

# MEETING SUMMARY

---

**Date:** May 22, 2019 - 9:00-11:30  
**Subject:** Planning Team Kick-Off Meeting Workshop Minutes  
**Project Name:** Spokane County 2020 Hazard Mitigation Plan Update  
**Summary Prepared By:** David O'Dea, Bridgeview Consulting, LLC, Consultant

---

Item	Action
<p><b><u>Welcome and Introductions</u></b></p> <p>Gerry Bozarth, Spokane County Project Manager for this effort opened the meeting, followed by comments from the Deputy Director, Chandra Fox.</p> <p>Group Introductions were made. A total of 18 people representing 16 planning partners were in attendance: Howard Johnson, Shawn Kendall, Jennifer Isaacson, Lonnie Rash, Roger Krieger, Chandra Fox, Mark Calhoun, Marci Patterson, Bill Dennstaedt, KayDee Gilkey, Nate Whannell, Jay Atwood, Darin Morgan, Garth Davis, Colleen Little, Malcolm Hamilton, Doug Ross, and Bonita Cobb. This includes representatives from seven (7) municipalities, four fire districts, and a flood control district. Also, in attendance were Tim Cook, Washington State Hazard Mitigation Officer, and Michael Levkowitz, the State Hazard Mitigation Strategist.</p> <p>Copies of the original sign in sheets are available from Gerry Bozarth, Greater Spokane County Emergency Management.</p> <p><b><u>Agenda:</u></b></p> <p>The Agenda was distributed prior to the meeting, and reviewed at the onset.</p> <p><b><u>Meeting Summary:</u></b></p> <p>Bev provided a brief overview of the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 and 44 CFR 201.6, discussing the process required for plan update, as well as the ramifications of not having a hazard mitigation plan in place. The 2015 Spokane County HMP was reviewed.</p> <p><b><u>In-Kind Exchange Match</u></b></p> <p>Bev O'Dea discussed the in-kind match for this project, and pointed out that both meeting and non-meeting hours needed to be reported to Gerry Bozarth for tracking purposes.</p> <p>During each meeting, each planning team member will be asked to record their hours spent on the project since the last meeting. This would be for any time spent working on the mitigation plan, including for such items as: reviewing the hazard mitigation plans for both the County and State, travel time, critical facility data gathering, meeting attendance (including any other HMP-related meetings and presentations), document and information gathering and review, and including discussions with other individuals/departments concerning relevant information. Bev also discussed the fact that each of the planning partners will also be utilizing their own local planning team to help with the gathering of information, public outreach, and review of the respective</p>	

Item	Action
<p>annex templates. That time should also be tracked and provided, with each intern planning team member identified.</p> <p><b><u>Additional Planning Team Members and Stakeholders</u></b></p> <p>The group discussed the possibility of any additional planning team members or stakeholders which have not yet been identified or invited to be part of the process. Bev asked the group to provide information for any potential new members to the planning team.</p> <p><b><u>2015 Spokane County HMP</u></b></p> <p>The 2015 plan was discussed and reviewed, with focus on the hazards of concern addressed therein. Gerry Bozarth, the County’s Project Manager and Roger Kreiger from Deer Park were members of the 2015 update of the County’s plan, no other planning partner in attendance worked on the last plan.</p> <p>Bev explained some of the differences which will exist between the 2015 and 2020 plan, including guidance requirements. Minor changes in layout were discussed, as was the addition of new planning partners.</p> <p>Bev asked that if any of the planning team members had any existing studies, reports, or data relevant to any of the hazards be identified to allow review as required by FEMA guidance.</p> <p>Bev explained that one of the additional major changes for the 2020 update is the fact that the plan will be completed to the International Association of Emergency Managers’ Emergency Management Accreditation Program (EMAP) standards, recognizing that Spokane County will be seeking EMAP Accreditation.</p> <p><b><u>Risk Assessment</u></b></p> <p>Bev explained the purpose of updating the risk assessment, and reviewed the previous hazards addressed. GIS and HAZUS programs will again be utilized. The group reviewed the hazards which are recommended for inclusion in this edition of the plan: Climate Change as a secondary hazard, Earthquake, Flood, Hazardous Materials, Landslide, Severe Weather (re-grouping of weather-related hazards currently in 2015 plan), Tsunami, Volcano, and Wildfire.</p> <p>Bev reviewed the basic analysis to be conducted with respect to the hazards of concern. The Risk Ranking methodology may change to utilize the Calculated Priority Risk Index (CPRI) for the hazard ranking process. Whether the method changes will be determined once the hazard profiles have been updated. The purpose of potentially changing the method of ranking to the CPRI methodology is the ease of use, and application to all hazards of concern, not just natural hazards.</p> <p>There will also be changes in the Strategy Prioritization methodology, which was discussed with the planning partners.</p> <p>Bev also discussed the fact that there are no new flood studies in the area, so little, if anything, by way of the flood hazard will change except for potential impact from any</p>	<p>Planning team members were asked to review the existing plans in place, including the County’s and State’s plan, as well as their neighbor jurisdiction’s plan, if one exists.</p>

