

Multnomah County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Program

Steering Committee Meeting

October 29, 2014, 1:00-3:00 pm

Portland Emergency Coordination Center, Coffey Conference Room

9911 SE Bush St., Portland, OR 97266

AGENDA ITEM	TIME
Welcome Introductions Review Agenda Review Last Meeting Minutes	1:00-1:10
Program Organization Development Any new feedback on proposed structure? Steering Committee –Finalize members and roles/expectations Subcommittees/ Additional Stakeholders – membership, recruitment	1:10-1:20
Updates on Grant Status Pre-disaster Mitigation Grant – Technical assistance through OPDR State Homeland Security Grant – Human-caused Hazards Risk Assessment - Contractor selection	1:20-1:40
Proposed Scope of Work for Plan Update Review draft scope Modifications, concerns? Discuss capabilities to contribute staff time and information	1:40-2:25
Goals and Objectives Review Review current plans' goals and objectives Determine types of changes desired	2:25-2:45
Other Updates/Questions/Comments	2:45-2:55
Next Steps Next meeting date Pursue Memorandum of Understanding? Identify Stakeholders Provide list of public outreach ideas and opportunities Review revised goals and objectives Send Word files of plans Begin asking about plans/reports updated or developed 2010-now	2:55-3:00
Adjourn Meeting	3:00

Multi-Jurisdictional Plan Update

Draft Scope of Work for Steering Committee Review, Oct. 29, 2014

Overview: Multnomah County and the cities of Fairview, Troutdale, and Wood Village are developing a combined Hazard Mitigation Plan to meet the 5-year update requirement (44 CFR §201.6(d)(3)). The cities must have approved updates completed and adopted by January 26, 2016. Oregon Office of Emergency Management and FEMA Region X must review the updated plan prior to this date. Taking into consideration the review period and time it will take to adopt the plan within our jurisdictions, our target completion goal for a final draft of the combined and updated plan is by August 31, 2015.

The plan update must include Fairview, Troutdale, Wood Village and the County since these plans are due for updates. As much as possible, however, the plan will be modified to be a countywide plan. If the City of Gresham participates in the planning process and would like to adopt the multi-jurisdictional plan upon completion they are encouraged to do so in order to be on the same update schedule as the other jurisdictions. The City of Portland is conducting their own plan update but data will be shared between the two plan update processes.

Requirements: The Stafford Act and Title 44 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) §201.6 has specific requirements for the content and process of updating Local Mitigation Plans. This scope of work notes tasks that are federal requirements and those that are optional but something that we would ideally complete by August 2015. Updates and improvements to the plan do not need to wait for the 5-year update cycle, however. If there are optional tasks that cannot be completed in the short timeframe for submittal to the State and FEMA, these tasks will be included in a 2016 scope of work.

Task 1. Planning Process

1.1. Jurisdictional Participation (Required): Each jurisdiction seeking approval of the plan (at a minimum: County, Fairview, Wood Village, and Troutdale) must designate at least one person who is representing the jurisdiction (name, title, and agency). The jurisdiction must have representatives that attend mitigation plan update meetings, provide data, or conduct stakeholder/public involvement activities. Any participation in the planning process must be documented. For purposes of in-kind match for our Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant (technical assistance from OPDR), we also need to track the time dedicated to the plan update by any staff or volunteers.

Responsibilities:

- a) The County Leads (Allison Boyd and Tina Birch) will maintain the Steering Committee roster and any other stakeholder group rosters created. All jurisdictions are responsible for providing roster data to the County for their respective representatives.

