



Find out more about the PRO at: [Governor of Oregon : Plan for a Resilient Oregon : Policies : State of Oregon](#)

December SRF Meeting: Drivers of Change in Resilience

Public programs and policies should remain effective as natural and human systems change. Developing plausible scenarios of those future systems allows us to examine whether policy options are likely to be effective given uncertainty about the future.

The first step in selecting policy options given uncertainty about the future is to identify drivers of change. Drivers of change are cycles, trends, issues, or events that influence the future development of systems. For example, the surge in demand for artificial intelligence is affecting development of the electricity system. Here, we concentrate on drivers of changes in resilience in Oregon¹. These drivers may be abrupt or gradual, and within or beyond governmental or human control. Drivers usually are framed as conceptual rather than numeric (for example, a trade deficit rather than a 20 percent increase in imports). Drivers also may be neutral with respect to direction (for example, a major shift in the balance of trade rather than a negative balance).

Before the Statewide Resilience Forum meeting on December 17, please think about potential drivers of change in resilience in each of the following six thematic areas.

- Politics (for example, changes in the political party with the greatest power)
- Economy (for example, national or global macroeconomic shocks)
- Society (for example, shifts in demography)
- Technology (for example, changes in electricity sources)
- Law (for example, Supreme Court decisions that affect states' rights)
- Environment (for example, a major natural disturbance)

The occurrence of a given driver may be fairly certain or highly uncertain, but likely to have a major effect on resilience if it occurs. You may derive your drivers from creative brainstorming, your own judgment, discussions with colleagues, literature searches, or other sources. Submit your drivers no later than December 10 to <https://forms.office.com/g/GUeWX63fDn>. During the meeting, we will discuss the drivers and clarify or edit them as needed. Each member then will select the driver within each of the six themes that they believe would be the most consequential or influential. Full consensus is neither anticipated nor required.

Following the meeting, the research team will retain the two or three drivers within each theme that received the strongest support. As needed, the research team will survey the available theory or evidence on potential effects of a given driver on resilience. For the January meeting, Forum members will evaluate the likely strength of interaction between each pair of retained drivers. Characterization of those interactions advances development of scenario narratives. Scenarios are descriptions of plausible futures. They are neither forecasts nor projections, but credible chains of cause and effect that reflect assumptions about major drivers and relations among them. Scenarios facilitate understanding of complex systems and how those systems may evolve. Ultimately, the research team will outline a process for building scenarios and stress-testing policy options against the scenarios.

¹ As defined in the Plan for a Resilient Oregon, the capacity of Oregon's people, institutions, and communities to anticipate, mitigate, respond to, and recover from disruptions—whether natural, human-caused, or systemic—while safeguarding community wellbeing, trust, and opportunity for all, including those at greatest risk of harm.



Office of Governor
TINA KOTEK



PLAN FOR A RESILIENT OREGON STATEWIDE RESILIENCE FORUM

Meeting 2: November 19, 2025

Via Zoom

Attendance:

Statewide Resilience Forum members: Debbie Cabrales, Centro de Servicios Para Campesinos (**Northwest Region Facilitators**); Lisa Dawson, Sara Baker & Chantal Ivenso, Northeast Oregon Economic Development District (**Eastern Region Facilitators**); Tessa Elbettar & Matthew Havnear, Jackson County Long Term Recovery Group (**Southern Region Facilitators**); Tabitha Juquin & Metzin Rodriguez, Unite Oregon (**Central Region Facilitators**); and Xitlati Torres, Verde (**Portland Metro Facilitators**); Marina Denny, OSU Extension Service; Paris Edwards, Oregon Department of Transportation; Ed Flick, Oregon Department of Human Services; Gabriela Goldfarb, Oregon Health Authority; Kristin Greene, Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development; Ali Hansen, Oregon Department of State Lands; Shannon Marheine & Scott Burwash, Oregon Housing and Community Services; Patence Winningham & Natasha Fox, Oregon Department of Emergency Management; Maxwell Woods, Oregon Department of Energy.