Item	Action
<p>significant events occurring since the last plan was updated. The same holds true for earthquake, as there are no new shakemaps created by USGS which can be utilized which would be of any benefit.</p> <p>The planning team confirmed the hazards of concern for the 2020 edition, as well as the risk methodology which was presented during the meeting.</p> <p><b><u>Critical Facilities</u></b></p> <p>Bev reviewed the definition of critical facilities which was distributed to the planning team for review. The planning team reviewed and confirmed the definition.</p> <p>As part of this update process, planning partners reviewed the previous plan’s critical facilities’ structure information and confirmed that the same list will be used as no new facilities have been built by the planning team members. That data will again be utilized as the maps and risk assessment are developed.</p> <p><b><u>Public Outreach Strategy</u></b></p> <p>Bev advised the Planning Team that all planning meetings were open to the public, and the public was invited to provide information and comments during those meetings. The Team determined that in order to ensure a fair public process, the Planning Team would adopt the same public comment process as the County utilizes for its Commissioner’s meetings, establishing the following ground rules:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Meeting notices and agenda will be advertised on the Hazard Mitigation Planning website a minimum of one day in advance;</li> <li>➤ The individual wishing to address the Planning Team will raise their hand and be recognized by the Chair or meeting facilitator;</li> <li>➤ Each citizen will be provided three (3) minutes to address the topic;</li> <li>➤ No “sharing” of minutes;</li> <li>➤ Topics are restricted to mitigation planning efforts being addressed during the previous meeting as citizen comment will occur at the beginning of the meeting;</li> <li>➤ Each citizen will be provided a 6-minute maximum per meeting.</li> </ul> <p>Several options for the public outreach strategy were discussed, including a website, press releases, public survey, safety fair, County Fair, email distribution lists, and other public presentations. If other jurisdictions have newsletters, consideration should also be given to include outreach materials in those publications. Many utility companies have inserts included with their monthly statements, which can include mitigation or safety information related to our process.</p> <p>Those entities with social media will also be utilized to keep the public advised of the on-going mitigation planning efforts. This includes the County, which has Facebook and Twitter accounts.</p> <p>The purpose of the outreach will be to provide general hazard information, as well as specific impacts in the jurisdictions. Safety tips and warning information (e.g., watches, warnings, and advisories, etc.) may also be provided. Fairs and large meetings may also</p>	

Item	Action
<p>provide an opportunity to disseminate insurance information as well, such as earthquake or flood insurance. As planning partners hold their respective meetings, insurance brokers or business leaders should be included to provide relevant information. After discussions, the following public outreach strategy was developed for this planning effort:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Press Releases, local public television, social media were all identified as viable options.</li> <li>– The County has developed and launched a hazard mitigation website, which will contain various information such as: agenda and minutes of meetings, a <i>Frequently Asked Questions</i> Flyer, hazard maps, a link to the draft plan (when completed), and a link to a public survey. Other data may be added as developed.</li> <li>– Planning team members will provide a link on their respective websites identifying the County’s site for additional information.</li> <li>– The use of the survey will be by both hardcopy and electronic format. The survey will be posted on the County’s website, with flyers developed indicating the survey’s availability, and address. The survey will remain active for approximately four months.</li> <li>– The County’s already-existing meetings as well as other planning partner’s existing meetings and events were discussed as a potential source to disseminate information concerning our mitigation planning process, availability of the survey, and once completed, to present the hazard maps.</li> <li>– Pre-established council and board meetings are excellent opportunities, as they are regularly scheduled and advertised, and have a regular level of attendance, allowing for greater public contact.</li> <li>– Bev asked that if anyone is making presentations or speaking to any groups, to please let people know that the County and its Planning Partners are updating the current mitigation plan and the status of the effort, asking for public involvement if possible.</li> <li>– Bev also asked planning team members to distribute the survey, and to let people know that it is available for completion.</li> <li>– If anyone has the opportunity to discuss the update to the mitigation plan and would like any type of information or handouts, let Bev know and she can help facilitate that request.</li> <li>– As appropriate, planning team members should be providing updates to their respective boards and councils, and any committees on which they serve concerning the update process. If anyone does speak about the mitigation planning effort, please let Bev know as that counts as public outreach, and we want to record the information in the plan.</li> <li>– Once the initial draft is completed, a link to the plan will be posted on the County’s website, with a press release issued announcing its availability for review and comment by the citizens.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Adoption</u></b></p> <p>Once the plan is completed, it will be presented for public review and comment. Once the public review process ends and the plan is submitted to FEMA, each Planning Partner will need to formally adopt the plan.</p>	

