mitigation Strategy Workshop in October 2015. Today the group will focus on refining each agreed-upon action and identifying the lead agency for each.
- Between steering committee meetings, Lisa will work with each lead agency to further refine each action.
- Danielle asked if the steering committee will meet after the plan is adopted. Lisa explained that after local adoption, during the maintenance and monitoring phase, a standing committee will meet at least twice per year, per federal requirements, to review new hazard and vulnerability data and update actions. These regular revisions will help reduce the amount of work needed during the next plan update. At the very least, the maintenance and monitoring group needs to include representation from all jurisdictions in the Planning Area, although others are welcome, including everyone on the steering committee.

- **Update proposed mitigation strategy actions**

- The group discussed the Action Ideas for Review and Discussion document. Lisa applauded Allison’s work on blending and paring down 144 actions from the five current plans into fewer than 40 actions. Some updates and additional actions have since been added, resulting in a total of 45 actions.



- The Action Item document tracks the following changes: Text in black indicates actions have been carried over from current NHMPs and blended with any actions that were similar. Text in green indicates revisions based on feedback at the workshop in October 2015. Text in red indicates revisions based on information gathered by MCEM since the 2015 workshop.
- Representatives from each jurisdiction in the Planning Area discussed the pros and cons of each jurisdiction prioritizing actions versus the steering committee prioritizing all actions for all jurisdictions. Prioritization will be discussed at the next steering committee meeting, in August.
- The steering committee discussed the first 23 action items (of 45) in the document. Actions were edited, deleted or identified as needing further discussion before the group can vote on it. No new actions were proposed.
- Specific actions were updated as follows:
  - Accepted as is, or with minor wordsmithing: Actions 1-8, 10, 12, 14, 15, 18
  - Substantive changes were made to these actions:
    - Action 11: The group prefers to use an existing third-party equity group to provide guidance (i.e. the Multnomah County Equity Council), if available.
    - Action 16: Specify *public* buildings.
  - Delete these actions:
    - Action 13: The discussion about historic and cultural resources has already been expanded in the Community Profile for this update. The group decided to reference the National Historic Registry rather than list specific properties.
    - Action 19: Seismic upgrades for public buildings is covered in Action 16.
    - Action 22.
  - Further discussion needed:
    - Action 9: MCEM will refine and bring back to the steering committee.
    - Action 14: To keep this action, needs to be more than 'advocating'. MCEM will check with PBEM.
    - Action 17: Specify *all bridges along Emergency Transportation Routes and other arterial bridges*; Check with MC Bridges Department, Check nomenclature for 'arterial.'
    - Action 20: MCEM will check with PBEM.
    - Action 21: Recommend deletion; check with Gresham.

## 5. Next Steps

- Lisa will follow up with individual jurisdictions to further discuss the Mitigation Strategy actions. Lisa will send a Doodle or When2Meet poll to establish the August meeting date and time. At a

minimum, the agenda for the August meeting will include the remaining action items, any new action items, and prioritization.

- 6. The meeting adjourned early at 3:45 p.m., as agreed.**

## **G.1.f Steering Committee Meeting Notes, August 11, 2016, 9 a.m.-12 p.m.**

**Location:** Kellogg Community Room, 234 SW Kendall Ave., Troutdale, Oregon 97060

**Attendees:** Adam Barber, Multnomah County Land Use Planning; Lisa Corbly, Multnomah County Emergency Management (MCEM); Chris Voss, MCEM; Chris Blanchard, MCEM; Craig Ward, City of Troutdale; Mike McBride, Multnomah County Facilities; Nolan Young, City of Fairview; Scott Sloan, City of Wood Village; Danielle Butsick, PBEM; Kelle Landavazo, City of Gresham; Peter O'Farrell, PBEM.

### **1. Welcome and Introductions**

- Lisa Corbly welcomed the group and asked attendees to introduce themselves. Cookies and coffee were provided to help stir creative juices.

### **2. Meeting Notes**

- The group reviewed notes from the June meeting. No changes were made by group.