- b) Any jurisdiction holding a hazard mitigation related meeting will use a sign-in sheet and scan and send this to the County. For in-kind documentation, please note the amount of time for the meeting, hourly rates of attendees if available, and if any of the attendees are federal employees or funded through a federal grant (i.e. EMPG).
- c) Submissions of data for the plan update will be sent via email to the County (Allison.Boyd@multco.us and Tina.Birch@multco.us) whenever possible so that a record can be maintained. Also, please include the amount of time and personnel involved in gathering the data for documenting in-kind match.
- d) Any public awareness or involvement activities will be documented as appropriate and emailed to the County (e.g. if information is posted to website send a link or screen shot, if booth set up at a public event send advertisement and photo). Again, please track in-kind match related to these activities.

1.2. Stakeholder Participation (Required): Opportunity to be involved in the planning process must be offered to 1) local and regional agencies involved in hazard mitigation activities; 2) agencies with authority to regulate development; 3) neighboring communities. Involvement means they were invited as participants (e.g. to a meeting) and given a chance to provide input to the plan's content.

Responsibilities:

- a) Steering Committee members will assist County in developing a list of stakeholders to include in update process and will provide contact information for recommended stakeholders (name, title, agency, email, and phone number).
- b) Steering Committee will plan at least one meeting during plan update process to invite stakeholders not already represented on the Steering Committee. County will coordinate meeting and send invites.
- c) Any stakeholder meetings held by a jurisdiction will be documented and emailed to County. (e.g. a city specific meeting to gather information for the plan from multiple departments).
- d) County will ensure stakeholders have an opportunity to comment on the draft plan.

1.3. Public Involvement (Required): Plan must include documentation of how the public was given the opportunity to be involved and how their feedback was incorporated. Public involvement must occur during plan drafting prior to the final draft comment period.

Responsibilities:

- a) Steering Committee members will determine potential methods of public involvement they can implement prior to August 2015 and provide a list of opportunities to the County who will compile these for Committee discussion. (e.g. public events could include a hazard mitigation "open house" element, website postings, surveys, community meetings, etc.) At a Steering

Committee meeting, opportunities to do joint outreach will be discussed as well as what the public input request should be. Specific tasks for conducting the public activity will be assigned at that time.

- b) County will coordinate with OPDR to determine if any technical assistance can be provided for conducting public involvement.

Task 2. Data Updates

2.1. Incorporation of existing plans and studies (Required): The plan has to document what existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information were reviewed in updating the plan. This will most likely only include items that have been updated and developed in the last 5 years.

Responsibilities:

- a) Steering Committee members will check with their colleagues in their jurisdiction for any relevant plans/reports that may have been updated or created since 2010. They will email this to the County.
- b) County will use the stakeholder list (created by the Steering Committee) to ask for any new or updated plans/reports that may be relevant to the hazard mitigation plan.
- c) The County will document the new data and determine if there is a need to incorporate it into the risk assessment. On a case by case basis, the County may ask for assistance from Steering Committee members or OPDR in reviewing or incorporating information from the identified plans/reports.

2.2. Changes in Development (Required): The plan must describe changes in development in hazard prone areas since the last plan was approved. If no changes impacted the vulnerability, the plan must note this.

Responsibilities:

- a) The County will provide the hazard maps (GIS shapefiles, if preferred and available) to the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee members are responsible for ensuring the appropriate personnel in their jurisdiction review the areas and provide feedback on whether changes in development occurred in the past 5 years or is planned to occur.
- b) The County will incorporate the input provided by the jurisdictions into the plan and will also conduct analysis to determine population changes in the hazard-prone areas. The County will include in the plan update whether these changes have any effect on vulnerability of the community and the Steering Committee will review these edits to the plan.

2.3. Minimum Risk Assessment updates (Required): Hazard/disaster occurrences within the past 5 years as well as changes to the NFIP repetitive loss or severe repetitive loss lists must be included.

Responsibilities:

- a) County will update declared disaster events and major hazard occurrences. Steering Committee members will provide any localized hazard occurrences from 2010-2015 via email to the County.
- b) Each jurisdiction will provide most current NFIP inventory data to the County via email.

