

## **SR 530 Landslide Commission Meeting**

Tuesday, November 4, 2014; 5:00 – 8:00 p.m.  
The Everett Community Center, Port Gardner Rooms A&B  
3900 Broadway, Everett, WA 98201  
Phone: (425) 385- 4019

### *Meeting Summary*

#### **ATTENDANCE:**

See Attachment 1

#### **Welcome and Meeting Overview**

Kathy Lombardo, Executive Director, opened the meeting and thanked the Commissioners, the William D. Ruckelshaus Center, and the public for their attendance at the meeting. She appreciated the time commitment and hard work that the Commissioners have given to this work.

The October 20 Commission Meeting Summary was reviewed and edits were suggested. Once additional comments by the Commissioners are received the Summary will be posted.

#### **Review Draft Report Structure**

Presentation – Draft Report Structure -Amanda Murphy, Ruckelshaus Center

Presentation materials – available at [www.bit.ly/sr530commission](http://www.bit.ly/sr530commission)

The purpose of this discussion was for Commissioners to provide high-level feedback on several elements in the report that need clarification realizing that the draft report is a work in progress.

Amanda presented a PowerPoint with the report recommendations synthesized and categorized under various themes. She suggested a number of themes and ways to organize the recommendations. These included:

- Group lessons learned as simple, complicated or complex and elaborate each theme in a paragraph.
- Categorize emergency management as a complex system.
- The top priority is building a resilient statewide emergency management system and an effective geologic hazards system.
- The recommendations could be categorized into three themes: 1) need for adequate sustained funding, 2) collaboration, and (3) information and communication.

- A “Call to Action” matrix can be developed that suggests who would be the responsible lead for each recommendation.

### **Commission Discussion of Report Structure and Introduction**

The Commission appreciated the presentation on the categorization of recommendations especially the “Call to Action” matrix. They discussed the difference between solving a simple problem and influencing a complex system. The distinction between priorities and categorizations was also clarified. It was emphasized that having adequate and sustained funding for all of the recommendations is necessary. Discussion also focused on whether the issues are too complex to categorize and whether the Geologic Hazards recommendations exactly fit with the categorization examples. Overall, the Commission supported the proposed approach for report structure.

### **Review of Introduction Section (Sections 1 and 2)**

The Commission reviewed the report introduction. The purpose of the introduction is to “tell the story” and to set the context for the whole report. Comments were focused on:

- *Are there factual items that need clarification?*
- *Are there facts or positions that need to be included?*
- *Are there facts or positions that can be removed or combined?*

### **Commission Discussion of the Introduction Section (Sections 1 and 2)**

Commissioner discussion focused on a variety of structural edits. More graphical representation of information was desired. Increase emphasis on what went well and that professional responders spent an extraordinary length of time on duty. It was noted that it is a challenge to tell the story accurately since there are multiple perspectives and experiences of the event. A number of ideas about how to approach this was offered.

### **Review Research Group Draft Recommendations – Emergency Management**

The Commission reviewed the Emergency Management Research Group Draft Recommendations. The purpose of the discussion was to see if there was consensus on the recommendations and to solicit additional edits. Comments focused on:

- *Are there factual items that need clarification?*
- *Are there recommendations that need to be expanded or added?*
- *Are there recommendations that can be removed or combined?*

### **Commission Discussion of the Emergency Management Draft Recommendations**

There were numerous edits to the recommendations as some recommendations needed clarification, some elements needed to be combined, and specific elements were left out and needed to be added back, such as the discussion of Family Assistance Centers.

Comments included wanting the tone of the recommendations to start with the positive, that the recommendations need to read more like statements, and that some recommendations need to be strengthened with additional text. It was noted that not only small jurisdictions were overwhelmed, but also Snohomish County was overwhelmed with the complexity and enormity of the incident.

Due to the variety of comments and the need for additional fine-tuning it was agreed that the Group would set up phone calls to complete the edits.

## **Review Research Group Recommendations – Geologic Hazards & Land Use**

The Commission reviewed the Geologic Hazards and Land Use Research Group Draft Recommendations. The purpose of the discussion was to see if there was consensus on the recommendations and to solicit additional edits. Comments focused on

- *Are there factual items that need clarification?*
- *Are there recommendations that need to be expanded or added?*
- *Are there recommendations that can be removed or combined?*

### **Commission Discussion of the Geologic Hazards & Land Use Draft Recommendations**

One focus of discussion was on the relationship between different recommendations and whether certain recommended actions need to happen prior to implementation of other recommendations. The Commission contemplated the sense of urgency related to specific recommendations particularly hazard mapping.

