

Wasco County Multi-Jurisdictional Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan Steering Committee Plan Maintenance Meeting Minutes	23 March 2017, 9:00 AM – 11:00 AM Emergency Management Conference Room 425 East 7th Street, Annex C The Dalles, OR 97058
Type of Meeting: Steering Committee	

Steering Committee Member Roll Call

In Person: Will Smith, Cindy Miller, Juston Huffman, Kristin Dodd, Steve Kramer, Kelly Howsley-Glover, Angie Brewer, Steve Harris, Tyler Stone, Frank Cochran, Robert Palmer

Absent: Kathy White, Tycho Granville, Dustin Nilsen, Ryan Bessette, Arthur Smith

ITEMS

1. Introductions

2. Funding

a. Options?

Will began the meeting with a quick discussion about funding options. He suggested it was likely too late to get anything significant in for this update but wanted to poll the room to see if anyone had any novel ideas. Will had emailed Scott Edelman of DLCD earlier in the week since he had heard from Josh Bruce of OPDR that they may have grants available for NHMP updates in the Gorge. Scott provided him with some information on this, but suggested due to state level budget priorities evidently targeting coastal issues, that it may not be productive. Also, that due date is mid-summer so any funds that we were awarded would likely not be obtained until after our process is completed. Juston mentioned that he spoke with Barb Ayers this week, the Hood River EM, and they will be hiring a consultant for their NHMP update process (which is due around the same time as ours). She offered to share some of their info with us as we move forward. Kristin suggested looking into OEM and Juston said he could get in touch with them. Angie mentioned that the email she sent to Shirley from DLCD last spring (and that she followed up on last month) has not borne any fruit.

3. Partner Agencies POC list

a. Google Doc to update

After the first meeting, Will compiled the list of suggestions for Partner Agencies to keep informed about this process and asked the Committee to take a look at it in order to provide names, numbers, and email addresses for Points of Contact for each group. Several people wrote in suggestions on the paper copy and he will be emailing the Google Doc out again for more feedback. As soon as it is filled he will send out an introductory email to that group to inform them of this update and solicit comments and input.

4. Risk Assessment Stage

The document guiding this update process has been OPDR's Oregon Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program Plan Update Training Manual. Stage 2 is Reviewing the Risk Assessment. In that section of this document there is a list of Requirements that all Mitigation Plans must have and keep up to date as outlined by the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000. The following discussion emerged from each point of that list.

a. Description of Type

There are eight major natural hazards covered in the plan. It was the consensus of the committee that this section did not need an update.

b. Description of location and extent

Will said that this one would need some kind of update of all the events that have happened in the last five years. What constitutes an event took up much of the discussion, especially centered on wildfire. Any declared disaster would count, which includes the Rowena fire, Government Flats Complex, and Wasson Pond. The 15 Mile fire was large, but fast moving and did not need a disaster declaration. Some standard will have to be used to decide where the cutoff is. Justin will be taking the lead on this, and coordinating with Kristin.

Kristin discussed the process she has been going through to obtain maps of fire risk areas and would send them to Will when she gathers them. Will had emailed Scott MacDonald of the Barlow RD on the Mt Hood NF and had been directed to communicate with the Forest Fire Planner Justin Sharpe who responded with several links to relevant data.

As far as non-Fire maps go, Angie suggested contacting DOGAMI and FEMA for geologic and flood hazard/incident maps.

c. Vulnerability

For this part we will need to inventory existing and future buildings, highlighting any new critical infrastructure or facilities that have been added in the past five years. The question of what is critical arose and was discussed. Tyler mentioned that Chris Mc Neil (from the Sheriff's office) maintains a list of critical facilities. Arthur Smith of Wasco Co. Public Works and Dave Anderson of The Dalles Public Works would be the best POCs for any new critical infrastructure. Will will contact them, examine planning files, and contact the Assessor or GIS to determine types and numbers of new buildings added in the past five years.

d. NFIP insured structures repeatedly damaged

The current plan has a list of these (which were all at 0). Angie will research these for the update, likely through FEMA or OEM.

e. Jurisdictional specific differences

There are several small cities within the County, as well as two large ones – Maupin and The Dalles. Angie suggested reaching out to them to see what they view as their risks. She had contacted Maupin as part of writing the grant letter to DLCD last Spring but did not receive any input. Will will follow up with them, as well as the other small cities, Dufur, Antelope, Shaniko, Tygh Valley, and Wamic.

Kelly mentioned that Maupin is worried about railroad spills and the impact of a potential Pelton Dam failure. This led into a discussion of railroads and highways and their associated hazards. These represent critical infrastructure that could be impacted, but even though spills could occur that impact the environment and communities, these are not being taken into account in this plan. This plan deals with mitigation, and mitigating highway spills or railroad derailments are generally outside the purview of County authority. Bob noted that these are not natural hazards, and that this is a prevention plan, not a response plan. Tyler felt that railroads should at least be mentioned as informing the risk. Kristin said that there is a relationship between transportation and the risk of hazards becoming disasters, such as a derailment causing a wildfire. As the discussion led to what other plans are in place, Bob suggested adding an appendix that lists all other related, relevant plans to be able to cross reference, such as the Community Wildfire Protection Plan.

In a follow up to a discussion from the first meeting, Will asked Bob if he was just representing MCFR, or if he represented all the Fire Districts. Bob mentioned that he is the Fire Defense Board Chief. Eugene Walters is the southern contact for that organization. The next meeting of the Fire Defense Board is April 12. Though Bob will be missing that meeting, Kristin will be attending and can discuss our plan update with them then. Will should have the introductory email out to them before then so she can also answer any questions they may have.

f. County Participation in NFIP and continued compliance

Angie will also be updating this section in conjunction with d. above.