University Research Team: Josh Bruce, University of Oregon: Oregon Partnership for Disaster Resilience; Erica Fleishman, Oregon State University Oregon: Climate Change Research Institute; Mike Howard, University of Oregon: Oregon Partnership for Disaster Resilience; Alyssa Cody, University of Oregon Graduate Student; Willow Vero, University of Oregon Graduate Student

PRO Staff Team: Jonna Papaefthimiou, Oregon Chief Resilience Officer; Erik Cole, Oregon Statewide Resilience Plan Manager; Aimee Fritsch, Oregon State Resilience Plan Coordinator; Blake Stroud, Oregon Housing and Community Services, Senior Policy Advisor, Disaster Recovery and Resilience

Welcome – Jonna Papaefthimiou, Oregon State Resilience Officer

Brief overview of agenda

1. Introductions by SRF Participants – Jonna Papaefthimiou, Oregon State Resilience Officer

Introductions of SRF participants who were not in attendance at the first meeting. Others were invited to introduce themselves in the chat.

2. PRO and SRF Recap – Jonna Papaefthimiou, Oregon State Resilience Officer

- Jonna clarified that the Statewide Resilience Forum acts as the steering group for the PRO, and the members are representatives from contracted Community-Based Organizations and state agency representatives. While members of the public are welcome to attend these meetings, the discussion is intended to be among SRF

- members. Members of the public are welcome to contribute through the chat feature.
- A PRO Calendar of community events is in progress and we will update you next meeting.
- Today, you will be asked to offer suggestions for focus groups and interviews via the Post-Meeting and will be incorporated by the University Research Team.
- University Team, presenting today, will be the scribes of the PRO.

3. Follow-Up from Last Meeting – Jonna Papaefthimiou, Oregon State Resilience Officer

Definition of resilience: The original draft definition, shared at the last meeting as a starting point for discussion, was pulled from an Oregon statute. At the first meeting, small groups discussed changes needed to the definition, which resulted in three final options for our shared definition. Last week, a poll was sent out for SRF members to vote on the three options. Option 1 won the majority of votes at 53 percent:

“Resilience is the capacity of Oregon’s people, institutions, and communities to anticipate, mitigate, respond to, and recover from disruptions—whether natural, human-caused, or systemic—while safeguarding community wellbeing, trust, and opportunity for all, including those at greatest risk of harm.”

Each Regional Forum has been asked to discuss this as well and Debbie Cabrales shared what came out of the Northwest Region’s conversation: “Community Resilience is the collective capacity to anticipate, prepare for, respond to, and recover from challenges such as emergencies and natural disasters while strengthening the fabric of community life. It means creating opportunities for growth, fostering education, and ensuring that every individual and family can thrive. True resilience protects and enhances social well-being, supports a vibrant economy, and sustains healthy ecosystems, all while empowering people to connect, learn, and build a stronger future together.”

Equity: Many of us are reflecting on our personal and professional role of advancing equity in this work. Defining equity in a way that we all agree on is unlikely, so Jonna wanted to provide one shared statement/goal: *All Oregonians are resilient*. Jonna cited Berkley’s definition of targeted universalism as a framework as an understanding we can work from on the PRO’s intention to advance equity. This is an ongoing topic and will be a question in the follow-up survey about how the SRF wants to engage in the subject and continue the conversation.

4. Resilience Plan Structure and Case Studies – Alyssa Cody and Willow Vero, University Research Team

The University Research Team presented an overview of six resilience case studies: Maryland; Canada; New Jersey; San Francisco; Vermont; and NREL. The overview of the plans included the Table of Contents, resilience themes, equity considerations, and implementation. The research team compared the plans to emphasize how they align and

differ. The University Research Team then led a discussion engaging the SRF on the types of elements and implementation mechanisms they hope to see employed in the PRO.

Questions:

- What works? How is the implementation of these plans going?
 - Implementation of these plans is challenging to track. Many of them were published recently and haven't reported significantly on progress. Some of the case studies go into greater detail about audits or reports from some of the plans, which point to gaps in implementation follow-through.
- What is the difference between regulatory and legislative?
 - Legislative reform is led by elected lawmakers and results in statutes or laws passed through the legislative process. They tend to be broad rules that set policy direction, authority, and funding. Legislation often enables regulatory reform.
 - Regulatory reform is created and led by executive agencies and municipalities in the form of administrative rules and regulations that interpret and implement legislative mandates. They tend to be more detailed, technical, and operational. They are also often easier to update than a legislative process.