Discussion also focused on whether the recommendations were about all geologic hazards or on landslides. It was acknowledged that there are solid programs related to earthquakes, but that there are gaps in analysis and information regarding landslides. Recommendations regarding land use may be controversial to some interests, especially regarding real estate transactions. It was noted that municipalities didn't always have shoreline and environmental regulations and that it is important to advance land use planning recommendations. The importance of a balanced approach to the geologic hazards and land use planning recommendations was emphasized.

## **Discuss Integration, Prioritization & Needed Content**

The Commission discussed whether to include a matrix of recommendations and who might be the action lead for each recommendation. The general consensus was that this should be included in the "Call to Action" in the report. Discussion focused on whether to and how best to prioritize the recommendations. A range of suggestions for how to rank recommendations was offered. Sustainable and sufficient funding was considered core to many of the other recommendations. The Commission contemplated what are the key leverage points that can significantly improve the system and how to be proactive instead of waiting for the "big one".

The Ruckelshaus facilitation team suggested that the Commissioners put forth their top two or three priorities and see if there is agreement among Commissioners. The following were the Commissioners' responses:

- Diane Sugimura: mapping starting with known areas; creating a task force on emergency management; all hazards mobilization
- Chief Steve Strachen: all hazards mobilization; sustainable and adequate funding for emergency management; hazard mapping
- Paul Chiles: hazard mapping-identifying the most dangerous first
- Wendy Gerstel: continue and expand the current investigation; hazard mapping; sustained and adequate funding for emergency management
- Bill Trimm: hazard mapping; all hazards mobilization
- Hon. Jill Boudreau: all hazards mobilization; hazard mapping, communications
- Renee Radcliff-Sinclair: all hazards mobilization; prioritized hazard mapping system, strategy for long-term funding
- Joann Boggs: all hazards mobilization; sustained and adequate funding, statewide hazard mapping
- John Erickson: all hazards mobilization; sustained and adequate funding; complete the current investigation; hazard mapping
- Lee Shipmen: all hazards mobilization; sustained and adequate funding; statewide hazard mapping
- David Montgomery (via email): top three priorities for each topic:  
Emergency Management  
Rec.#1. Task Force to examine existing programs  
Rec. #2. Review command and control  
Rec. #11. Legislative review of definition of all hazards mobilization

#### Geology & Land Use

- Rec. #1. Investigate and monitor the slide
- Rec. #2. Develop mapping program and identify high-risk areas (including Task Force)
- Rec. #3&4. Update WACs and subdivision laws

Commissioners varied in their preferences regarding prioritization. While some Commissioners preferred to rally around a few recommendations, others expressed concerns about “weighting” recommendations against each other. Some recommendations lend themselves to immediate action as they can be accomplished through existing agency work programs or existing authority. Certain recommendations set the groundwork for other actions and may need immediate attention. It was suggested that the core priorities be called “first steps”. The Commissioners concluded that the discussion provided enough guidance for the first draft of the report.

**For more information about the SR 530 Landslide Commission, including the times and places of future meetings, please see our website at: <http://www.bit.ly/sr530commission>** 4

## Event/Response Timeline Discussion

The Commission reviewed the Draft Event/Response Timeline. The purpose of the discussion was to confirm the approach and to solicit additional edits. Comments focused on

- *Does the structure of the timeline provide sufficient information?*
- *Are there factual items or actions on this timeline that need clarification?*
- *Are there facts or actions that need to be included?*
- *Are there facts or actions that can be removed or combined?*

Overall, the Commission confirmed that the timeline was appropriately developing. It is challenging to consolidate so much information especially in the first 5 days. Comments focused on the importance of capturing anecdotal stories and different perspectives realizing that there are a wide range of experiences, perceptions and statements. Whether to incorporate narrative into the timeline or find alternative appropriate places in the report was discussed. Possible titles for each of the phases on the timeline were discussed-*Rescue, Recovery, Resolve, Redevelopment*

## Final Working Draft Timeline & Wrap-up, Adjourn

The Commission discussed how to incorporate additional input into the report and the timeline for feedback and completion. Kathy Lombardo proposed that she collect the feedback from initial reviewers and email that feedback to Commissioners. Commissioner will have an opportunity to provide and review edits and may need to address issues raised by the feedback provided by the initial reviewers. Commissioners decided that at the December 2 Commission meeting they would agree on how to approach the final adoption of the Report.

## Public Comment:

### Barnaby Dow-Summary of comments:

As the External Affairs Officer for King County Emergency Management, Barnaby Dow applauded the work of the Commission. He raised the issue that there is a proposal that many in emergency management organizations have seen that put teeth on the first draft recommendation in the Emergency Management section. There is a proposal to do a gap analysis of the emergency management accreditation guidelines and suggested that a university can assist in analysis and building a case that can be brought forward to the State Legislature. (Handout attached).