2.4. New analysis and editing of risk assessment (optional): While not required, there are additional or improved analyses that can be included in the plan update, e.g. social vulnerability analysis, HAZUS updates, incorporation of human-caused hazard study, etc. Additionally, the descriptions of hazards and format of the risk assessment sections could be improved for readability and brevity.

Responsibilities:

- a) County will research potential analysis improvements and propose these to the Steering Committee. Steering Committee will provide feedback on priorities if all improvements can't be included in this plan process.
- b) County will propose format changes to Steering Committee for feedback if time permits these changes. Any sections that are rewritten or heavily edited will be provided to the Steering Committee for review prior to the final draft review period.
- c) County will coordinate with OEM and OPDR to determine what technical assistance can be provided for this task.

Task 3. Goals and Actions Updates

3.1. Review Goals/Objectives and Prioritization Process (Required): Since we are merging several plans and attempting to represent countywide mitigation needs, the goals will need more attention than usual. In addition, we will need to agree as a multi-jurisdictional group if changes need to be made to the prioritization criteria and process for actions/projects included in the plan.

Responsibilities:

- a) Steering Committee will review goals and prioritization process and discuss edits.
- b) County will prepare drafts and provide for Steering Committee approval. County will document in plan what and why changes were made.

3.2. Report on status of actions (Required): The plan must describe the status of actions in the previous plan by identifying those that have been completed or not completed. For actions not completed, it must be described if the action is no longer relevant or it needs to be included in the updated list of actions moving forward.

Responsibilities:

- a) Each jurisdiction is responsible for seeking input within their jurisdiction on the status of actions from their plan. A table describing the status (completed, in progress, not relevant, or include in plan update) should be emailed to the County.
- b) County will compile documentation and will pull out actions to be included in the plan update.

3.3. Develop updated Mitigation Strategy (Required): The mitigation strategy is a weakness of our current plans. At a minimum, we must ensure there are actions/projects included for each jurisdiction in relation to each hazard that jurisdiction is at risk from. It also must include actions that address the built environment, e.g. mitigation of existing or new buildings/infrastructure. Optionally, the mitigation strategy development can be opened to a broader group of stakeholders and expanded to include a broader range of projects for which we can actively pursue grant funding or phase into local budgets and work plans.

Responsibilities:

- a) Steering Committee will decide whether a large workshop or series of hazard-specific stakeholder meetings should be held to develop mitigation options. Other options could include jurisdiction-specific meetings to gather input as well.
- b) County will schedule and coordinate stakeholder meetings as decided by Steering Committee. County may request assistance from Steering Committee members in coordinating, inviting, and preparing for these meetings. County will coordinate with OPDR to determine if technical assistance can be provided for this task.
- c) County will compile action options from stakeholder input. Steering Committee members can volunteer to assist with this effort.
- d) County will hold a Steering Committee meeting to prioritize actions.
- e) Steering Committee will assist County in filling in gaps in information for final actions as needed. (e.g. responsibility for implementation, expected timeframe for completion, and potential funding sources)

Task 4. Document Production and Review/Adoption Process

4.1. Document Production (Optional but necessary): Merging of the plans into one multi-jurisdictional plan, general editing, and improvements to readability (time permitting) will be a large undertaking during this update process.

Responsibilities:

- a) Jurisdictional representatives on the Steering Committee are responsible for providing the County with their previous plan in Microsoft Word format.
- b) Steering Committee may propose changes to the outline of the plan and the County will determine if it has the capability to make modifications or if technical assistance from OPDR may be available.
- c) The County will merge the plans and edit.

4.2. Review of the Plan (Required): The Steering Committee will be asked to review interim draft sections of the plan. Once a final draft has been compiled, a comment period of at least 3 weeks will be provided for stakeholders and the public. After the comment period is complete, jurisdictions may present to their elected officials. After all local reviews have been completed, the plan will be submitted for State and FEMA review.

