

## **9.4 Planning Process**

### **9.4.10 Mitigation Actions Meeting, December 2013**

# OREGON NATURAL HAZARDS MITIGATION PLAN

## Mitigation Actions, Part 2: Prioritization

---

Friday, December 6, 2013  
8:00 AM – 5:00 PM

OFFICE OF THE STATE FIRE MARSHAL  
MT. HOOD CONFERENCE ROOM  
4760 Portland Rd NE  
Salem, OR 97305-1760

### AGENDA

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Time</u>
I. Welcome, Introductions, Useful Information	8:00 – 8:30
II. Procedure	8:30 – 8:45
III. Dive In	8:45 – 10:15
IV. Break	10:15 – 10:30
V. Reconvene	10:30 – 12:00
VI. Lunch	12:00 – 1:00
VII. Reconvene	1:00 – 2:30
VIII. Break	2:30 – 2:45
IX. Finish Up	2:45 – 4:15
X. Break	4:15 – 4:30
XI. Next Steps	4:30 – 5:00
XII. Adjourn	5:00

#### Please Bring:

- Pens or pencils
- Good humor. It could be a long day! 😊

# OREGON NATURAL HAZARDS MITIGATION PLAN

## Mitigation Actions, Part 2: Prioritization

---

Friday, December 6, 2013  
8:00 AM – 5:00 PM

OFFICE OF THE STATE FIRE MARSHAL  
MT. HOOD CONFERENCE ROOM  
4760 Portland Rd NE  
Salem, OR 97305-1760

### Meeting Notes

This meeting took place on a day with significant winter weather challenges. The meeting began at 8:30 to give everyone a chance to arrive. Those who were able to attend in person were:

Chief Wallace, State Fire Marshal

Alyssa Mucken, OWRD

Tom Fields, ODF

Chuck Leonard, ODA

Darrin Brightman, DAS-Real Estate

Greg Ek-Collins, ODOT

Tom Phillips, DCBS-BCD

Althea Rizzo, OEM

The meeting began with introductions and housekeeping items. Then Marian explained why we are updating the Oregon NHMP, gave an overview of the update process, and more detail on where we are with updating the mitigation action actions, what we were to do that day, and what the next steps would be. Then we discussed how we would go about doing the work that day.

DOGAMI's hazard leads were unable to attend, but had reviewed and scored a number of actions and provided their score sheets for use by the attendees. At the same time they suggested deleting one action (NEW EO-37B), revising one action (EO-64), and including ten new actions.

Also, DCBS-BCD had provided an email suggesting removing two ongoing actions (EO-21 and EO-25); modifying one ongoing action (CI-14); and revising one action (LU-16) and moving it to the ongoing table. All of DOGAMI's and DCBS-BCD's suggested additions, deletions, and changes were reviewed and the group decided to follow them prior to beginning the prioritization exercise.

Marian explained that the scoring is based on requirements in the Code of Federal Regulations and FEMA guidance interpreting those requirements. Essentially, mitigation actions are required to be cost-effective, environmentally sound, and technically feasible. FEMA guidance leads us to use a series of questions known as STAPLEE (Social, Technical, Addministrative, Political, Legal, Environmental, and Economic) to evaluate the actions and determine if they meet the requirements. The score sheet is set up to address most of the STAPLEE questions and the final score will be interpreted as indicating the degree of the action's cost or benefit. The STAPLEE item that is not included on the score sheet is Political: does the action have a champion? That question will be answered in the next step – obtaining agency managers' level of support for implementing each action.

How to address the potential for mitigating environmental issues was raised, and the group decided to add a question to the Technically Feasible section of the score sheet to incorporate the possibility of mitigating any environmental issues that might be present.

The group worked in two teams to score each action, including DOGAMI's score sheets with the new question in mind. The plan was that after the actions were scored we would review the scores, determine if they made sense or needed to be adjusted, and that those with the same score would be ranked so that each action would have a unique priority placement. However, scoring took much longer than anticipated, and the ranking was not done that day. Due to the weather, the meeting was adjourned in mid-afternoon after the scoring was complete.

