Attendees:
Michael Roberson, EMD
Jason Biermann, Snohomish County
Mark Douglas, EMD
Steven O'Brien, DoD
Jim Sande, Swinomish Indian Tribal Community
Marianne Hegg, WAARNG
Eli King, Dept. of Commerce
Melanie Rogers, Military Dept.
IT Division
Amy Gillespie, King County
Sandi Duffey, Grant County
Brab Graf, City of Seattle
Lucia Schmit, City of Seattle
Kim More, Dept. of Health
Greg McKnight, Dept. of Health
Lindsay Gorgen, Dept. of Health
Elenka Jarolimek, City of Seattle

Jason Osleson, DHS, Cybersecurity & Infrastructure Security Agency
Tom Wall, Argonne National Laboratory
Alysha Kaplan, EMD
Patrick Wright, WSDOT Aviation
Justin Fordice, EMD
Debi Stumpp, WAARNG
Randy August, The Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation
Jim Buck, Region 2
Justin Cravin, FEMA RX
Horace Ward, Yakima County
Serena Segura, EMD
Chris Utzinger, EMD
John Holdsworth, Snohomish County

Notes:
Survey:
• The intent of the questions is to take this out to locals to facilitate a discussion focusing on these questions. After today, we are moving forward with the questions as the basis for the facilitated discussion.
• Rail lines – caution – don’t mix missions for debris clearance and transportation
  o Also remember there is a difference between clearance and removal
    ▪ Clearance is response and removal is recovery (how WA will look at it)
• Need to clarify if debris management is just for railways
  o or 1h: need to connect to a SSA (state staging area) – co-located with FSA but need to document SSA
• Might want to break out questions by category
• 1t – need to add some clarification – make clear what the difference is and why they should care
• Need to define connect? If connecting to all schools that can be very significant
  o What type of term is it? Operational – how to get to x as an end point.
• Standby contracts – public works. Public works has most likely identified. Change question to identify who is contracted – include contracting in Debris management plan
  o Jason can talk with Jim Buck re: SR530 best practices
• 50 routes – need to provide more information so it is known what we are talking about
  o Add link to the routes in the presentation
• Questions to add:
  o Do they have access to fuel pod (f-pod)/access to fuel
  o Do you have a plan or plans that identify your hazards that can help with this planning?
  o Have generic question at the end: what are other things we should take into consideration for life safety and life sustaining efforts for moving resources and people
  o Who has a generator in their community to access fuel? (move into fuel outreach program)
  o Communication and water routes – are you aware of critical communication infrastructure (water, communication, and transportation interdependencies)
These questions look at health well but are there other critical infrastructure dependencies that should be considered?

Debris removal/clearance – jurisdictional responsibility and private sector responsibility – transition from response to recovery – contract piece might be coming from outside the state (this may be a planning assumption)
- Need to focus on route clearance and not removal – keep debris removal separate.

- Consider adding a question about interdependencies to other capabilities such as casualty collection points, shelters, responder camps, etc.

- Schools – assumption that this is a place that people can/will gather. Some communities deciding what to retrofit.

WISE Tool Review:
- Tool to facilitate the discussion with critical infrastructure
- Review tool after data is inputted – tool was being fickle during the meeting

Facilitation Guide Review and Input:
- PowerPoint with notes for the facilitator and the slides for the audience
- Delivery is by us – the SCIPT. If you need more context or clarification please let us know ASAP
  - Maximum-of-maximums – could be different for county/region that they should also be considering along with the CSZ scenario
- Add note on CSZ slide: what it is, disruption to saving life
  - May want to include disruption to services especially
- SCIPT slide: add tribes and federal partners (no need to add more logos)
- Planning Framework – change utilities restoration to critical infrastructure utilities restoration for: 
- RRAP slide: Only 1 ISB and located in eastern WA – connect with state staging areas on the western side
  - RRAP is to connect with federal staging only unless co-located with state staging (which it is in WA)
- RRAP Planning slide: What does high peak ground acceleration mean? What does highest impacts on Olympic Peninsula... mean? Need to clarify slide and quantify and make graphic more visible.
  - Coastal roads?
  - Just looked at transportation routes. Worked with DNR tsunami staff (have death data). Does take into account those routes. The study was to determine what could survive, prioritize routes to Moses Lake, etc.
    - No relying on just HITRAC or RRAP, but asking them to bring their best science.
    - Give locals info on the state’s priorities and planning efforts to connect state and local
    - RRAP focused on all routes, focus on debris clearance (not restoration, but a useable function to get resources and move people from point A to point B)
- Add 3 slides after the Framework to go thru Critical Transportation to define the phases and discuss roles/responsibilities
- Slides have a lot of words. Key points on the slides to make it more visually appealing. Use handouts. Text heavy on the facilitation guide.
- This is an 80% solution and each can adjust to fit your style
Note to add disruption scenarios and be able to note which ones are relevant to the audience.
Consider text color – gray/white is hard for people who are color blind.

1-Pager:
- Will have definitions – so everyone has common definitions.
- Still in process, and will be sent out to the SCIPT for review via email.
- It provides context for our why
- If you have input, please email Jason Biermann

Follow-Up Items:
- Update facilitation guide
- Draft 1-Pager
- WISE Tool data input
  - Will do a training session on WISE (next SCIPT Meeting?)