Responsibilities:

- a) As much as possible, the County will email draft sections of the plan to the Steering Committee for review as soon as available so that the plan components can be reviewed incrementally at the Committee's convenience. Do to the large scale modifications that may be needed, the tracked changes feature may not be possible but general indications of what has been modified will be provided. Steering Committee members will review the plan drafts and provide edits (using tracked changes and comment boxes in Word whenever possible).
- b) The County will use the stakeholder list developed by the Steering Committee to invite stakeholders to comment on the final draft plan.
- c) The County will post the final draft plan on its website and invite the public to comment electronically (exact method of comment will need to be determined). Jurisdictions can link to the county's website or post the plan on their own sites.
- d) The County will provide copies of the final draft plan in selected libraries for the public to provide comments.
- e) The County and Jurisdictions intending to adopt the plan will consider presenting the final draft plan to their Commission/Councils for comment prior to submitting for State and FEMA review.
- f) The County will submit the final draft plan to the State for review once all local reviews have been completed (or, if past August 2015, deadlines require moving forward with the review process). The State will forward the plan to FEMA for review once they have finished. The County will be the point of contact with the State and FEMA and will be responsible for responding to requests for revisions during this review process.

4.3. Adoption of the Plan (Required): After the State and FEMA have approved the plan pending adoption, the jurisdictions must formally adopt the updated plan. If the jurisdiction adopted the plan

prior to submission for State and FEMA review and there were no required revisions to the plan, then this task is already met.

OMD - Office of Emergency Management and
Oregon Partnership for Disaster Resilience
2014 FEMA Pre-Disaster Mitigation Funding

2014-2017 Community Pre-Application

Natural Hazard Mitigation Planning

Submit application by email to Julie Havens at jhavens@uoregon.edu
by June 6, 2014.

Contact Person Name Allison Boyd

Title Continuity and Resilience Planner

Organization Multnomah County Emergency Management

Mailing Address 501 SE Hawthorne Blvd, Suite 400 Street Address

City, State, Zip Portland OR 97214

Phone 503-988-8362

Fax

E-mail allison.boyd@multco.us

Cell

Website <http://www.multco.us/em>

NHMP Maintenance

Please describe the plan maintenance activities your jurisdiction has undertaken since your last plan update.

The County and Cities of Gresham, Troutdale, and Wood Village participated in the FEMA Risk Map project through an online meeting, phone conferences and a workshop held in September 2012.

Multnomah County has been tracking implementation of actions since its last update. Meetings since the last update were held on June 25, 2013, September 24, 2013, and December 10, 2013.

The new Multi-Jurisdictional Steering Committee met May 27, 2014. Multiple planning team and jurisdiction-specific meetings have been held since September 2013 to build support for and agree upon a multi-jurisdictional organization.

NHMP Implementation

Please describe the plan implementation activities your jurisdiction has undertaken since your last plan update.

This could include FEMA funded projects, or those funded by state or local government resources.

Projects that have been or are in the process of being implemented:

- Develop multi-jurisdictional hazard mitigation program
- Evaluate structural vulnerability of county facilities
- Train staff in ATC-20
- Participation in Mt. Hood Coordination Plan to address volcanic hazard action items
- Participation in the Risk Map Discovery Process
- Many disaster preparedness outreach events, including collaborating with the libraries to develop outreach workshops
- Considering hazards in the update of the Sauvie Island Rural Area Plan

Local Partners/Supporting Agencies

Please list the current members of your local NHMP committee. Also identify any additional partners you intend to invite to participate in the plan update process. This could include school districts, consumer-owned electric utilities, etc.