Item	Action
<p><b><u>Goals and Objectives</u></b>                      The 2015 goals were reviewed. A draft of updated goals and objectives was previously provided. Based on that draft, the planning team identified and approved its goals and objectives for the 2020 update. The identified goals and objectives are more linear in nature, supporting the intent of the mitigation planning process, while also allowing greater opportunity to connect with other on-going planning efforts, as well as enhancing the potential to pursue grant funding for projects not yet identified.</p> <p><b><u>Grant Opportunities</u></b>                      The various grant opportunities were also discussed. Once the plan has been completed and adopted, the Planning Partners will be able to pursue various pre- and post-disaster grants as they become available, which will assist in completing mitigation projects. Our partners from the State of Washington in attendance at the meeting provided an extensive overview of the potentials for grant funding for those entities with completed HMPs. The group thanked Tim Cook for his overview of the grants, as well as Michael Levkowitz for attending the kick-off meeting.</p> <p><b><u>Jurisdictional Annex Templates</u></b>                      The Jurisdictional Annex Templates will be distributed. Bev went over the type of annexes (e.g., new planning partner, jurisdiction, special purpose district, etc.). Each section of the plan was discussed, with relevant data distributed, such as the disaster history table, various cheat-sheets.</p> <p>It was suggested that each partner begin the process of assimilating the data and identifying potential resources and individuals within their own respective entities who have information relevant and necessary to develop their specific annex documents. An internal planning team which encompasses different relevant departments and personnel will enhance the end-product of the plan. Bev asked that as each jurisdiction identified their internal personnel and teams, that the information be recorded in the respective jurisdiction’s template to illustrate the information. Bev also indicated that if the planning partner elected to bring their internal team to the workshops and meetings, that was highly encouraged.</p> <p>Gerry reiterated that each planning team member who had not previously done so needed to provide their respective Letters of Intent. Bev indicated that each jurisdiction must identify at least two people who will serve on the County’s planning team to allow for attendance at meetings and to ensure an appropriate level of participation, as required. Some jurisdictions will require formal appointment or approval for participation through their various councils, commissions, and boards. Understanding this delay, those entities which wish to join but may be delayed by the formal process can send an email indicating their intent, followed by the formal notification.</p> <p><b><u>Capabilities Assessment</u></b>                      Bev briefly discussed the existing Capabilities Assessment from the 2015 plan, and advised everyone that they would need to update their respective tables based on current information. This will take some time to complete, but much of the data can be captured as we work through the rest of the planning process. Bev suggested that everyone begin the process of reviewing the template early and not wait until the end of the process.</p>	<p>Bev will distribute the word version of the templates so that each Planning Partner can begin capturing the necessary data.</p> <p>Letters of Intent are due ASAP. Realizing some jurisdictions must go through a formal process of appointment, notification of intent to participate followed by the letters is adequate.</p> <p>Bev provided “Cheat Sheets” to help identify various types of capabilities which can be identified.</p>

Item	Action
<p><b><u>Mitigation Strategies</u></b>                      Bev discussed potential mitigation action items and strategies. She explained that the strategies could be programmatic, policy development, or structural projects. Bev provided examples of potential efforts, and suggested that as team members identified potential strategies during other meetings within their organization, that they begin recording those ideas for discussion when we begin that phase of the plan’s development. During budget cycles, when Capital Improvement Plans are discussed, projects may be identified which can include mitigation efforts and which are eligible projects.</p> <p><b><u>General Topics</u></b>                      Planning Team Chair – The Planning Team felt it was appropriate to elect a Chair for the Planning Team. The Chair will address any media questions, and help facilitate (if necessary) any responses to questions which may arise from public officials. The Chair will be involved in all planning phases, and will serve as the over-all decision maker. The Planning Team nominated and unanimously elected Gerry Bozarth, Program Specialist for Spokane County’s Emergency Management to serve in this capacity.</p> <p><b><u>Mandatory Level of Involvement, Expectations, and Voting</u></b>                      The Planning Team discussed and identified what would constitute a minimum level of expectation to achieve plan development. Various items and issues were addressed. In order to ensure successful completion by all Planning Partners, the Planning Team determined that mandatory attendance at all workshop sessions would be necessary. However, recognizing that situations do arise outside of our control, the Team determined that each <i>entity</i> would be allowed one excused absence. Each Planning Partner (entity) will appoint a primary and an alternate point of contact. Attendance by either member will be acceptable to meet the mandatory meeting attendance (at least one person MUST attend every meeting). Voting on any item would be determined by majority present.</p> <p><b><u>Action Items for next phase</u></b>                      Everyone was assigned specific ‘homework,’ as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ CIKR/CDMS update (in-progress)</li> <li>✓ Review of the County and State’s Hazard Mitigation Plan</li> <li>✓ Begin completing Template</li> <li>✓ Track hours – everyone should record</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Next Meeting:</u></b>                      The next meeting will be in approximately two months; however, that will be determined by receipt of any new critical facilities data by the planning team members (if any) and the completion of the risk assessment.</p> <p>At the conclusion of the meeting, representatives from Washington State Emergency Management Division provided a short overview of some recent changes in the grant process including additional funding opportunities.</p> <p>There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:15 p.m. by Bev O’Dea.</p>	<p>“Cheat-Sheet” and FEMA’s handbook on mitigation strategies provided. Members should begin recording any ideas for potential strategies for use when we get to that point in the planning process.</p>