Regional Recovery Framework

Best Practices and Recovery Goals Workshop

City of Portland Regional Disaster Preparedness Organization

June 21, 2018

RDPO
Regional Disaster Preparedness Organization
Unified. Prepared. Resilient.

Table of Contents

Best Practices and Recovery Goals Workshop Summary

Multnomah Building
General Training Room B14
501 SE Hawthorne Blvd.
Portland, Oregon 97214

ATTENDEES

Riad Alharithi, *Multnomah County Transportation Division*
Sarah Allison, *Portland Emergency Management*
Cathy Amerson, *City of Hillsboro*
Jasmine Avgerakis, *Multnomah County Emergency Management*
Tammy Bryan, *Hillsboro Fire Department*
Alice Busch, *Multnomah County Emergency Management*
Courtney Catt, *Clark County Food Bank*
Kevin Cook, *Multnomah County*
Rebecca Geisen, *Regional Water Providers Consortium*
Amy Haase, *Multnomah County Emergency Management*
Luis Hernandez, *Portland General Electric*
Megan Neill, *Multnomah County*
Jeremy O'Leary, *Multnomah County*
Jonna Papaefthimiou, *Portland Bureau of Emergency Management*
Dan Pippenger, *Port of Portland*
Shanna Pittman-Frank, *Elders in Action*
Raul Preciado Mendez, *Latino Network*
Kevin Sutherland, *Multnomah County*
Kevin Tracy, *Oregon Department of Transportation*
Anthony Vendetti, *Clark Regional Emergency Services Agency*
Chris Walsh, *Washington County Emergency Management*
John Wheeler, *Washington County Emergency Management*
Jay Wilson, *Clackamas County Disaster Management*

Staff
Hope Winship, *Hagerty Consulting*
Sylvia Ciborowski, *JLA Public Involvement*
Hannah Mills, *JLA Public Involvement*

Welcome and Agenda

Sylvia Ciborowski, facilitator with JLA Public Involvement, welcomed the group and reviewed the agenda. The agenda was as follows:

1. Best Practices Review, Discussion, and Validation
2. Recovery Vision and Goals
3. Next Steps and Close

Sylvia explained that the Core Planning Team (CPT) and Hagerty Consulting reviewed a variety of documents to learn about disaster recovery best practices and develop recommendations for how to move forward with the development of the Portland Regional Recovery Framework. She told the group that they would spend time reviewing and responding to the Recovery Vision and Goals that were formed using the input from the Kick-Off Sessions that were held in May 2018.

Sylvia introduced two members of the CPT and asked them to briefly explain the best practices development process. Chris Walsh, Washington County Emergency Management, highlighted the importance of creating best practices that are unique, and honor and serve the values of the region. Jay Wilson, Clackamas County Disaster Management, introduced the term "pre-covery," explaining that the purpose of this effort is to hold these conversations in advance of a natural disaster to promote effective and efficient recovery. Jay noted that this framework provides an opportunity to align with existing disaster preparedness and recovery plans, guide the vision and focus, and leverage recovery planning.

Best Practices Review, Discussion, and Validation

Hope Winship, facilitator with Hagerty Consulting, began by introducing the Best Practices and Current Capabilities Memo. She explained that the purpose of the memo is to:

- Identify national and international pre- and post-disaster best practices;
- Outline current local, regional, and state plans with capabilities related to the best practices; and
- Build on this information to provide recommendations for recovery structures and operations in the Portland Metropolitan Region.

Hope explained that the findings and recommendations were broken into three categories: **Organization Structure, Communications,** and **Operations.** She told the group that the memo, as well as feedback from this workshop, would help inform the decisions made at future workshops, which will in turn serve as the foundation for the content of the Recovery Framework.