The newly created Multi-Jurisdictional Steering Committee has representation from each jurisdiction in the county and each have been asked to designate up to three members representing Emergency Management, Community Planning, and Public Works or Facilities. Jurisdictions represented:

- Multnomah County
- City of Fairview
- City of Gresham
- City of Maywood Park (invited)
- City of Portland
- City of Troutdale
- City of Wood Village

Technical Subcommittees are in the process of being formed to include a broad stakeholder base that will provide input into the plan update as well as ongoing plan implementation. The stakeholders involved in each of the jurisdictions' past plan update processes will be built upon to develop these subcommittees. We are currently developing stakeholder lists for three subcommittees: Wildfire Subcommittee (based on the CWPP Steering Committee), Earthquake Subcommittee, and Flood, Landslides, and Severe Weather Subcommittee. Representatives from local government, regional, state and federal agencies as well as school districts, special districts, and community organizations will be invited to participate in these subcommittees.

We also intend to create a larger list of additional stakeholders throughout the county whom we plan to make aware of the hazard mitigation program and keep updated on an annual basis.

Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan – Update Priorities

The Pre-Disaster Mitigation (PDM) Program makes available federal funds to State, Local and Tribal Governments to implement and sustain cost-effective measures designed to reduce the risk to individuals and property from natural hazards, while also reducing reliance on Federal funding from future disasters. Please identify and briefly describe your planning priority(ies) for this update cycle. Which part(s) of your NHMP do you intend to focus on?

Priority 1 — Update and Enhance the Action Plan

Activity Description: **To improve future implementation of the Plan we wish to focus on developing and prioritizing specific actions and projects with clear implementation steps. This will assist with assigning local resources and pursuing funding opportunities.**

Priority 2 — Merge Jurisdiction-specific Plans and Improve Usability

Activity Description: **Multnomah County and the Cities of Fairview, Troutdale, and Wood Village wish to merge their plans into one multi-jurisdictional plan in time to meet the update deadline of January 2016 for the three cities. If time permits, the recently updated City of Gresham plan will also be integrated or it will be incorporated during the next update cycle. The City of Portland has a simultaneous update in process and will therefore not be included in the multi-jurisdictional plan at this time.**

If time and resources permit, the participating jurisdictions are also interested in reformatting the plan to improve usability in our community outreach and to streamline maintenance of the plan. It would be ideal to make the plan more reader-friendly and to organize some components of the plan, such as the risk assessment, by community so that portions of the plan can be pulled out to use for community education and outreach.

Priority 3 — Build the Multi-Jurisdictional Organizational Structure

Activity Description: **As we work on this multi-jurisdictional plan update, we also want to begin establishing a Countywide Hazard Mitigation Program that actively engages our stakeholders on an annual basis to support incremental plan maintenance and implementation. To do this we want to establish an organizational structure and meeting schedule that strategically targets stakeholder input and provides valuable networking and information sharing without overtaxing our government and community partners.**

Priority 4 — Update and Expand the Risk Assessment

Activity Description: **New data has been made available for several hazards since the last update that must be incorporated into our risk and vulnerability assessment. Our communities would like to expand our hazard vulnerability assessments to include human-caused hazards that have been of increasing concern, such as hazardous materials incidents. Our current plans also do not address social vulnerability which we would like to consider in our mitigation strategies. In addition, the excellent work that has been documented in the Community Wildfire Protection Plan and the Climate Change Preparation Strategy needs to be integrated into the Hazard Mitigation Plan. Finally, as we expand our mitigation planning countywide, we would like to work on a common methodology for assessing risk in terms of prioritizing our mitigation actions.**

Priority 5 — Integrating Hazard Mitigation Planning

Activity Description: As part of the Hazard Mitigation Plan update we would like to ensure consistency with our other local planning efforts and incorporate hazard vulnerability considerations into other plans. We would like to develop a coordinated process where updates to the Hazard Mitigation Plan provide the data and analysis necessary for addressing Goal 7 of the state planning goals to consider areas subject to natural hazards in the comprehensive plan.

New Hazard or Community Based Data

Please describe any new hazard or community-based data you intend to incorporate into your plan. Indicate if you have the data already or if new data is needed/desired. This could include new hazard and map data, disaster impacts and losses, population and demographic updates, etc.

