

Program Committee Meeting Minutes

May 20, 2019; 1:00 – 3:00 PM
Red Cross, 3131 N. Vancouver Ave., Portland

PROGRAM COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE (Quorum reached: 7 of 13 active positions represented)

1. Alice Busch, REMTEC Chair
2. Jamal Folsom, Portland Water Bureau (representing Lonny Welter for Public Works Work Group)
3. Sherrie Forsloff, Health System Rep
4. Eric Frank (representing Renate Garrison for Citizen Corps Work Group)
5. Jack Nuttall, Public Health WG Chair
6. Henry Reimann, Law Enforcement WG Co-Chair
7. **John Wheeler, Program Committee Chair**
8. **Katy Wolf, Program Committee Vice Chair**

RDPO/PBEM Staff and Other Attendees:

9. Beth Crane, RDPO Grants Program Coordinator
10. Kirsten Ingersoll, PHEP Coordinator, Clackamas County
11. Eric Missman, RDPO Staff Assistant
12. Justin Ross, Disaster Sanitation Task Force Chair
13. Greg Shortreed, RDPO Logistics Coordinator
14. Jennifer Stacey, Port of Portland

1. **Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review** – John Wheeler, Committee Chair
 - At 1:00pm, Chair Wheeler called the meeting to order, welcomed everyone, and asked for self-introductions. The meeting agenda was also briefly reviewed.
2. **Administrative Matters** – John Wheeler, Committee Chair
 - Chair Wheeler called for comments and a motion to approve minutes from the two joint SC-PrC meetings that took place in March and April. Mr. Nuttall motioned to approve both sets of minutes, with a second on both from Ms. Busch. All in favor, with no opposed. Both sets of minutes were approved.
3. **RDPO Update** – Beth Crane, RDPO Grants Coordinator
 - As Denise was not in attendance due to illness, Chair Wheeler called on Beth Crane to provide an update on RDPO work and activities of the Policy and Steering Committees. Beth expressed that it is both an exciting and very busy time for RDPO, with lots of projects being concluded from the UASI '16 period. Laura Hanson has been working with contractors on the [Regional Recovery Framework Project](#), and expects to have all materials back this week in order to begin reviewing and synthesizing the information to come up with final documents for this phase. She is also working with regional partners to launch the Emergency Transportation Routes (ETR) and fuel projects.
 - Denise has been working with the Policy Committee on bill tracking and various legislative advocacy pursuits, with specific focus on:
 - i. HB 2206, which directs the implementation of a program to evaluate the condition of buildings after emergencies to determine whether they may be safely occupied.
 - ii. HB 2208, ordering the establishment of a program to issue grants for improving seismic safety of unreinforced masonry buildings.

- iii. HB 2265 bill to support counties to hire emergency personnel.
- iv. Working on letter to Oregon congressional delegation that addressed executive branch FY 2020 budget. The president's budget calls for more cuts for EM funding at federal level. Letter will advocate for stable or increased funding, not cuts.

4. **Regional Disaster Sanitation Task Force SOP** – Justin Ross, Sanitation TF Chair

- [Link to SOP.](#)
- Chair Wheeler called on Justin Ross (MultCo Emergency Mgmt and current Sanitation TF Chair) to kick off a review of the Task Force's SOP to solicit feedback on any needed improvements or vote on its approval if no changes were proposed.
- Several PrC members proposed a handful of changes with a few discussion points and questions arising.
 - i. Ms. Bush asked if governance of the Disaster Sanitation TF falls under the Steering Committee domain, with Beth and Chair Wheeler clarifying the PrC chartered it.
 - ii. Chair Wheeler inquired as to whether these SOPs are brand new. Justin advised they were approved internally by the group back in January, but with the PrC focused on the projects pipeline, it was held off for review and approval until now.
 - iii. Ms. Forsloff asked for clarification on the document's mention that guidelines are now being developed for jurisdictions to use when considering what to do with waste. Was the focus here only on households or were commercial and industrial applications considered as well? Justin advised that most efforts have been put towards multifamily housing for now but reported there has been a lot of interest from colleges / universities, healthcare and other institutions and stakeholders. The task force will need to determine how to move forward beyond the initial target group.
 - iv. Ms. Busch asked about the membership and voting privileges—inquiring whether it would be a good idea to require a public health subject matter expert for voting/decision-making to ensure subject matter experts contribute to final decisions.
 - v. Vice Chair Wolf agreed with Ms. Busch and expressed concern about attendance “not being tracked”. It was suggested that a meeting sign-in sheet be utilized, and Ms. Busch asserted that this tracking becomes very important in situations where past attendees or project stakeholders may question consensus decisions or votes taken in previous meetings.
 - vi. Chair Wheeler added that as opposed to the larger RDPO committees, these task forces are smaller groups with a narrower focus and care should be taken not to impose too many restrictions on them. Ms. Forsloff asked, “is there a summary of who attends meetings in general?” Justin answered that sign in sheets are used (but attendance is not tracked), members of the public have attended before, as well as DEQ representatives. Laura Hall puts together meeting summaries and plans for following meetings, so all is being documented.
- To close the SOP review discussion, Chair Wheeler and Vice Chair Wolf suggested adding roster and work plan attachments to the SOP to; identify who is needed for input and decision-making, define deliverables, and outline an approval process. Chair Wheeler suggested that Justin return to the task force with proposed changes and potentially look to present again to the PrC in August or September.