Sylvia explained the process for reviewing, discussing, and validating the findings and recommendations. Each group member was given red, yellow, and green cards – red to indicate opposition; yellow to indicate mild support on the basis of further discussion, clarification, or

refinement; and green to indicate support. The group was then given brief explanations of the recommendations within each category – **Organization Structure, Communications,** and **Operations.** Below is a summary of feedback gathered pertaining to each recommendation:

Organization Structure Findings and Recommendations

Structure and framework through which all executing local recovery planning and operations will function

- *Leadership Positions in the Recovery Structure*
- *Elected Official Buy-In*
- *Planning Processes*

Hope explained that the CPT and project team looked at various existing plans when developing the organization structure recommendations:

- **The Portland Plan, 2012**
  - Identifies clear roles and responsibilities for leadership and supporting organizations
- **Washington Restoration Framework, 2012**
  - Leadership actively participates in plan execution
- **State of Oregon Recovery Plan, 2014**
  - Clearly identifies and describes the roles of the recovery operations, including focusing action at the local level

ORGANIZATION STRUCTURE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. ***Create a Clear Governance Structure:*** *Identify a Recovery Manager and develop a common recovery operational structure — Recovery Support Functions — with assigned leadership roles*

Discussion and Validation – members made the following comments and suggestions:

- It would be beneficial to define leadership in regards to recovery planning, and to differentiate between "leader" and "recovery manager."
  - A recovery manager has the authority to make decisions and move processes forward. Not all leaders will be managers, and leadership can change over time, while management will remain consistent in terms of who has the authority to make decisions and champion efforts.
  - Champions can often be activists or advocates. However, based on social science research, a lot of general public community members do not feel qualified enough to be involved, and are under the impression that they need to an expert. Consider using the term "champion" rather than leader and clarify how "champions" will be engaged in the organization structure.

- Counties need interdependence in silos, as well as regional managers across all five counties.
- Clarify Recovery Support Function (RSF) leadership roles per county and regionally.
- Include cities and their government and political leaders when developing management roles.
- The language needs to explain how cities feed into counties, and how counties feed into the region per the organization structure.
- It's important to consider the cross-cutting elements of the governance structure – for instance equity, incident command, etc.
  - This will be explored further at future workshops.

2. **Obtain Political Buy-In:** *Memorialize political buy-in for recovery processes through agreements and maintain a list of all agreements through a matrix*

Discussion and Validation – members made the following comments and suggestions**:**

- The language should reflect the need for "ongoing" political buy-in.
- Explain the level of elected official included in the political buy-in – Metro, TriMet, counties, cities, etc.

3. **Understand the Connections:** *Maintain a database of all the relevant plans and policies, and the implementing agencies, within the jurisdiction for each Recovery Support Function to reference during the recovery and redevelopment processes*

Discussion and Validation – members made the following comments and suggestions:

- Narrow the language to better explain the process and who is responsible for maintaining it. Illustrate how this will look realistically.
- This seems aspirational. It's important to understand that the actions of elected officials do not always align with plans.
- Recovery needs to be considered in all regional plans.
- It seems premature to commit to creating and maintaining a database of all regional projects.
- There was support for keeping RSF groups up to date on all regional plans.
- It is important to promote cross-county and cross-jurisdictional coordination, and to define how special districts will coordinate with counties.
- Identify areas of the RSFs that may be more regional efforts rather than county efforts.

Communications Findings and Recommendations

Methods of communicating recovery initiation, progress, and buy-in with the whole community and stakeholders

- *Communications Structures*
- *Communication Methods and Tools*
- *Progress Promotion*

Hope explained that the CPT and project team looked at various existing plans when developing the communications recommendations:

- **The Oregon Resilience Plan, 2013**
  - Focus on providing a "relatable perspective" to communicate the impacts of disasters from the viewpoint of community members
- **Oregon Resiliency: A Progress Report**
  - Efficient and clear depiction of status of identified priorities
- **Disabilities, Access and Functional Needs Inclusive Planning: Summary of Guidance, Best Practices, and References, 2016**
  - Leveraged existing community group knowledge and networks to ensure inclusive planning and recovery actions

COMMUNICATIONS RECOMMENDATIONS

1. ***Engage the Whole Community During Planning:*** *Ensure community (including community organizations, private sector, and organizations focused on vulnerable populations) is informed of, and given opportunity to participate in, pre- and post-disaster planning*

Discussion and Validation – members made the following comments and suggestions:

- Meetings need to be inclusive and accessible – consider offering transit reimbursement and ensure meetings are held at convenient locations at times when the public can attend. Meetings should take place after normal work hours and need to offer childcare and meals.
- Develop innovative and thoughtful strategies for engaging communities.
- Identify and connect with trusted community organizations that can assist in reaching vulnerable and underrepresented populations.
  - Community organizations may have issues knowing who to coordinate with in the government.
- It is important to consider the potential and likely influx of aid and volunteer organizations following a natural disaster. Prepare and plan for coordinating with these groups and individuals.
- Add "and opportunities" at the end of the recommendation.
- Develop a "Next Steps and Actions" update that can be added to the memo and/or stakeholder engagement strategy.