Available Data:

We would like to incorporate new data available from DOGAMI, including updated landslide data and earthquake shaking and liquefaction for areas that were not covered during our previous plan update. We will also want to include any applicable data from the Oregon Resilience Plan. There has been updated flood mapping within some jurisdictions. We also want to incorporate the climate change studies that have been done locally, public health studies as applicable, and new wildfire risk mapping that the ODF should have available during our update process.

New data desired:

During the Risk Map Discovery process, we requested assistance with HAZUS analysis particularly for earthquake modeling of impacts. If conducted, this would also be incorporated into our other emergency planning efforts such as debris management, mass care and sheltering, and recovery planning. We also would like to address human-caused hazards in our plan and will need to gather data for a risk analysis of some of these hazards. Additionally, we would like to better address social vulnerability in relation to our hazard risk assessments.

Local Funding/In-Kind Match

FEMA PDM grants require a 1:3 match local match commitment. In other words, a dollar of local funding is needed to match every three dollars of federal grant funds (75% FEM funding with a 25% local match). Please indicate an approximate amount of local match your jurisdiction can commit to this effort and what form (cash or in-kind) the match will take. Note that no federal dollars (including federally funded local staff positions) can be used as match.

Our jurisdictions will use in-kind match generated through staff time (locally funded staff only) who work on updating components of the plan and all of the stakeholders who volunteer their time to attend meetings and provide input to the plan update.

If for any reason sufficient in-kind match can not be met, the County is willing to provide cash match to cover the gap up to \$10,000. The County is also providing additional commitment to this plan update project through dedication of staff time that due to EMPG funding of the positions is not eligible for in-kind match.

Other Relevant Information

Is there any additional information you would like to provide in support of your pre-application?

This pre-application was prepared by Multnomah County in collaboration with the Cities of Fairview, Troutdale, and Wood Village for a combined plan update process. (City of Gresham and Portland also provided input into the priorities submitted under this application.) The County and Cities of Fairview, Troutdale, and Wood Village are working together to produce a single multi-jurisdictional plan to meet the update deadline of January 2016 for the cities. We believe creating a multi-jurisdictional plan as well as conducting countywide hazard mitigation meetings will improve our capacity for mitigation as well as be cost-effective in maintaining our planning requirements. It will require an increase in effort during this planning process but will set the stage for more efficiency in the future.



**STATE HOMELAND SECURITY GRANT
PROGRAM**

PROJECT PLANNING WORKSHEET

MAY 2014



STATE HOMELAND SECURITY PROJECT PLANNING WORKSHEET

Overview

This worksheet is for applicants applying for the FY2014 State Homeland Security Grant Program (SHSGP) funding in compliance with FY2014 Application Instructions and Grant Guidance. This worksheet must be completed in full and provide a detailed budget as identified in the application instructions. No more than seven (7) worksheets may be turned in per county or tribe.

Project Information:

(See page 8 of application instructions)

1. County or Tribe:
Multnomah

2. Project Name:
Countywide Human-Caused and Technological Hazards Identification and Risk Assessment

3. Total Federal Funding Requested:
\$40,000

Investment Justification

(See page 8 of application instructions)

4. Identify State IJ:
1. Planning Investment

Baseline: New or Ongoing Project

Capabilities that will be created or enhanced by the project.

(See pages 8 and 9 of application instructions)

5. Project Phase: (Place an "X" in the corresponding box)	(Point Value = 5)
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Sustaining or maintaining a core capability acquired with Federal funding</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Sustaining or maintaining a core capability acquired without Federal funding</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Developing or acquiring a new core capability (new capabilities must be deployable)</p>	
<p>Description of Capabilities:</p> <p>This project is a single phase project that will provide an objective risk assessment for human-caused and technological hazards that have not previously received a comprehensive assessment in the county. Future planning, training, exercise, and outreach may use this project as a foundation of information. The project's output will be maintained through the existing Hazard Mitigation Plan update process in the future.</p>	

Project Description:

Provide a detailed description of this project.