### AGENDA

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Time</u>
I. Welcome, Introductions, Useful Information	8:00 – 8:30
II. Procedure	8:30 – 8:45
III. Dive In	8:45 – 10:15
IV. Break	10:15 – 10:30
V. Reconvene	10:30 – 12:00
VI. Lunch	12:00 – 1:00
VII. Reconvene	1:00 – 2:30
VIII. Break	2:30 – 2:45
IX. Finish Up	2:45 – 4:15
X. Break	4:15 – 4:30
XI. Next Steps	4:30 – 5:00
XII. Adjourn	5:00

#### Please Bring:

- Pens or pencils
- Good humor. It could be a long day! ☺



MITIGATION ACTION PRIORITIZATION		LINE #	ACTION #	
Section	Criterion	Possible Values	Maximum Value for each Section	Score
1	<b>Environmentally Sound:</b> Is the mitigation action likely to have positive, negative or no impact upon natural and cultural resources? Consider the mitigation action's effect on land, water, listed species, and cultural/historic/archaeological resources over its life.		3	
	Protects?	3		
	Neutral?	0		
	Adversely Impacts?	-3		
2	<b>Technically Feasible:</b> Can the mitigation action actually be accomplished and is it likely to have the intended results?		10	
	Expected to reduce risk/loss over the long term to lifelines?	3		
	Expected to reduce risk/loss over the long term to other structures?	2		
	Expected to produce minimal secondary impacts?	2		
	Can any environmental issues that may be present be mitigated? Y = 0; N = -3.	-3		
	Funding: Consider all aspects - capital, operation and maintenance, staff, consultants, supplies, etc.			
	Is the necessary funding in place or is it reasonably assured?	3		
Is it questionable whether funding could be secured or is there no idea at this time of whether or from where funding could be obtained?	0			
3	<b>State Capability:</b> Does the state have the resources (other than funding) to accomplish the mitigation action?		4	
	Technical Expertise?	2		
	State/Federal laws, policies, regulations:			
	Support?	1		
	Facilitate?	1		
Hinder?	-3			
4	<b>Timeline:</b> Can the mitigation action be accomplished within the life of this plan (by March 2018) or is it a longer-term task?		3	
	Expected completion before March 2018?	3		
	Expected completion after March 2018?	1		
5	<b>Timeline:</b> Is the nature of the mitigation action such that it can be accomplished before a disaster or would it more likely be undertaken after a disaster?		3	
	Pre-disaster mitigation action?	3		
	Post-disaster mitigation action?	1		
6	<b>Multi-Objective:</b> Will the mitigation action address more than one goal of the State NHMP? More than one hazard? More than one state initiative?		3	
	# Plan Goals addressed	0-1 = 0; >1 = 1		
	# Hazards addressed	0-1 = 0; >1 = 1		
	Integrated with other efforts	0-1 = 0; >1 = 1		
7	<b>Social Justice:</b> Is the mitigation action likely to adversely affect any particular segment of the population?		3	
	Yes	-3		
	Neutral	0		
	No	3		
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>				

# 2012 Oregon Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan

## GOALS

- GOAL 1** Protect life and reduce injuries resulting from natural hazards.
- GOAL 2** Minimize public and private property damages and the disruption of essential infrastructure and services from natural hazards.
- GOAL 3** Increase the resilience of local, regional, and statewide economies.
- GOAL 4** Minimize the impact of natural hazards while protecting and restoring the environment.
- GOAL 5** Enhance and maintain state capability to implement a comprehensive statewide hazard loss reduction strategy.
- GOAL 6** Document and evaluate Oregon's progress in achieving hazard mitigation.
- GOAL 7** Motivate the public, private sector, and government agencies to mitigate against the effects of natural hazards through information and education.
- GOAL 8** Eliminate development within mapped hazardous areas where the risks to people and property cannot be mitigated.

## HAZARDS

1. Coastal Hazards
2. Drought
3. Dust Storms
4. Earthquakes
5. Flooding
6. Landslides
7. Tsunamis
8. Volcanoes
9. Wildfire
10. Wind Storms
11. Winter Storms