

Multnomah County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Program

Hazard Mitigation Strategy Workshop Summary

October 1, 2015, 1:00-3:30 pm

Multnomah County East Building, 1st Floor Chinook Room

600 NE 8th St, Gresham, OR 97030

Attendees: Adam Barber, Multnomah Co. 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 Co. Facilities; Angela Carkner, Multnomah Co. Drainage District; Tim Lynch, Multnomah Co. Sustainability; Daniel Nibouar, Metro; Steph Sharp, Port of Portland; Justin Ross, OHSU; Allan Berry, City of Fairview; Roy Iwai, Multnomah Co. 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 hazard mitigation plan 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 “under-represented” 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), wondering if since the county has a later deadline and the cities are merging plans with the county, if they would 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 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 specifics resource availability within each of our partners.

In order to adjourn on time the action idea discussion ended at Idea #8.

6. Additional Action Suggestions

The attendees were asked if they had any additional actions they wanted to suggest. Angela Carkner from the Mult. Co. Drainage District 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.

Meeting adjourned on time.