(See page 9 of application instructions)

6. Description of Project:	(Point Value = 30)
<p>Multnomah County and its cities would like to hire a planning consultant to develop a countywide Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (HIRA) report that focuses on human-caused and technological hazards. This report would provide an objective and comprehensive assessment of hazards that need to be addressed in a multitude of response and mitigation plans throughout the county and region but for which there is no common understanding of the risk and community vulnerability.</p>	
<p>The County and cities' Natural Hazard Mitigation Plans do not currently include human-caused or technological hazards in their hazard identification and risk assessment sections. The newly created multi-jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Steering Committee (representing Multnomah County and its cities) identified the inclusion of human-caused and technological hazards in the multi-jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan as a priority for the upcoming plan update process. Many different first responder, emergency management, public health, and private industries have developed scenarios or assumptions as the basis of their response plans but it can take a substantive amount of research to discover and review all these plans and still not obtain a comprehensive understanding of risk within our different jurisdictions. The Portland Urban Area Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (THIRA), for instance, uses three hazard scenarios, only one of which is human-caused, to identify desired outcomes and capability targets for the region but doesn't provide a comprehensive risk assessment of the hazard.</p>	
<p>The proposed Human-Caused and Technological HIRA would compile best available data from a variety of sources to describe the characteristics of each hazard, the risk, and the vulnerability of people, property, and the environment. Hazards to be addressed will be vetted through a stakeholder group and dependent on funding but may include: terrorism (explosive, chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, cyber, electromagnetic pulse); workplace/school/university violence; civil disorder; transportation incidents (motor vehicle, railroad, watercraft, aircraft, pipeline); hazardous materials release; infrastructure failure (bridges, tunnels, dams); fuel/resource shortage; and utility interruption/failure.</p>	
<p>The hazard profiles developed for this project can be used as an objective foundation for emergency preparation, response, continuity, mitigation, and recovery plan and exercise development by the jurisdictions, agencies, non-governmental organizations, and private industry within the county and cities. A goal of the project would be to involve stakeholders in the data collection and report review processes so that there will be agreement and awareness of the final product. We expect this project to lead to efficiencies and more consistency in emergency planning since each organization</p>	

can refer to one comprehensive HIRA report rather than assessing the hazards independently with varying levels of knowledge. We also hope that this project will assist in continuing to build relationships and providing value to our many emergency management partners, particularly those in private industry. We plan to engage stakeholders through relevant existing associations, such as the Local Emergency Planning Committee, and document stakeholder networks for future outreach and communication.

Equipment or Services

Equipment or services to be purchased for the project.
(See page 9 of application instructions)

7. Project Outputs: (Point Value = 10)

1. The project deliverable will be a Human-Caused and Technological Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment Report. The report will be provided to all emergency management partners within Multnomah County and its cities.
2. The report information will also be incorporated into the Multi-jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan that is currently under development by Multnomah County and city partners. The Hazard Mitigation Plan will be available to the public and will be a basis for future public education and outreach*.

*It is assumed that the project may result in supplemental data that is protected under Chapter 192, ORS and only provided to emergency management partners. The information that is incorporated into the Hazard Mitigation Plan will be appropriate to share with the general public.

Capabilities

Capabilities that will be created or enhanced by the project.

(See page 10 of application instructions)

8. Project Outcomes:	(Point Value = 15)
-----------------------------	---------------------------

1. A better understanding of the human-caused and technological hazards that exist within the county to inform community resilience planning.
2. Objective and scientific hazard data to inform scoring and/or prioritization of hazard vulnerability for multiple organizations as well as an opportunity to work on collaborative assessments of vulnerability and capabilities.
3. New and current hazard risk information to use in updating continuity, emergency response, and mitigation plans throughout the county.
4. A countywide compilation of risk information on human-caused and technological hazards that can be used to educate businesses and the public.
5. Enhancement of the natural hazards mitigation planning in the county to all-hazards mitigation planning.
6. More relationship-building among county, cities, private-sector, and non-governmental partners in the county.
7. Efficiency and cost-effectiveness in planning by providing one countywide assessment rather than each organization spending time and resources to create their own.

