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| **Date of Meeting:** | March 9, 2021 |
| **Subject:** | Steering Committee Meeting 2 |
| **Attendees:** | **Steering Committee:** Beth Gilden, Rica Perez, Jonna Papaefthimiou, , Anne Castleton, Kate Carone, Nishant Parulekar, Aaron Fox, Kim Anderson, Chris Silkie, Dave Lentzner, Steve Bregman, Paul Belton, Edina Na-Songkhla, Mindy Brooks, Nate Takara, Kim Kosmas, Emily Tritsch, Jay Wilson, Sallie Edmunds, Nickole Cheron  **Planning Team:** Beth Gilden, Jonna Papaefthimiou, Rica Perez  **Risk Assessment Team:** Dr. Peter Dusicka, Dr. Yu Xiao |
| **Agenda Overview** | * Introductions (15 minutes) * Vision Mission Goals (20 minutes) * Key Decisions for Risk Assessments (25 minutes) * Community Profile—basis for analysis (25 minutes) * Review work for next time (5 minutes) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Agenda Item** | **Notes** |
| *9:00* **Introductions** | **Dr. Yu Xiao and Dr. Peter Dusicka are leading the Risk Assessment analysis from Portland State University .**  About Peter: My research focuses on seismic resilience of our infrastructure such as bridges, buildings and utilities. My recent activities include assessment of the anticipated Cascadia Subduction Zone earthquakes on fuel storage tanks, evaluation of seismic repair methods for bridges, and development of low earthquake damage mass timber buildings.  About Yu: Dr. Xiao is an Associate Professor in the Toulan School of Urban Studies and Planning at Portland State University (PSU).  Before moving to PSU, she worked for Texas A&M University for nine years. The main area of her research deals with community resilience with a focus on local and regional economic sustainability and resiliency. |
| *9:15* **Vision Mission Goals** | The below is from 2016. The planning team is proposing to keep the vision and mission from 2016, and update the goals to reflect our current context.  **Vision:** Portland is a prosperous, healthy, equitable and resilient city where everyone has access to opportunity and is engaged in shaping decisions that affect their lives. (City of Portland 2035 Comprehensive Plan).  **Mission:** To equitably reduce risk and the adverse impacts of natural hazards by building community resilience through collaborative, cost-effective actions and strategies.  **Goals**   Protect life and reduce injuries.   Engage and build capacity for the whole community.   Minimize public and private property damage.   Protect, restore, and sustain natural systems.   Minimize the disruption of essential infrastructure and services.   Integrate mitigation strategies into existing plans and programs.   Prioritize multi-objective actions that reduce risk to vulnerable communities.  **Additional considerations**  Include community voice—especially those frontline communities  Prioritize projects that reflect what we’ve learned through collaborative work around infrastructure resilience (RIPE/DRRAG)  Update language around vulnerability  **We are proposing to keep the mission and vision from the 2016 plan.**  **Overall there was support for this proposal, a few comments about wording and how the goals should be updated which are captured on the padlet. Other comments included:**   * There are benefits to mitigation actions during “peacetime” and these projects (short term and long term) should still be prioritized. An example would be protecting our existing natural systems. * Acknowledge multigenerational planning due to constant changes of environmental and social conditions (demographics) |
| *9:35* **Key Decisions for Risk Assessment** | **What is required by FEMA**   * Include a description of natural hazards that affect the jurisdiction * Provide an explanation for any omitted hazards which are “commonly recognized” to impact an area * Conduct a risk analysis as described below   Natural Hazard: source of harm or difficulty created by a meteorological, environmental, or geological event.  **What we do in the analysis:**   * Describe the hazard: location, extent, previous occurrences, probability of future events * Identify community assets: people, economy, built environment, natural environment * Analyze risk: What are the potential impacts? We will use: exposure analysis, historical analysis, scenario analysis. * Summarize vulnerability: create problem statements   **Hazards from 2016 Plan**   * Flood * Dam Failure * Earthquake * Landslide * Severe Weather * Volcanoes * Wildfire * Drought * Space Weather   **Hazards from 2020 Oregon Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan (for our region)**   * Drought * Earthquake * Extreme Heat * Floods * Landslide * Volcanoes * Wildfire * Wind Storms * Winter Storms   **Key Questions and Decisions:**   * What set of hazards do we want to include for the 2021 Plan? * What is important to consider in the methodology of these sections? * Is there anything that we think will dramatically impact these assessments? from 2016?   **There was general support for keeping the same list of hazards, but disaggregating some of the severe weather types, elevating wildfire and adding smoke. There were some questions about the importance of this list—in general we need to discuss the hazards in our area, we also need to provide a sufficient discussion of hazards that will be linked to our mitigation work.**  **Considerations for severe weather:**   * **what mitigation actions can we take in the face of severe weather?** * Multnomah County: multijurisdictional plan uses a catch-all approach to addressing severe weather, not disaggregated * Disconnect between public perception of severe weather and the reality/experiences of people with disabilities—what is the level of service needed/different impacts for different communities when considering severe weather like a snow storm?   Considerations for smoke and wildfire   * Wildfire smoke is included in the county Wildfire protection plan * People with disabililities were heavily impacted by the smoke: need to include representatives who can represent disability issues as they will be disproportionately affected * *Are there available wildfire studies?* (for Dave): not yet but will involve state and county level air quality studies. We will rely on public health representatives to relay this information. * Air quality can be an encompassing term but may not align with FEMA standards   **In addition to the comments above, Compounding effects will need to be built into assessment in the hazard description as a means to create a cohesive story there were conversations about risk, climate change and compounding hazards.**   * Perception of severity of risks and frequency of risks have changed. Risk characterizations do not capture new reality under climate change. * We need to do a better job in the plan of discussing compounding factors/looking at risks in a wholistic way |
| *10:00* **Community Profile—the basis for our analysis** | The community profile section describes the City of Portland and sets the basis for the risk assessment and MAP strategy. It describes the physical geography, environmental, political, cultural and planning assets development characteristics etc.  The 2016 plan provides a lot of detail about the City of Portland that is important to FEMA, but a comprehensive “story” about the City of Portland. To improve on the 2016 plan, we will try to help tell the story of Portland.  Key decisions that will influence the risk assessment:   * Geography used for analysis * Social “vulnerability” inputs     The 2016 plan divided the city in 9 areas based on City budget areas. The areas also correlate roughly to neighborhood groups.  **Key questions:**  How do these smaller geographies help us in analysis?  Are these the right geographies?—sharing characteristics that help us plan for disasters?  **The group had mixed feelings about the geography used in the 2016 plan. There seemed to be consensus that there is value in showing risk at a smaller scale than just the City, but no one perfect geography for analysis and presentation.**   * It provides a bit more detail—maybe people can better relate to the plan, but it doesn’t add much. * For the purpose of completing a plan quickly we may choose to keep this geography (it works fine), but we as a city need to think about this question for other planning efforts. Beyond the MAP. * A GIS person could provide more perspective on this * From BPS perspective—BPS is always trying to find data that can tell a story for planning. They tend to fall back on traditional neighborhoods, watershed, areas between ridgeline; land use can be another way to do this. It ends up being context dependent. * Geography can also be Important to consider in terms of connectivity and explaining life for people in different parts of Portland * Can Portland maps link back to this geography and make something more relevant to people?--Unsure * Do we need to make this decision now? Yes and no, we are starting the risk analysis and some geography is needed. It’s not a closed door, but we need a basis to start from. * The PBOT Resilience plan will be using a “resilient islands” concept braking up geography by transportation routes.   **Vulnerability:**  **We didn’t get to start our discussion of “social vulnerability” which will be moved to the next meeting. We did discuss Metro’s creation of a “social vulnerability tool”.**  Social Vulnerability Tool: A project to create a regional index that can be used in this type of planning. This project has a community-based advisory group and an technical advisory group.  We hope to collaborate with metro to put this tool to use in the plan. We will have more discussion on this topic at the next meeting. |
| *10:25* **Next steps** | Read through Chapter 4 (City of Portland Profile) and Part 2 (Risk assessment) of 2016 MAP. Questions to keep in mind: (1) What new data and studies are available to update each section? (2) Consider the social vulnerability and vulnerability section. Do we have a better way of conceptualizing vulnerability?  **\*\*\*We will follow up with links and an e-mail to provide feedback\*\*\*** |