### **3. Updates**

- **Risk assessment review period through August 19th**
  - The group extended the risk assessment review period another week, until August 26th.
- **Special districts**
  - Lisa and Angela discussed the new FEMA requirement that special districts have an adopted NHMP, or be an annex to an adopted NHMP, in order to be eligible for some federal mitigation funding. The state is in the process of developing NHMP guidance for special districts. MCDD is exploring a potential HMGP project. If this project is eligible for HMGP funding, the new NHMP requirement for special districts would apply. MCEM and MCDD will coordinate on next steps as the new guidance becomes available.
- **Public comment period**
  - Lisa outlined the federal requirement for each jurisdiction to have a public notice and public comment period for the draft NHMP. Each jurisdiction will determine its public notice approach by the next steering committee meeting. MCEM will post the draft NHMP on the county website and will receive and integrate comments. Public comment approaches, roles and responsibilities will be discussed at the committee meeting in October.

#### 4. Working Session

- **Update mitigation strategy actions**

- First the committee revisited actions that had been tabled at the last meeting and have since been updated or for which new information has been identified. Those actions were updated as follows:
  - Actions 9, 14, 20
  - Action 17: Keep as is, including new language to coordinate with school districts.
  - Action 21: Keep as is. Gresham needs to check status with wastewater project.
- Then the committee reviewed the remaining actions and accepted as is, edited or deleted each:
  - Accepted as is, or with minor wordsmithing: 26, 27, 28, 31, 32, 33, 37, 38, 41, 42, 43, 44, 46, 47.
  - Substantive changes were made to:
    - ✓ Action 25: Gresham only.
    - ✓ Action 39: Keep first half of action, but the second half needs to be reworded, because the committee does not have authority over power companies.
    - ✓ Action 45: Align with Portland Mitigation Action Plan (MAP) and CWPP.
    - ✓ Action 40: Change to make more actionable: from *evaluate adequacy* to *encourage retrofits* to mobile homes for high winds.
  - More information needed:
    - ✓ Actions 24, 29, 33, 34, 35, 36: inquire with DOGAMI.
  - Deleted: no actions were deleted
  - Additions:
    - ✓ Action 48: Communicate with utility agencies the NHMP actions and priorities, and encourage integration into their planning.
    - ✓ Action 49: Consider regulations that require fire-safe construction in high-risk areas using wildland urban interface (WUI) overlays.
    - ✓ Action 50: Use best available data to consider impacts of wildfire risk when developing policy.
- Lisa will follow up on the outstanding actions and update the action list accordingly.

- **Decide prioritization criteria, approach, timeline**
  - Lisa presented to the committee the draft action prioritization criteria, based on the existing criteria in current local and state NHMPs, feedback during the Hazard Mitigation Strategy Workshop in October 2015, and FEMA guidance. After some discussion about federal requirements and how the Portland MAP is organized, the group made some changes and ultimately agreed to the following:
    - **Criteria:**
      - ✓ Equity: Keep definition provided.
      - ✓ Benefit: Reference Portland MAP to develop this definition.
      - ✓ Cost: Reference Portland MAP to develop this definition.
      - ✓ Available Capacity/Funding: Keep definition provided.
    - **Scoring:** each criterion will have three weighted scoring options, High (3 points), Medium (2 points), and Low (1 point).
  - The group agreed that each jurisdiction will determine its own top actions and will score its top actions.

## 5. Next Steps

- **Homework**
  - **Risk assessment review and comment:** Due to MCEM August 26th.
  - **Actions:**
    - Lisa will update the prioritization table, develop a scoring worksheet and send it to the committee along with the updated action list by August 26th.
    - The group decided three weeks was ample time to identify and prioritize top actions. These will be due to MCEM by September 16th.
  - **Review other draft sections and comment** — coming later in September.
  - **Next meeting:** Thursday October 13, 9 a.m.-12 p.m.