### Dominic Marzano-Summary of comments:

Dominique Marzano, Division Chief with Kent Fire Department, commented that all hazard statewide mobilization is the cornerstone for addressing gaps in emergency response. It is important to define all hazards, all disciplined mobilization. Fire mobilization is effective for fighting fires, but firefighters cannot do everything. It is essential to have skills from others. The

state needs to develop type and kind list based on the kind of resource needed and the capability of the resource. FEMA has 120 type and kind categories. (Handout attached).

Brian McMahan-Summary of comments:

Brian McMahan shared that he was one of the responders to the SR 530 landslide. He initially intended to listen to the Commission meeting and not speak. He pointed out that there are critical things that need to be in the timeline that are not there. He stated that the timeline does not show the whole picture and needs more details. He encouraged the Commission to seek out more documentation and suggested that they request the first four days of documentation (214 form) from the document unit leader from incident management teams.

John Niles – Summary of comments:

John Niles stated that he is an independent transportation policy analyst and was formerly a safety analyst and naval officer. He thanked the Commission for their work. He shared information from Will Knedlik and agreed that the Everett-Seattle rail corridor is a significant hazard. John encouraged the Commission to include a statement about this rail corridor and its landslide risk in the report and that more work needs to be done to analyze the hazard and risk of landslides in this corridor. (Handout attached).

Upcoming SR 530 Commission Meeting Dates	Location
• December 2nd, 5-8 p.m.	• Everett Community Center

**Attachment 1**  
**Meeting Attendees**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title and Affiliation</b>
Kathy Lombardo	Executive Director
Joann Boggs	Pend Oreille County Emergency Management Director, current Chair Washington state Emergency Management Association
Hon. Jill Boudreau	Mayor, Mount Vernon
Paul Chiles	Owner/ President, Chiles & Co Real Estate
John Erickson	Former Director of Emergency Preparedness, Department of Health
Wendy Gerstel	Principle, Qwg Applied Geology
Renee Radcliff-Sinclair	Former Representative, Current Strategic Initiatives for Western United States for Apple Inc.
Lee Shipman	Emergency Management Director, Shoalwater Bay Tribe
Steve Strachan	Chief, Bremerton Police Department
Diane Sugimura	Director, Seattle Dept. of Planning and Development
Bill Trimm	County Planner/Land Use Expert, Member, Snohomish County Planning Advisory Council representing Mountlake Terrace
Mike Gaffney	Ruckelshaus Center
Amanda Murphy	Ruckelshaus Center
John Snyder	Ruckelshaus Center
Phyllis Shulman	Ruckelshaus Center
Raquel Espinosa	Ruckelshaus Center

## SR 530 LANDSLIDE COMMISSION MEETING PUBLIC COMMENT SIGN-IN SHEET

**Meeting Date & Time:** November 3, 2014, 5:00pm – 8:00pm

**Location:** The Everett Community Center, 3900 Broadway, Everett, WA 98201

Welcome to the SR 530 Landslide Commission Meeting. Public comment is encouraged and appreciated. If you wish to speak, please sign-in and provide the agenda item topic you wish to speak about to the Commission.

A total of 15 minutes will be provided for public comment. Please limit comments to 3 minutes per person. No speaker may convey or donate his or her time to another speaker. In an effort to be respectful of everyone's time, Commission members will not be able to engage in a dialogue with individual members of the audience and no immediate action will be taken on any public comment issue.

Name	Address/Phone/Email (Optional)	Representing Self/Business	Agenda Item/Topic	Wish to Provide Written Comment?
Brian Dow		King Co OEM	DRAFT RACS/ Capabilities	NO VERBAL
Dominic Marzano		Kent OEM	DRAFT REPORT MOBILIZATION	YES AND VERBAL
Brian McMahan			Timeline	NO
John Niles	JNILES@ ALUM.HIT.EDU	PITF	Draft RACS	YES + VERBAL

## SR 530 LANDSLIDE COMMISSION MEETING SIGN-IN SHEET

**Meeting Date & Time:** November 4, 2014, 5:00pm – 8:00pm

**Location:** The Everett Community Center, 3900 Broadway, Everett, WA 98201

Name	Title	Affiliation	Phone	E-Mail
Michael Kern	Director	Rodkelshaus Ctr.	on file	on file
BARNABY DOW	EXTERNAL AFF.	King Co. OEM	206 205 4070	barnaby.dow@kingcounty.gov
Laura Merrill	POLICY DIRECTOR	WSAC (counties)		lmerrill@wacounties.org
Peter Selvig	LSO	Darlington	360 436 1168	pselvig@frontier.com
Kevin Ashe		Darlington	360 436 1987	
Shawn Yanity	Chairman	Stillaguamish	425-359-7922	syanity@stillaguamish.com
Pat Stevenson	Environ. Manager	Stillaguamish	360 739 4578	pstevenson@stillaguamish.com
Lacey Stevens	Planner	St. Ilaguamish Tribe	360 652-7362 x234	lstevens@stillaguamish.com
Jally Hintz	Senior Advisor	Sen Caudwell		
Brian McMahan	Asst. Chief	Muk. Itso Fire	425 508 9630	bmcmahan@ci.muk.itso.wa.gov
John Niles	Citizen	Public Interest Transportation Fund	206 781 4475	JNILES@ALUM.MIT.EDU