2. ***Leverage the Planning Portal:*** *Leverage existing RDPO planning portal during the Regional Recovery Framework development, and future local pre- and post-disaster planning efforts, to provide tools, updates, and transparency*

Discussion and Validation – members made the following comments and suggestions:

- Ensure the Planning Portal is streamlined and well-organized.

3. ***Incorporate a Joint Information System (JIS) into the Recovery Process:*** *Use structured organization of Public Information Officers to provide the public, elected officials, and stakeholders with essential information during the recovery process*

Discussion and Validation – members made the following comments and suggestions:

- Clarify how communication will happen following a natural disaster.
- Engage the whole community in planning and operations.
- Ensure the recovery team is prepared to coordinate with the JIS.
- Perform a gap analysis to strengthen the JIS and develop strategies for addressing gaps – examine each county's plan for approaching and mitigating deficiencies.
- It is important to continually assess the effectiveness of the JIS.
- Ensure Oregon Emergency Management is involved and prepared to coordinate with the JIS.

Operations Findings and Recommendations

Actions taken to execute recovery goals following a disaster

- *Regional Consistency*
- *Inclusive Planning*
- *Incorporating Resilience*
- *Recovery Actions*

Hope explained that the CPT and project team looked at various existing plans when developing the operations recommendations:

- **Clark County Comprehensive Plan, 2015**
  - Identifies policies, projects, and priorities which can guide recovery actions after a disaster
- **RDPO Disaster Debris Management Framework Executive Summary, 2014**
  - Provides a toolkit for local disaster debris management actions to ensure effective coordination and efficient management
- **City of Portland and Multnomah County Climate Action Plan, 2015**
  - Focuses on equity, including best practices for integrating equity, metrics to measure equity, equity specific objectives, and implementation strategies
- **Washington Comprehensive Framework Plan for the Urban Area, 2017**
  - Identifies roles and responsibilities within the county to serve growth in the community, which can be leveraged after a disaster to implement actions

Operations Recommendations

1. ***Identify Response to Recovery Communication and Transitions:*** *Enable decision making immediately after a disaster to ensure efficient and equitable short-, intermediate-, and long-term recovery*

Discussion and Validation – members made the following comments and suggestions:

- Clarify how immediate decisions will be made to impact long-term recovery.
- Ensure there is further discussion on who will be responsible for making decisions.
- It's important to understand that it's not always clear how a decision will impact long-term recovery. Decision-makers need to be aware of the criticality of their judgement.
- It would be beneficial to develop an outline for decision-making and planning processes. Determine the minimum engagement requirements.
- Revise the language to provide more clarity.

2. ***Implement the Build Back Better (BBB) Concept:*** *Incorporate increased resilience into construction*

Discussion and Validation – members made the following comments and suggestions:

- It is important to understand the cost of this recommendation. It cannot be completed without adequate funding. Where will funding come from?
- Seek to understand the city and county goals for redevelopment – are they planning on building back the same?
- If planning is done prior to a disaster, it will still only cover 1-10% of the cost of BBB.
- Determine the agility of regional planning processes.

3. ***Incorporate Greenspaces and Sustainability When Applicable:*** *Prioritize sustainable and greenspace recovery projects*

Discussion and Validation – members made the following comments and suggestions:

- Clarify how this will be achieved and what this will be prioritized against.
- Consider encompassing BBB and Greenspaces into one recommendation focused on sustainability.

4. ***Build a Robust Recovery Matrix:*** *Utilize a matrix to assign tasks, roles, and responsibilities through all periods to organize and track the recovery process*

Discussion and Validation

- The group unanimously supported this recommendation.