Discussion:

- There are a few things from Oregon's Adaptation Framework that would be cool to pair with these case studies. Many of these recommendations included establishing funding and leadership structures. The PRO feels like a baton hand-off from this framework. Oregon also has a statewide comprehensive planning framework, which means intervention can be very powerful.
 - [Equity blueprint](#) / [toolkit](#) for state agencies to incorporate into their climate work.
 - Legislature adopted [HB 447](#) update of states EJ council. New equity justice mapping underway. Envisioned as a tool for the public to enable their prioritization of the populations most in need. This bill also has an EJ definition
 - [2020 Climate Chante Social Resilience Report](#)
 - Prioritization of climate change and the built environment. Does this mirror the prioritization of the PRO?
 - PRO is meant to increase resilience against natural hazards, which many of are climate hazards.
- "My gut says focus on financing"
- "YES---we NEED ACCOUNTABILITY because at least on the Coast we need grassroots participation as we as documents and plans and resources"
- "The plan needs to be not only enforceable but actually enforced."
- Flexible collaboration is essential to balance both near-term actions and long-term transformation.
 - "To Natasha's point, Oregon has been working very hard for many years on climate and energy programs that have health and resilience co-benefits - so PRO "pointing" at those, and perhaps developing integration mechanisms, rather than seeking to build new would be great."

- “To expand on Natasha's comment, balancing heat resilience with energy efficient building could work. Wildfire mitigation (hazardous fuels reduction and building codes) with zoning laws.”
- “I think regulatory enforceability would be a complex endeavor and may take more time to build out equitably than is worthwhile. I also think near-term actions are important and could be rolled out quickly if done collaboratively! There are a lot of existing, effective programs & grants that are building resilience on the ground already and need more support.”
 - To really be flexible in collaborating, we need regulatory structures that support those efforts and budget that fund them beyond political cycles.
- Waste and water are two areas that impact climate resilience and community nurturing. They provide more measurable data that can prove to the public that progress is happening and results in strong storytelling.
- “I think the PRO needs to consider the existing regulatory authorities of the state that can be directed at addressing some of the challenges we face but not seek or create new regulatory mechanisms. But also look at all of the collaborative, incentive-based programs that already exist and how they can be directed at addressing some of the challenges we face. Like how much of the state \$100B+ budget can be serving its direct purpose while also contributing to resilience in related space?”
- “Also want to note that there are concerns on how to equitably address these needs to geographic areas that may have specific needs. The way how the regional forums have been designed, the coast is being integrated into zones that I am concerned will be overlooked by regions that have been impacted by wildfires off the coastline.”
- One of the most important things we learned from our community in our forum is around equity and supporting the CBOs already doing this work. It takes too long for state programs to get off the ground, and they could be replicating the work the CBOs are already doing. Resilience is about supporting the community structures already there, who are already adaptable to doing more with less. It’s going to be a long time before we recover on the federal side—the state needs to be able to stand on its own two feet.
- “We need to welcome and EMPOWER the actual people in the actual communities to become INVOLVED and have ACTIVE VOICES in this process! We need town halls, public discussions and EASY WAYS for them to COMMUNICATE their UNMET NEEDS now and in the future (we need to WORK WITH PEOPLE not just “for” them.”
- Research is showing that recovery from natural disasters is related to the number neighbors people know within their immediate area. Creating community spaces forms the basis for resilience for all stressors and hazards.
- “The Farmer Rancher Disaster Resilience Grants are a great example of effective, equitable funding. They were greatly oversubscribed and we got lots of feedback from farmers that it’s exactly what they need to build resilience, but unfortunately funding was not renewed by the Legislature this year. See more here: <https://ocfsn.org/disaster-resilience-grant>”

5. Updates and Information from Regional Resilience Forum Facilitators

CBO leaders from each region were asked to share updates from their regional meetings:

- **Chantel Ivenso - Eastern Region**
 - Statewide, regional, and local CBOs
 - 1st meeting went very well overall. Eastern OR worked in Breakout rooms, and discussed 3 definitions of resilience. Eastern OR appreciated the ideas of working together and preparedness. Emphasized individual and personal preparedness
 - Regional strengths: Collaboration, networks, experience with wildfire, flood, drought, connection to place and environment
 - Challenges: Rurality and geographic distribution, vulnerable populations, perceived separation from western state, cuts to funding, underfunded communities, outdated infrastructure
- **Debbie Cabrales - Northwest Region**
 - Regional Forum developed a definition for resilience:
 - Priorities: improving communication systems, plans for family and organizations, expanding mental health, collaboration across counties
 - Challenges: rurality and isolation, transportation issues, housing shortages, tsunami issues on the coast, funding issues, general bureaucracy, state is not held accountable for funding, organizations feel unseen by the state, state accountability, misinformation, childcare issues, trust and accountability,
- **Xitlali Torres- Portland Metro**
 - Statewide, region, and local CBOs
 - Resilience is about building relationships built on trust
 - A resilience plan needs to be trauma informed, and should be proactive to barriers and past harms. Secure communication is critical
 - There is a fear of federal resources
 - Need for culturally specific health workers
 - Need for stabilization of federal programs
 - Discussed the urban setting of the region and how to care for different community members
- **Tessa Elbetter – Southern Region**
 - Statewide, regional, and local CBO partners
 - Statewide preparedness, several members are working with farmers and ranchers, and are
 - Several networking groups, including food systems, resilience hubs, and groups to fill federal government gaps
 - Challenges: wide geographic spread, distribution of resources, need for resource mobility during disasters, funding mismatches, operational capacity, climate vulnerability, political and cultural differences hindering collaboration,
 - Priorities: strengthening relationships, building multi county partnerships to be competitive for funding, improved data sharing, rural partnership, more support for local governments that staffing and capacity.

