

DRAFT

Minutes of the January 16, 2014 meeting of the State Interagency Hazard Mitigation Team

Meeting location: This meeting was held in State Emergency Coordination Center (ECC) within the Donald N. Anderson Readiness Center in Salem.

The following people participated in the meeting:

Oregon Partnership for Disaster Resilience (OPDR)	Michael Howard
DAS – State Services Division, Risk Management	Darrin Brightman
DCBS, Insurance Division	Tracie Weeder
Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)	Don Pettit (on telephone)
Office of State Fire Marshal (OSFM)	Mark Wallace
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (OSFW)	Joy Vaughan
Dept. of Geology and Mineral Industries (DOGAMI)	Rachel Smith
Dept. of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD)	Matt Crall
	Marian Lahav
	Lisa Pepper
	Chris Shirley
	Patty Snow
OMD, Office of Emergency Management (OEM)	Sean McCormick
	Joseph Murray
	Althea Rizzo (on telephone)
	Dennis Sigrist
Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)	Greg Ek-Collins
Public Utility Commission (PUC)	Rick Carter
Water Resources Department (WRD)	Alyssa Mucken
Business Oregon – Infrastructure Finance Authority (IFA)	Paulina Layton
Benton County Emergency Management	Eric Rau

The following were distributed during the meeting:

- *Meeting agenda*
- *Revised minutes of October 17, 2013 meeting (agenda item #2)*
- *Senate Bill (SB) 379 Line Advisory Committee Consensus Report (agenda item #4)*
- *DOGAMI Recommendations for updating tsunami inundation line (agenda item #4)*
- *2015 Oregon NHMP Update (agenda item #7)*
- *Oregon NHMP Actions Prioritized Ongoing Removed (agenda item #7)*

[Email joseph.murray@state.or.us for a copy of one or more meeting handouts.]

1) Introductions

Dennis opened the meeting at 9:06 a.m. with introductions.

2) Action on revised minutes of October 17 meeting

A revised draft had been distributed by email on January 14. The minutes were deemed acceptable as revised.

DRAFT

3) Recent sub-grants awarded (disaster and non-disaster)

Dennis noted that the PDM '13 and FMA '13 application periods closed in October. Oregon submitted two planning sub-applications, one for Portland, and one for OPDR, which includes many local jurisdiction planning projects. Both of the sub-applications were "identified for further review," which means that they are likely to be funded. Oregon also submitted two project sub-applications, a home acquisition in Linn County and a mitigation project for a senior center in Vernonia. Neither of these was selected. OEM is considering an appeal, especially of the Linn County project, which has a history of flood losses. Dennis noted, "If we are going to do one hazard really well, it is the flood hazard." FMA '14 may open this Spring; if so, the two projects above will be resubmitted.

4) Tsunamis

Matt provided a big picture overview and introduced the other speakers.

Rachel talked about an August press release that included information about modeling and mapping for the entire Oregon Coast. She brought example maps for Seaside, a community with the potential to be hard-hit. The maps delineate distant and near tsunami worst case scenarios, and include evacuation maps, assembly areas, fact sheets, and brochures. She noted the following website and said "We have an app. for that":

<http://www.oregongeology.org/tsuclearinghouse/>

The fact sheets and brochures can be obtained from the Oregon Tsunami Clearinghouse.

Rachel talked about "the data behind the maps," which DOGAMI has been releasing in separate publications; "we are up to six or seven of those now." Data is available for engineers, site specific studies, etc.

Rachel noted that the "Senate Bill 379 Line" is the only regulatory piece. She talked about the Advisory Committee, and noted the two handouts: *Senate Bill (SB) 379 Line Advisory Committee Consensus Report*, dated August 5, 2013; and *DOGAMI Recommendations for updating tsunami inundation line*, dated September 6, 2013

One of the things the Committee discussed is what the building code is intended to do. It was decided that the current "379 Line" should be replaced. In order to do this, action is needed by the Oregon Legislature or the Governor.

Rachel said that DOGAMI is working on guidance for ports and mariners. Phase 1 will address how far those going to sea need to go, measured in fathoms and time required. Phase 2 will include port specific evacuation planning. DOGAMI has a maritime committee that George Priest put together. Dennis suggested starting Phase 2 with the Port of Brookings-Harbor.