## 6. The meeting was adjourned on time.

## **G.1.g Steering Committee Meeting Notes, October 11, 2016, 9 a.m.-12 p.m.**

**Location:** Kellogg Community Room, 234 SW Kendall Avenue, Troutdale, Oregon

**Attendees:** Angela Carkner, Multnomah County Drainage District; Lisa Corbly, Multnomah County Emergency Management (MCEM); Mike McBride, Multnomah County Facilities; Nolan Young, City of Fairview; Scott Sloan, City of Wood Village; Kelle Landavazo, City of Gresham.

### **1. Welcome/Announcements**

- Lisa Corbly opened the meeting and the group discussed the imminent series of winter storms and likely impacts, including downed power lines from high winds and urban flooding from blocked storm drains.

### **2. Meeting Notes**

- The group approved the minutes as is.

### **3. Updates**

- **Timeline**

- Lisa presented the timeline and the group discussed the Public Comment period. Public Comment is slated to open in November. Exact timing will be contingent on the Committee proving feedback on final draft sections of the plan, and completion of the action tables, in a timely manner and the level of feedback provided.

- **Review of Draft Sections**

- Final feedback is due 10/15/2016, a Saturday. So MCEM extended the due date to the end of day (EOD) Monday 10/17/2016. Lisa highlighted that significant feedback is needed from each jurisdiction on Appendix: Implementation Mechanisms. The group discussed the importance of articulating which existing planning mechanisms can be used to further mitigation efforts.

- **State Feedback**

- MCEM has been sending Oregon OEM draft sections of the plan for review and feedback, concurrent to Steering Committee review. Overall the State has confirmed that the draft plan seems to meet federal requirements. MCEM and Oregon OEM have discussed how the risk assessment data varies in granularity and content among jurisdiction, a function of merging five plans. The State recognizes this complication and suggests adding a statement in the Risk Assessment Introduction that explains data variances.

- **Special Districts**

- MCEM and MCDD have been working with the Oregon OEM to determine NHMP requirements for levee districts. If the levee districts chose to adopt an NHMP, they will be able to append this NHMP once it is formally adopted.

#### 4. Discussion

- **Top Action, by Jurisdiction**

- The group reviewed the current action table that includes top actions and prioritization for all jurisdictions. Some actions require additional information. Final action tables are due EOD Monday 10/17/2016.
- MCDD asked for clarification if each levee district needed to prioritize actions for their district. MCEM answered that it was possible that was the case. Angela will pose the question to Oregon OEM.

- **Mitigation Actions: New/updated**

- The group was pleased a new action for the Joint Office on Homeless Services was added. MCDD clarified language in two actions to articulate the role of cities and the county in supporting Levee Ready Columbia.

- **Public Comment: Timeline/Approaches**

- Lisa presented the public comment approaches for each community. MCEM will provide draft language by Friday 10/14/2016, for newsletters. That announcement will not include the exact public comment dates, because completion of the final draft will be contingent on the feedback provided by each jurisdiction, due 10/17/2016. The goal is to open public comment by 11/07/2016. The group agreed on a 4-week public comment period.
- MCEM will send an email blast to a long list of stakeholders in the region and asked if other jurisdictions would be doing the same, or if they wanted to add their contacts to the MCEM email. All communities indicated a preference to email their own stakeholders directly. MCEM will provide the group a Google Doc with the MCEM stakeholder list to minimize redundancy.

#### 5. Next Steps

- Homework: All comments on draft sections due EOD Monday 10/17
- The last Steering Committee meeting before the plan goes to the State OEM and FEMA will be: December 15, 9:00-12:00 @ the Troutdale Community Room

#### 6. The meeting adjourned at 10:45.

December meeting notes will be available in the final plan document.



## G.2.a One-on-one Meeting Agenda Example

- I. NHMP Timeline
  - a. June 2016 Meetings: 6/1, 6/28
  - b. HMGP: Feb 17, 2017
  - c. Local adoption: sufficient time?
  - d. Conflicts?