State Strategy:

Identify all goals and objectives in the State Homeland Security Strategy supported by this project.

(See page 10 of application instructions)

9. Project Goals and Objectives:	(Point Value = 5)
<p>This project primarily supports the State's Strategy Goal 5: "Ensure Emergency Management all hazard planning and program infrastructure is maintained and enhanced statewide." Specifically under Goal 5, the project will enhance all-hazards planning and support Objective 5: "Develop and promulgate an Enhanced Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan."</p> <p>The project also supports Goal 4: "Enhance Oregon's statewide ability to plan, prepare for, and respond to CBRNE/WMD and all hazards events" by developing a report that will share information and provide a better understanding of Multnomah County's human-caused and technological hazard risk. The project will also provide an opportunity for stakeholder outreach and relationship-building and therefore supports Goal 4, Objective 5: "Continue the effort to identify and build on the informal relationships that exists among public safety entities to promote an effective multidisciplinary response."</p>	

Proposed Funding by Solution Area:

Provide the Proposed Funding amount to be obligated from this project towards Planning, Organization, Equipment, Training, and Exercises (POETE). (Please provide amounts for all that apply) (See page 11 of application instructions)

10. Proposed Funding:		(Point Value = 5)
Solution Area	Amount of Proposed Funding \$	Funds dedicated to LETPA*
	SHSP	
Planning	\$40,000	\$0
Organization	\$0	\$0
Equipment	\$0	\$0
Training	\$0	\$0
Exercises	\$0	\$0
Total Proposed Funding:	\$1	\$78

** If applicable, provide the proposed funding amount that is expected to be obligated towards Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Activities (LETPA).*

Core Capabilities:

Select all Core Capabilities supported by this Project. (Place an "X" in the corresponding boxes)

(See page 11 of application instructions)

11. Project Core Capabilities:		(check all that apply)	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Access Control and Identity Verification	<input type="checkbox"/>	Operational Communications
<input type="checkbox"/>	Community Resilience	<input type="checkbox"/>	Operational Coordination
<input type="checkbox"/>	Environmental Response/Health and Safety	<input type="checkbox"/>	Planning
<input type="checkbox"/>	Infrastructure Systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Information and Warning
<input type="checkbox"/>	Intelligence and Information Sharing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Screening, Search, and Detection
<input type="checkbox"/>	Interdiction and Disruption	<input type="checkbox"/>	Situational Assessment
<input type="checkbox"/>	On-Scene Security and Protection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Threats and Hazard Identification

Milestones:

Identify Milestones by quarter, with start and end dates, which will be achieved within the period of performance.

(See page 11 of application instructions)

12. Project Milestones:		(Point Value = 15)	
Quarter	Milestones	Start Date (mm/yyyy)	End Date (mm/yyyy)
1	Request for proposals and consultant selection	10/2014	12/2014
2	Stakeholder identification and data collection	01/2015	03/2015
3	Analysis and development of draft report	04/2015	06/2015
4	Draft report review period followed by submission of final report	7/2015	9/2015

Sustainment:

Identify how you will sustain the project.

(See page 12 of application instructions)

13. Sustainment:	(Point Value = 15)
<p>The Countywide Human-Caused and Technological HIRA will be maintained as a component of the Multi-jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan 5-year update process. The multi-jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Steering Committee oversees the update process and Multnomah County Emergency Management coordinates implementation of plan updates. The stakeholder list generated as part of this project will be used in future updates to gather new data and solicit feedback on the human-caused and technological hazard portions of the plan.</p>	