Rachel then plugged DLCD's new guidebook, *Preparing for a Cascadia Subduction Zone Tsunami: A Land Use Guide for Oregon Coastal Communities*. She also noted that there are a few places on the Oregon Coast where vertical evacuation may be the best option, i.e., utilize tall buildings to move people above the tsunami inundation. Two of these locations may be Seaside and Warrenton, where DOGAMI plans to do evacuation modeling.

Patty talked a bit about the new *Land Use Guide*, and noted that it is available on DLCD's website:

<http://www.oregon.gov/LCD/OCMP/docs/Publications/TsunamiGuide20140108.pdf>

DRAFT

Greg suggested that DLCD link to this from both their homepage and their Coastal Program page.

Patty talked about the great work done by a consultant team and Matt Spangler of the DLCD staff. She noted that NOAA funds much of the DLCD Coastal Program, and also talked about ties to *The Oregon Resilience Plan*:

http://www.oregon.gov/OMD/OEM/ossprac/docs/Oregon_Resilience_Plan_Final.pdf

Althea talked a bit about the work of the Oregon Resilience Task Force:

<http://www.oregon.gov/OMD/OEM/Pages/Resilience-Taskforce.aspx>

Matt asked, "Will the Task Force produce something substantive?" Althea said that they will probably end-up with Policy Option Packages.

She also talked about the challenge of doing tsunami "way-finding" better. She is working with the School of Architecture and Allied Arts at the University of Oregon on this.

5) Potential mitigation resources of the Infrastructure Finance Authority (IFA)

Paulina noted that she worked at OEM previously, and is now working at the IFA. She said that the Oregon Business Development Department is made-up of Business Oregon and the IFA. Business Oregon is "branded"; it is the only branded state agency in Oregon. Paulina said that the program she manages is "Helping Oregon Communities." She talked a bit about the IFA ports programs, and the water/wastewater loan/grant fund, which includes "forgivable loans." She said that the work of IFA touches often on work done at DEQ and DLCD. She talked a bit about the role of IFA in managing Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) for much of the state, and then showed a graphic of the IFA regions and regional coordinators.

Dennis praised CDBG's ability to lose its federal identity, thereby being able to match other federal grants. He noted, however, that the CDBG cycle and the FEMA grant cycles often don't match-up well.

6) Update on local mitigation planning

Michael provided an update on local mitigation planning, saying that Sherman County is likely to receive its FEMA "Approvable Pending Adoption" (APA) letter soon. He talked about the recent FEMA approvals of the Harney County and Lake County NHMP updates. He said that the Jefferson County NHMP update is APA, and the Northeast Oregon Regional NHMP update and the Malheur County NHMP update are "mostly waiting for the OEM reviews to be completed."

He then talked about the local governments included in the PDM-13 grant application, which Dennis had noted is "identified for further review" under agenda item #3. Those jurisdictions are: Coos, Curry, Douglas, and Lincoln counties (and some of their cities), Corvallis, and Eugene-Springfield.

Michael also talked a bit about the work that the Community Planning Workshop (CPW) at the University of Oregon is doing with the City of Madras on integration of their mitigation plan with their Comprehensive Plan's Goal 7.

DRAFT

7) Oregon NHMP update and work session on actions

Marian did a visual presentation and had related handouts. She talked a bit about the work that has been done since October on the risk assessment and the actions in the Oregon NHMP, noting that the session today will focus on the actions. With regard to the risk assessment, she noted that Jeff Weber and Kathie Dello are working on the climate change aspects of it. With regard to the regional profiles, she noted that work is about to get underway with OPDR.

Marian showed a schedule, saying that the end of March 2014 is a big sub-deadline. She talked about the April State IHMT meeting being critical; after that we'll do final adjustments during July and August. She anticipates providing FEMA with a draft of the updated Oregon NHMP in October. She noted that FEMA will then have 45 days for their review. In January 2015, we'll resubmit the Oregon NHMP to FEMA with any revisions or additions necessary. We will then seek a formal "approvable pending adoption" document from FEMA in order that the Governor can re-adopt the Oregon NHMP at the end of February 2015.