	2016	2017
	January February March April May June July August September October November December	January February March April May June July
<b>Phase 1:</b> Public Involvement, Draft	PC	
<b>Phase 2:</b> OEM, FEMA Review to APA		
<b>Phase 3:</b> Adoption by Local Jurisdictions		

PC: Public Comment period will be one month

- II. Table of Contents
- III. County-specific Questions
  - a. Profile
  - b. Risk Assessment
    - i. Types of each hazard that affect Fairview
    - ii. History: hazard events
    - iii. Mitigation success stories/examples
- IV. Anything Else?

## G.2.b Action Prioritization Steps

Multnomah County Multi-Jurisdictional NHMP: **Action Prioritization**, 8/25/2016

Take these **5 steps** to fill out the Action Prioritization excel spreadsheet.  
 Due to MCEM by Friday **September 16<sup>th</sup>**. Please contact Lisa if you would like assistance prioritizing actions for your community.

### Step 1: Identify top actions for your jurisdiction

*Requirements: Identify a comprehensive range of actions for hazards to which your community is subject — especially hazards to which you have high to moderate risk, based on the risk assessment (see risk score table below). Emphasize new and existing buildings and infrastructure.*

**Risk Scores\***

	Unincorporated Multnomah County	Gresham	Troutdale	Fairview	Wood Village
<b>High</b>	Earthquake Flood Wildfire	Earthquake Severe Weather	Severe Weather	Severe Weather	Severe Weather
<b>Moderate-High</b>				Earthquake	
<b>Moderate</b>	Severe Weather	Flood Landslide	Earthquake Volcano Flood Wildfire	Volcano	Earthquake Volcano Landslide
<b>Low-Moderate</b>				Flood	Flood
<b>Low</b>	Landslide Volcano	Wildfire Volcano	Landslide	Landslide Wildfire	Wildfire

\*This table shows the risk scores identified by each jurisdiction in the Planning Area.

**Column G “Top Action”:** Indicate **Yes** for all top actions for your community.

*What are “top actions”?* Top actions are those most likely to meet multiple NHMP goals and objectives<sup>1</sup>, have benefits that exceed cost, and can be implemented over the life of this Plan, within the next 5 years. (See footnote for a list of the NHMP goals and objectives.) These actions will be the focus for each respective jurisdiction during this Plan’s 5-year cycle. As mitigation resources become available, the Planning Team will first consider these actions for implementation.

*Actions not identified as a top action:* Remaining actions will be evaluated and reviewed during the required semi-annual NHMP monitoring meetings. If the equity, benefits, costs, risk, or capacity and support change during this Plan’s 5-year cycle, the Planning Team will re-assess the prioritization ranking.

**Column H “Jurisdiction”:** For recommended actions only, type your jurisdiction’s name.

### Step 2: Identify a Lead

**Column I “Lead”:** List one Lead department/entity responsible for each recommended action.

### Step 3: Prioritize top actions

**Columns J “Equity” through N “Capacity/Support”:** Determine, Low (1 point), Medium (2 points), High (3 points) for your recommended actions, using the criteria and scoring method listed in the table below.

**Column O “Priority Score”:** One score will automatically be calculated for each recommended action.

Prioritization Criteria			
Criteria	High (3 points)	Medium (2 point)	Low (1 point)
<b>Equity</b>	Social benefits are highly likely, especially for people in areas with high hazard exposure and for people who have been disproportionately impacted by natural disasters.	Social impacts are likely to be neutral to positive, especially for people in areas with high hazard exposure and for people who have been disproportionately impacted by natural disasters.	Social impacts are likely to be neutral, especially for people in areas with high hazard exposure and for people who have been disproportionately impacted by natural disasters.
<b>Benefits</b>	Supports compliance with a legal mandate or will have an immediate impact on the reduction of risk exposure to life and property.	Will have a long-term impact on the reduction of risk exposure to life and property.	Long-term benefits of the action are difficult to quantify in the short term.
<b>Costs</b>	Possible to fund under existing budget. Project is or can be part of an existing ongoing program or would not require substantial effort to initiate or appropriate funds.	Could budget for under existing work-plan, but would require a reapportionment of the budget or a budget amendment.	Existing work plan and funding levels are not adequate to cover the costs of the proposed project.
<b>Risk</b>	Addresses a high-risk issue as described in the risk assessment. <i>See above risk table.</i>	Addresses a moderate-risk issue as described in the risk assessment. <i>See above risk table.</i>	Addresses a low-risk issue or has not been assessed for the level of risk. <i>See above risk table.</i>
<b>Capacity</b>	Capacity is highly feasible within 5 years.	Capacity is uncertain within 5 years.	Capacity is unlikely within 5 years.