5. **UASI '19 Pipeline Hot Wash** – John Wheeler, Committee Chair & Beth Crane, RDPO Grants Coordinator

- Chair Wheeler opened discussion on the completed UASI '19 pipeline process and summarized the hotwash discussion at the Steering Committee. Ideas for improvement were:

- when funding equipment and supplies, require a plan that shows how the investment fits into a regional framework;
 - Revise project proposal scoring process by forming a grant review subcommittee or involve a larger body in the scoring effort;
 - Review project criteria and possibly weigh criteria differently;
 - Ensuring that smaller jurisdictions can access UASI resources to meet emerging federal standards and upgrade requirements
- Chair Wheeler asked PrC members to provide input on what went well and what could have been different or better to improve the next project development cycle. Discussion included:
 - Agreement that needing plans for equipment/infrastructure investments is valid
 - Acknowledgement that there is mixed information about guidelines from previous and emerging infrastructure investments (i.e. radios). Some previous investments were approved, but at some point, RDPO turned away from investing in infrastructure radio systems. There is a lack of clarity and documentation about what is and is not fundable as infrastructure/day-to-day cost of doing business.
 - Beth referred to the [final application package](#) handout and gave a brief summary of the recent joint SC-PrC sessions. At the May 6th Steering Committee, discussion focused on how to address the additional \$750k over flat funding planning assumption. Steering Committee priorities were:
 - Extending RDPO staffing from 12 to 24 months
 - Funding OHSU radio consoles, and
 - Funding a regional plan to deliver emergency water, which resulted in a significant amount of discussion.
 - Most projects were funded at request, except OHSU radio consoles, Citizen Corps and nerve agent antidote project.
 - Questions / Discussion.
 - Mr. Folsom asked about the decisions made regarding water planning. Beth answered funding decisions were made at one of the two recent joint SC-PrC meetings, and discussions have also been incremental and over time. She added there have been repeated concerns around funding requests for equipment when there is not a clear plan in place.
 - Ms. Busch expressed concern that several proposals were submitted by specific groups that fell completely within the realm of another. She requested that whenever this is the case going forward, the project owner should be required to obtain and attach a letter of support from other impacted groups to document that they are aware. Beth expressed a prior statement from Denise that proofs of concept are intended to happen within the various work groups themselves, with the PrC then assisting to connect groups and be sure efforts are not duplicated.
 - Mr. Reimann shared he was content with Denise and Beth (as unbiased observers) involved in the scoring portion of the process, stating that sometimes with too many people involved, focus gets shuffled around.
 - Vice Chair Wolf recommended efforts be made to ensure quality, fully developed projects that have been reviewed and signed off on by relevant workgroups (not just the primary proposing workgroup) before proposals are brought in front of the Steering Committee for review, with Vice Chair Wheeler adding that when people

heard about the additional \$750k, some came up with new ideas that may not have been completely vetted (example: RDPO staffing, which had been considered before, but was not initially on the priority list).

- Mr. Wheeler suggested some additional accountability needs to be instituted, citing the PrC formerly prioritized all projects, and brought only the highest priority proposals in front of the SC. Now the SC wants to review all regardless of their priority. The SHSP grant process in comparison is very rigid, and we should aim towards balancing scrutinizing proposals with minimal bureaucratic activities aiming to come away with high quality proposals with the strongest return on investment. Ms. Wolf added our scoring may be overly generous, as we do not wish to unfairly limit and would rather build out these proposals into good projects. Beth commented that perhaps technical assistance needs to be offered/required earlier in the process, but Ms. Busch believes much of the issue with further vetting stemmed from the fact that some workgroups did not connect with each other. Mr. Wheeler agrees the process needs to be better formulated to ensure the right individuals and subcommittees review and determine what needs to be done to make a proposal better, then have another group review again under a more rigorous process, but without adding too many steps that may overcomplicate.
- Vice Chair Wheeler recapped that no opposition was heard to the idea of enhancing justification of equipment, or to form a small grant review committee to help Denise & Beth with scoring (and to potentially look at scoring criteria to ensure it is adequate). He also confirmed the request that items impacting more than one workgroup subcommittee need to be vetted through all relevant work groups. He also cited a few valuable points again from the SHSP process, such as the impartiality of the scoring process and that, in general, people involved in the grant review process do a specific thing, and do not represent a specific point of view or interest. Mr. Reimann likes the software rating program used in SHSP and suggested that perhaps the PrC investigates borrowing or building something similar.