Timeline:
Consideration for legislative staff since it could be a really busy session

RRAP Report Brief Out and Tool Demo:
- 1 year process, collect data, analyze
- 2 years for partners to build on the initial project
- Can provide limited support for activities
- Based on key findings look at ways for resilience enhancement options
- Began out of 2016 Cascadia Rising Exercise
- Two objectives for the project
  - Analyze and identify priority inter-model transport routes
  - Identify and prioritize transportation routes and facilities for potential investments
- Focus on highways
- Two tools
  - Bridge seismic screening tool
    - Worked with WSDOT Bridges Office to develop the tool (collaborative)
    - Reviewed bridges in western and central WA (excluded far eastern WA counties)
    - Estimate repair types and reopening times
    - Primarily focus on highway bridges and does not take into account local roads/bridges that might be viable
    - Did not consider aggregate re-opening times or resource availability
  - Road seismic screening tool
- These are spreadsheet based tools, and are estimated to have them delivered to WSDOT in January 2019. No software needed. Then they will start the review process with WSDOT. They are expected to release to all in the first quarter 2019.
- Rigid pavement: did the model look at liquefiable soil of after-shocks? No, it did not. The challenges are the number and intensity that would occur. It is difficult to estimate the post event condition and then further degradation.
- Is there a tie in with the supply chain resiliency project? Yes – and will be tied in with the current work of four Puget Sound counties.
- FY19 looking to do an RRAP on water systems (working with DOH)
• Integration of RRAP and Outreach – waiting to see how easy the tools are to use and how we can add local data to the tool. We will need to assess once the tools are released. The local office can conduct train-the-trainer table tops to train us then we can train our partners.

Resilience Supply Chain Project Briefing:
• Grocery sector in the Puget Sound Region – FEMA projects and aligns with catastrophic preparedness
• We can engage with the private sector and better for the community to get groceries from stores than MREs from CPODs
• Identified big box and who supplies the mom-and-pop shops
• Met with grocers and identified key bottle-necks, common challenges,
• Most distribution centers are clustered in south King and north Pierce counties
• Limited on business continuity and re-opening
• Had conversations with grocers, and focus on how to help them from the public sector
• Next step: gather major grocers in Puget Sound region for a summit
• The grocers are willing to work with each other (competitors)
• Incorporate into catastrophic planning
• This should inform the planning efforts (i.e. where a CPOD should be)

Outreach Program Strategy #2:
• Did link supply chain and pharmaceutical work together. Not sure if that work is still being done. Kim Moore/Lindsay Gorgen will check on the status.
• Fuel and Logistics: This is the next strategy
  o Eli – agrees that it would be good to go forward with logistics and fuel outreach
    ▪ Can use the RRAP as a starting point
    ▪ Establishing a fuel workgroup (Commerce)
  o Workgroup:
    ▪ Eli King, Commerce
    ▪ Mark Douglas, EMD Logistics
    ▪ Marianne Hegg, National Guard
    ▪ Michael Roberson, EMD
    ▪ Serena Segura, EMD
    ▪ Tristan Allen?
    ▪ Jill Nordstrom?

• Water & Waste Water
  o Have databases with GIS capabilities (starting point)
  o Need to recognize the need; identify gap
  o RRAP maybe spring of 2019 to start – but will be too late
    ▪ Use information from outreach to inform RRAP
  o In their infancy of forming and planning – setting priorities, identifying interdependencies with others
• Need to focus on completing the Framework before creating the outreach program (fuel, water/waste water)
• There are other stakeholders for fuel and water/waste water than there are for transportation. It can be very privatized. May want to look at a little differently.
• Look at dependencies – fuel may be a driver for water and waste water
• Look at what Oregon has done for fuel. Have Oregon brief out on their fuel plan.
• Fuel and generation – this is a gap

Administrative Items:
• Framework Status and Cascadia Rising 2022
  o Conduct meet and greets with new staff at partner state agencies: Military Department IT, DOH, and Commerce
    ▪ Military IT: November 8\textsuperscript{th}
    ▪ DOH: November 21\textsuperscript{st}
    ▪ Commerce: TBD
  o Conducting a work session with the Military Department IT to start their planning efforts for the Framework and CIA on December 19th

• Next Meeting/Meeting Schedule for 2019
  o February 28, 2019
    ▪ 1\textsuperscript{st} Quarter Agenda: Outreach updates and reviews on Critical Transportation and Fuel and Logistics, establish outreach coordinators, WISE Tool demo, Oregon Fuel Plan Briefing(?), and Jason Osleson is available to train to the RRAP tools (not the week of February 19\textsuperscript{th})
  o June 27, 2019
  o August 29, 2019
  o November 28, 2019

Action Items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey questions updated from SCIPMt Meeting input</td>
<td>Michael Roberson and Brittany Miller</td>
<td>12/14/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation Guide: review and provide input to Michael Roberson and Jason Biermann</td>
<td>SCIPt</td>
<td>12/14/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation Guide: update from SCIPt input</td>
<td>Michael Roberson and Jason Biermann</td>
<td>1/4/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Pager drafted and sent to SCIPt via email</td>
<td>Jason Biermann</td>
<td>12/14/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 SCIPt Meeting Schedule</td>
<td>Serena Segura</td>
<td>12/7/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>