## Step 4: List potential funding

**Column P “Potential Funding”:** List known or possible funding sources for each of your community’s recommended actions. A diverse range of funding is preferred. Some funding sources may include local resources, state funded projects, or federal grants. When possible, be specific.

## Step 5: List implementation mechanisms

**Column Q “Implementation Mechanisms”:** When appropriate, list other planning mechanisms through which each recommended action *could* be implemented. Some examples are: comprehensive plans, capital improvement plans, or local regulations.

---

<sup>1</sup> NHMP goals and objectives were identified during the Workshop in October 2015 and then refined by the Steering Committee. They include:

- Goal 1. Strengthen the capacity of the whole community<sup>1</sup> to reduce risk by increasing hazard awareness, creating partnerships, and leveraging multiple implementation mechanisms and funding opportunities.
  - Obj. 1.1. Ensure the risk assessment and related risk information materials are current with the best available science and appropriate for diverse audiences.
  - Obj. 1.2. Support community outreach activities that increase stakeholder awareness and understanding of hazard risk and mitigation options.
  - Obj. 1.3. Continue efforts to build effective partnerships with community-based organizations, businesses, and government agencies to identify and implement mitigation actions.
  - Obj. 1.4. Integrate risk reduction concepts, policies, and projects into existing planning and implementation mechanisms, such as comprehensive plans, development codes, and capital improvement plans.
  - Obj. 1.5. Seek various funding opportunities including mitigation-specific grant sources and local financing solutions.
  - Obj. 1.6. Enhance efforts to monitor vulnerability reduction and document progress towards resiliency.
- Goal 2. Develop mitigation actions that consider all community systems: economic, health and social services, housing, infrastructure, and natural and cultural resources.
  - Obj. 2.1. Consider strategies that support a prosperous and resilient economy and that would expedite economic restoration following an incident.
  - Obj. 2.2. Consider strategies that promote the health, independence, and well-being of the whole community.
  - Obj. 2.3. Consider strategies that mitigate existing housing risks and increase resilience in new construction, repair, and rebuilding.
  - Obj. 2.4. Consider strategies that strengthen essential infrastructure and services, decrease disruptions, and increase resilience in new construction, repair, and rebuilding.
  - Obj. 2.5. Consider strategies that conserve, protect, and restore the natural and cultural assets of the community.
- Goal 3. Prioritize mitigation actions that have a high benefit-to-cost ratio and increase social equity.
  - Obj. 3.1. Prioritize actions that have a positive benefit-cost ratio by estimating whether the expected long-term benefits of losses avoided will exceed the cost of the mitigation action.
  - Obj. 3.2. Prioritize the allocation of resources for mitigation actions that benefit underserved and under-represented communities<sup>1</sup>, especially those in high hazard risk areas.
  - Obj. 3.3. Seek opportunities in which hazard mitigation also benefits other community goals, such as economic development, energy efficiency, public health, universal design, or environmental conservation.
  - Obj. 3.4. Consider the increased benefit an action may have that reduces risk from multiple hazards.
- Goal 4. Plan for including mitigation activities during post-disaster recovery and reconstruction.
  - Obj. 4.1. Integrate policies that reduce disaster risk into recovery plans and reconstruction standards by planning for recovery prior to a disaster.
  - Obj. 4.2. Educate stakeholders on post-disaster mitigation funding sources and opportunities to build back resiliently.
  - Obj. 4.3. Ensure policies and public outreach strategies are in place to provide equitable access to post-disaster mitigation opportunities.