5. Review Section 2 of NHMP

a. Note what needs updating

The Committee reviewed Section 2: Risk Assessment of the 2012 Plan and noted what needs to be updated.

- The first several pages likely won't need any updating.
- Page 2-6 - we should add an update on the 2016-2017 winter storm and it's effects, including the disaster declaration.
- Page 2-7 - add all FEMA disaster declarations
- Add all declared Conflagrations in our County (in past 5 years)
- Table 2.4 - Note severity isn't quite right, frequency seems to impact these numbers (i.e. volcano eruption is very severe but only has a 1, since they rarely erupt though overall severity is low). Different language needed?
- Find the source of these charts to better understand them and the methodology behind the numbers.
- Include description of methodology – where the numbers come from, etc.

- Include map of senior homes (GIS) (Juston said the Red Flag Task Force has a map of vulnerable populations. Steve suggested talking to Carolyn Wood of AAging and Oregon Project Independence, or Bob at Helping Hands.)
- Ensure privacy is protected with all maps of vulnerable populations.
- Page 2-9, Non English Speakers, update 2010 census data with more recent information.
- Adjust all census info with updated info (Kelly mentioned the American Community Survey has annual updates, she also has some other relevant research that might be useful).
- Non-English speakers are under represented by Census. Cindy mentioned that up to 35% of students in the school systems do not have English as their first language.
- Figure 2.2 created a lot of discussion. It was unclear how useful it is and will be removed. It seemed to be North Wasco County centric, and very incomplete with no clear application.
- Add some of the info from Fig. 2.2 back into the summaries.
- Figure 2.3 is all economic issues and should be examined and updated by MCEDD.
- Figure 2.4 appears to be two separate tables in one. The chemical issues do not constitute “natural” hazards, but are important to be concerned about due to the crossover between manmade disasters causing natural disasters such as wildfire.
- Figure 2.4 – for cropland remove “cereal grains”.
- Figure 2.4 – Break out the first three rows into a separate “Environmental Resources”/Land Use chart. The remaining rows are “Environmental Risks.”
- Figure 2.5 – Add railroads (UP, BNSF), highways, bridge, port, dam, and river as infrastructure.
- Figure 2.5 – Add industrial zoned lands
- Figure 2.5 – Add Celilo Converter, BPA
- Figure 2.5 – Add County roads
- Figure 2.5 – Remove 19th st. extension
- Figure 2.5 – Change Readiness Center since it has moved locations – remove flood, and EQ risk checks, replace with fire
- Figure 2.5 – Add Government Services, Facilities such as FDs, City Halls, etc. (follow up with Bob Palmer to establish a list)
- Figure 2.5 – Add Red Cross Shelter sites (Follow up with Juston to identify these)
- Figure 2.5 – Consider using a map rather than a chart format.
- Page 2-17 mentions that neither the County nor any Cities are members of the Community Rating System which is a voluntary incentive program. Add an Action Item suggesting investigating becoming members.
- Table 2.8 – again, the methodology is unclear. Research, clarify, explain, and solicit public input on perceived risks.

6. Community Profile update

Appendix C is an in depth examination and description of the current state of the Community. This Community profile will need to be updated. Since Kelly will be conducting a similar effort as part of the Comprehensive Plan Update she will begin looking into updating this for the NHMP as well. Steve Harris may be able to provide a City Planner to assist.

7. Public Outreach meeting planning

As part of the update process a NHMP specific public meeting will be held this summer, likely in July. Will, Justin, and Kelly will lead the effort to organize this meeting. The first public meeting where this will be discussed will be at the Planning Commission mega meeting on April 11. Will will be discussing the plan and soliciting input. A survey was included in the 2012 plan that needs to be updated. Justin will create an updated survey that can be accessed electronically before April 11 so these surveys can be distributed at all public meetings. At some point local radio shows will also help advertise the survey.

Will adjourned the meeting at 10:56 AM.

ACTION ITEMS (TO COMPLETE BEFORE THE NEXT MEETING)

Will: Finish compiling and contact POC list of Partner Agencies.

Justin: Assemble list, chart, or map of all large/relevant/declared natural disasters that occurred in the past five years.

Will: Contact DOGAMI and FEMA for geohazard and flood hazard/incident maps.

Will: Contact Arthur Smith, Dave Anderson, and Chris McNeil for lists of critical infrastructure.

Will: Examine planning files and contact the Assessor or GIS to determine number and type of new structures built in the last five years.

Angie: Research and compile a list or chart of NFIP insured structures repeatedly damaged.

Will: Contact small cities to gather their input on what risks they feel they face and note any differences with the County as a whole.

Steve: Examine The Dalles chapter to identify any significantly different risks the city faces.

Kristin: At the April 12 Fire Defense Board meeting, let the other chiefs know about this update and that we will be soliciting comments.

Will: Make suggested changes to Section 2.

Justin: Using the 2012 plan survey, create a new survey to use in both hardcopy and electronic formats for the webpage.

Will: Send out a doodle poll for a June meeting date.

All: Review Action Items from previous plan. This will be a major focus for the third meeting.

SUGGESTIONS (TO ADD IN THE FINAL VERSION)

- Appendix of other related relevant plans (such as Community Wildfire Protection Plan, etc.) and where to find them
- Action Item suggesting joining voluntary Community Rating System program.