5. ***Incorporate Debris Management:*** *Integrate recovery planning with debris management processes to inform priorities and actions*

Discussion and Validation – members made the following comments and suggestions:

- Determine whether it's important for debris management to have its own recommendation – if not, will it lose priority during recovery?

- Consider making debris management a subset to the infrastructure RSF.
  - Debris management impacts each of the RSFs.

6. ***Standardize Local Recovery Plans within the Region:*** *Provide tools and templates to local jurisdictions to build their Recovery Plan in alignment with guidance in the Framework*

Discussion and Validation – members made the following comments and suggestions:

- Provide tools and templates to other governmental and non-governmental organizations in addition to local jurisdictions.
- Consider developing tools and guidelines rather than "fill-in-the-blank" templates.
- Consider using the term "recipe" to better clarify the purpose of the tools and templates.
- Include cost recovery.

Recovery Vision and Goals

Hope briefly reviewed the Recovery Vision and three Recovery Goals with the group. The group was given blue and yellow post-its, and asked to write revisions to the Recovery Vision and Goals on the yellow post-its, and comments or suggestions on the blue post-its, and post them on the posters. Below is a summary of the group's feedback pertaining to the Recovery Vision and each Recovery Goal:

RECOVERY VISION

> *Encourage equitable and community-focused recovery in order to prevent the creation of new risk; reduce existing risk; sustain and advance community physical, social, and economic capacity; and strengthen resilience in the Portland Metropolitan Region.*

Discussion and Validation:

- Consider using "facilitate" or "foster" rather than "encourage" to strengthen the language.
- Consider adding language about healing prior to "prevent the creation of…"
- Consider reversing the order of "prevent the creation of new risk" and "reduce existing risk."
- The vision statement needs some wordsmithing to be more declarative. Consider: "Regional recovery efforts will be well-coordinated and sustainably focused in serving all communities, improving future resilience and environmental outcomes while supporting a rapid return to economic compatibility."

RECOVERY GOALS

1. *Establish and maintain public information communications regarding recovery progress.*

Discussion and Validation:

- Incorporate celebration into the messaging.
- Analyze gaps in communication networks to reach disadvantaged populations.
- Include language on the facilitation of two-way communication.
- Include a focus on community engagement.
- Consider that there are many different ways in which people receive information.
- This is too narrowly focused on communication rather than regional coordination. This is too tactical for a regional recovery framework goal unless there is an addition of a regional planning and recovery execution coordination goal.
- Replace "recovery progress" with "recovery expectations and progress."
- Are information communications exclusive to the public?

2. *Incorporate improved sustainability, safety, and resiliency into recovery projects through laws, policies, and building codes.*

Discussion and Validation:

- Add "social and economic equity."
- Include economic restoration in the language of the goal.
- Take into consideration the demographic shifts that are occurring in the region.
- Quickly and efficiently restore critical services.
- Include non-regulatory language – for instance culture and other incentives.
- Clarify that this applies pre- and post-disaster.

3. *Restore and improve access to equitable community functions and services including health services, social services, critical infrastructure, economic development, natural and cultural resources, and housing.*

Discussion and Validation:

- It is important to be mindful to the risk of causing significant displacement of marginalized populations.
- Clarify the definition of equity.
- Consider future and current demographic shifts that have implications on where we need to progress with infrastructure, services, planning, etc.
- "Improved access to prosperity" is a concept of sustainability and needs to be clarified.
- Health, social services, and economic recovery cannot happen without the repair of critical infrastructure.

- Consider adding the goal: "Communication and coordination across counties to streamline the process for getting more critical and long-term goals met."
- Work with insurance companies to better prepare for personal, private, and public infrastructure damage.
- It is important to include language about the speed of recovery.
- Acknowledge the conflict between speed and deliberation vs. ensuring the recovery is done well.
    - Call out this challenge in addition to any other potential challenges in the vision and goals.

Next Steps and Close

Hope thanked the group for their participation and briefly reviewed PowerPoint slides illustrating the components of the Recovery Framework project process and a schedule of the upcoming workshops. She asked the group members to fill out a comment card and closed the meeting.