- **Metzin Rodriguez - Central Oregon**
 - Topics and themes: community solutions and where groups are working, impacted communities, climate anxiety, agricultural workers, language barriers, vulnerable populations, houseless populations, managing Cascadia
 - How do we minimize risk during federal shutdowns, access to resources is critical
 - Community trust is critical and understanding all people across the state, each community has different needs!!

6. Discussion Targets and Major Topics for Interviews/Focus Groups

The Research Team is planning to complete interviews and focus groups across the state. The team has created a list, is seeking more candidates. Ideas can be a person, agency, or group. The Research Team would also like to know why they should be interviewed or participate in a focus group. Please send ideas to Erica at erica.fleishman@oregonstate.edu

7. Meeting Wrap Up

A survey was shared and all members were asked to please take a moment to share their insights.

Plan for a Resilient Oregon

Draft Table of Contents, 12 November 2025

This Draft will be updated based upon statewide and regional feedback in December, 2025.

I. Front matter

- A. Teams and individuals who participated in development
 - 1. Governor's office
 - 2. Research team
 - 3. Statewide Resilience Forum
 - 4. Community-based organizations
 - 5. Tribal Nations
- B. Others who informed plan (named with permission)
 - 1. Interview participants
 - 2. Focus group participants
 - 3. Others
- C. Acknowledgments

II. Foreword from Governor Kotek

- A. Motivation for and intended purpose of PRO
- B. Expected outcomes of PRO
- C. Next steps (embed resilience in standard operating procedures of state government?)

III. Executive summary

- A. Purpose and scope of PRO
- B. Ownership of and responsibility for implementing the PRO
- C. Recommendations for action and responsible parties

IV. Scope of PRO

- A. Our definition of resilience
- B. Major natural hazards encompassed by the PRO
- C. Major dimensions of resilience (e.g., emergency response; civic and built infrastructure; rule of law; public health; engaged communities; coordination, leadership and collaboration among jurisdictions; housing)

V. Methods

- A. Synthesis of existing resilience plans
 - 1. Within Oregon, at state, county, and municipal or other local levels
 - 2. Beyond Oregon
- B. Regional resilience forums (community-based organizations)
- C. Community engagement events
- D. Key person interviews
- E. Focus groups
- F. Statewide resilience forum
- G. Drivers of change (factors outside state control that may affect success of the PRO)
- H. Tribal youth resilience projects

VI. Recommended resilience actions, and associated actors, that emerged from the methods (where possible, describe how the actions are likely to be robust to future potential drivers of change)

- A. Legislative changes and other policy actions
- B. Governor's budget
- C. Executive orders and other administrative actions
- D. Local initiatives and community actions

VII. Literature Cited

VIII. Appendixes (incorporate photographs within appendix and PRO if we have consent from all people in the photographs)

- A. Existing resilience plans within and beyond Oregon
 - 1. Definitions
 - 2. Plan types
 - 3. Geographic scopes
 - 4. Goals
 - 5. Objectives
 - 6. Actions, responsibilities, and authorities
 - 7. Evidence of implementation and outcomes
 - 8. Case studies
 - 9. Suggested topics or methods for strengthening plans and outcomes
- B. Insights from regional resilience forums, such as needs, enabling conditions, mechanisms for increasing resilience, and measures of success
- C. Insights from key person interviews and focus groups
 - 1. Needs, enabling conditions, suggestions and mechanisms for increasing resilience, and so forth
 - 2. Actions that can be taken by state agencies
 - 3. Actions that can be taken by other entities
- D. External drivers of potential changes in Oregon's resilience
 - 1. Drivers in each thematic area
 - 2. Dependence between and relative influence of drivers
 - 3. Potential future process for stress-testing budget, administrative, or policy options against the drivers