6. Equity Advisor Discussion – Chair Wheeler

- Chair Wheeler asked PrC members to raise ideas on the specific role and qualifications of the equity advisor position they previously agreed to incorporate in support of the RDPO strategic plan and project pipeline process. He kicked off the discussion by suggesting they begin with an assessment of what’s happened so far and reporting on the status of RDPO regarding social equity to help determine any gaps or opportunities, and then called for other thoughts and comments.
- Questions / Discussion.
 - i. Vice Chair Wolf expressed that we would likely want to see this advisor participate on the “grant review subcommittee”, and to develop some equity tools (several RDPO jurisdictions have various tools) to evaluate that component. Beth added part of the social vulnerability project proposal for 2019 calls for defining *what* equity is.
 - ii. The PrC could establish a task force to bring recommendations forward and establish structure. Ms. Forsloff commented she would rather see a small group formed, to distill down to specific needs and incorporate feedback from involved agencies or jurisdictions they represent.
 - iii. Justin Ross asked about funding for the role, with Chair Wheeler answering that if the PrC looks to use resources from within one of their own organizations, a more practical

discussion may need to occur on who is appointed, especially if it is a non-paid, non-voting role.

- iv. Discussion about allocating funding for a paid consultant
 - v. Ms. Busch reported that the original equity lens in Multnomah County was focused on race but could be a good starting point to define what we mean. Ms. Forsloff added OHSU had one written relating to who (risk-based) would get the H1N1 vaccine, but this got chaotic and fell apart when determinations went to individual counties.
 - vi. Ms. Busch questioned whether an actual advisor would be appropriate, or rather a common equity lens we all incorporate and adopt. A more fitting proposal may be to get someone to help with one-time development, with the critical point being *who*. Mr. Wheeler suggests a manageable approach would be to find someone independently with technical expertise to come up with a game plan to develop and recommend level setting and implementation training to get everyone on the same page relating to equity, then hunt for self-assessment tools to use for establishing metrics and measuring progress. Ms. Wolf suggested graduate students as one potential resource, as well as consultants or a funded project, but as the project pipeline was just wrapped up, this may not be practical if it is a priority.
 - vii. Mr. Folsom suggested perhaps we may not need to find answers within this group, and rather it may be more useful to pose questions externally to entities such as the Center for Equity and Inclusion (independent, local non-profit). Groups such as these do this type of work every day and should be able to provide guidance on an approach to move forward toward the goal of introducing equity into our work. Ms. Busch added that even with the equity and empowerment lens in MultCo, after several trainings, they are still back to getting a professional in the field as a subject matter expert.
 - viii. Ms. Wolf likes the idea of funding this in ongoing way, but a big concern with this could be if funding ever goes away, we won't have something we can use. Mr. Wheeler reiterates the idea of hiring an advisor for a short-term project to assess and measure or help with self-evaluation in terms of equity and produce a report to publish and share information.
 - ix. Mr. Reimann thinks forming a workgroup consisting of individuals from within our own disciplines who have some level of equity training or expertise would be a good idea.
 - x. The Policy Committee likes the idea of an actual equity advisor role, believing it will hold the group accountable and keep the topic in the forefront.
 - xi. Mr. Folsom asked, how would the PrC's work differ or be enhanced by the equity advisor. Mr. Wheeler explained that a primary focus of the PrC is to shepherd the pipeline process and provide a general situation status and problem-solving function around those projects. So, the overall discussion surrounds figuring out who can help us or how can we do those things while incorporating the value of equity. Justin Ross added MultCo previously had an evaluation pertaining to service delivery to people with disabilities / access & functional needs (DAFN), and the recommendation from that was for an advisory committee focusing on this area to be formed.
- b. Vice Chair Wheeler presented the options to proceed—form an advisory committee or allocate funds to hire an equity consultant advisor to help us gain footing. Beth added that with either option, the Steering Committee would need to sign off, and suggested inviting consultant subject matter experts to a future meeting to present, review our notes on equity discussions from prior meetings, and the DAFN assessment. Mr. Wheeler closed the discussion by recommending further offline discussion to come up with an action plan to get to where a decision can be made, then come back with next steps at the June meeting.

7. **Round Table / Good of the order**

- Beth shared information about the [Vanport Mosaic Project](#) and associated events taking place on May 21. MultCo and City of PDX are involved.

8. **Adjourn**

- Chair Wheeler adjourned the meeting at 3:00pm.