Marian covered a slide that describes what has been done with the plan actions since September. She noted that actions need to be SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and time-oriented) and that they are also being examined in the context of STAPLE/E (social, technical, administrative, political, legal, economic, and environmental).

She emphasized one goal is to streamline the Oregon NHMP, including reducing the number of actions from about 150 to about 90. She noted a score-sheet that exists on the project website. The current emphasis with the actions is on ascertaining political support organized around: (1) likely to be funded and undertaken; (2) not sure of funding or ability to undertake; (3) unlikely to be funded or undertaken before March 2018. This process results in Priority 1, 2, and 3 level actions. She noted that agency planning for 2015 – 2017 budgets may later influence this list and the priorities.

Marian's visual presentation showed how many actions are sorting into each priority organized around four broad categories (hazard identification, risk assessment, risk prioritization, and resilience initiatives). She said that one reason for the prioritization is to meet a criterion that appears in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) with respect to state level mitigation plans.

She noted that we have agreed that only State IHMT agencies can be shown as lead or support on Oregon NHMP actions. She said that she needs description statements or better description statements from lead agencies for some actions.

A work session on the actions then took place.

Erik (Rau) asked if the risk assessment revision will contribute to local planning. Lisa noted that local hazard analyses and state agencies identify the most vulnerable communities, and that DLCD is developing a new state risk assessment methodology pending funding. It will not be used for this Oregon NHMP update, however.

This led to a brief discussion about the relationship between the Oregon NHMP and local NHMPs. It was noted that the Oregon NHMP risk assessment informs local NHMPs, and that local NHMPs inform the Oregon NHMP risk assessment and actions.

There was a suggestion from Darrin (Brightman) to change the way we are using the word priority; i.e., what we often mean by priority is actually "level of support." Rachel (Smith) agreed with this suggestion.

DRAFT

Several people noted that the actions need to be organized by hazard. Marian said that she will produce a spreadsheet that can be organized that way.

Michael (Howard) wondered whether eventually each action will include ideas for implementation. Marian said “no – action deliverables are not included in the scope of work for this project.”

Marian asked the State IHMT members present for concurrence “to move to a refinement meeting in February?” There were no objections.

8) Other business

Dennis praised Tracie for her help to DLCD and OEM on flood insurance, especially private sector flood insurance. He noted that we are going to see more private sector insurance policies. Dennis said that “force-placed” insurance protects the mortgage holder, not the homeowner. Dennis noted that in some cases, there needs to be a formal complaint from a homeowner to the Insurance Division to trigger assistance in acquiring access to the Increased Cost of Compliance (ICC) coverage associated with flood insurance policies.

Chris then provided an update on the Biggert-Waters (B-W) Bill, which went into effect on October 1. We are starting to see some flood insurance policies with \$30,000 per year premiums. There are a lot of efforts underway in Congress to revise or delay B-W. For example, a Bill in the U.S. Senate would delay the phase-out of subsidies for four years. There is a similar Bill in the U.S. House.¹

Dennis said that the Association of State Floodplain Managers (ASFPM) position paper on B-W is on the right track, reaching a middle ground.

Rachel brought-up radon. She noted that we have talked previously about adding radon to the Oregon NHMP.² She said a new development is that DOGAMI applied to study radon via funding from the Oregon Framework Implementation Team (FIT), and the grant application was denied because radon is not a hazard identified in the Oregon NHMP. Rachel intends to change this.

Rachel also noted a pilot study they have underway with the Oregon Health Authority Public Health Division on vulnerability to Cascadia earthquake events; it is focused on the Hwy #18 Corridor, and runs through this June.

9) Discuss/develop possible agenda items for April meeting

Joseph spoke briefly about agenda commitments that have been made for the April meeting.

10) Public comment

No members of the general public were present, so there was no public comment.

11) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 11:33 a.m.

¹ For an update, see http://www.nola.com/politics/index.ssf/2014/03/senate_passes_bill_averting_la.html

² Anecdotally, during July 2011, Dennis found a local NHMP that addresses radon (Montgomery County, Pennsylvania).