## Statement for the record of the Joint SR 530 Landslide Commission, Meeting of November 4, 2014

By John Niles, Founder  
Public Interest Transportation Forum  
4005 20th Ave West, Suite 111  
Seattle, WA 98199  
206-781-4475  
jniles@alum.mit.edu

I commend and appreciate the efforts of the Commission to follow up on the Oso tragedy.

I understand your mission to include developing recommendations that bear on preventing other loss of life and property in landslides in the vicinity of Oso.

So in the public interest I offer you the following information that I have developed through independent, unpaid research about another landslide-prone environment in Washington State in the same wet climate and unstable landscape as Oso, a corridor that is 30 to 50 miles away.

Fourteen daily passenger trains are at risk of being hit by a severe landslide on any rain-soaked day along the Puget Sound shoreline just north of Seattle. The Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) rail corridor of single and double track has high, unstable bluffs along one side of the track and the water of Puget Sound on the other side. Both the Oso landslide location and the landslide prone track corridor are marked on an attached map.

There have been hundreds of landslides on these shoreline tracks over decades of past history. Here is a viral YouTube video of a freight train being hit in December 2012:  
[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UeT0m-hpD\\_4](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UeT0m-hpD_4)

As a former aviation safety professional, transportation analyst, and concerned citizen of the region, I have taken a position that these passenger trains are too dangerous for any passenger to ride in the fall-winter-spring rains along the coast of Washington. Here is *Transportation Issues Daily* coverage of my position that includes my justification:

<http://www.transportationissuesdaily.com/analyst-its-too-dangerous-to-ride-amtrak-in-seattle-in-winter/>

And here is the Washington State DOT "Landslide Mitigation Action Plan Final Report" prepared mostly prior to the Oso event <http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/NR/rdonlyres/85894B65-81D7-4DC7-A8DF-521D22BA011A/0/LandslideMitigationFinalDocument.pdf> that documents the landslide prone tracks with detailed maps, but underplays the hazard. Civil engineering work is underway on some parts of the route to attempt stabilization, but I understand it is limited in its coverage of the hazardous sections, and may not prevent slides reliably even where built.

BNSF is mostly freight, but is paid by Amtrak, Washington State DOT, and Sound Transit to accept passenger trains, under Congressional and Executive Federal pressure. BNSF makes most of its money with freight, not passengers. However, the railroad is well compensated by government and Amtrak to intermix the seven round-trip passenger trains, which are shorter and run on published daily schedules, unlike the much longer freight trains that roll at various changing hours of the day and night.

The current hazard mitigation process is to detect landslides with trip wires 24 hours per day connected to a BNSF train control center in Fort Worth, Texas, and then halt all subsequent

passenger trains for 48 hours following a slide, called by BNSF a moratorium for safety. If a passenger train is hit by a landslide, the passengers call 9-1-1.

Most of the landslides are small, and are called mudslides locally. But there have been some big ones. There was one a year ago that derailed a passenger train in a minor way without injuries, described in this front page from *The Seattle Times*:

<http://www.bettertransport.info/pitf/Everett,WA-Landslidefrontpage,April7,2013.pdf> The bloodless analysis of declining ridership on this particular train in the previously referenced WSDOT Mitigation Report is striking: “While this decline in ridership and revenues was observed in most of Amtrak’s national network during April 2013, customers may have chosen not to ride the trains due to concerns for their safety after Amtrak’s long-distance Empire Builder train was partially derailed by a landslide near Everett, specifically on April 7, 2013.”

In recent memory, landslides have put freight trains into Puget Sound, as in January 1997, the Woodway slide: [http://www.ecy.wa.gov/climatechange/images/landslide\\_woodway.jpg](http://www.ecy.wa.gov/climatechange/images/landslide_woodway.jpg)

There have also been large landslides on similar nearby waterfront bluffs that didn't happen to have tracks at the base, such as <http://bigstory.ap.org/article/1-home-destroyed-washington-state-landslide-0>

The fourteen weekday passenger trains are considered important status symbols for the region, but their function is replaced easily with substitute buses on nearby Interstate 5 during the intermittent 48 hour landslide moratoriums. Commuter train customers are sometimes directed to simply use regularly scheduled buses.

I have more information, including names and titles of government officials responsible for authorizing the operations of the trains. I have emails from many of them, pre-Oso, with assurances that they care, but with no acknowledgment of the life-safety hazard that rail customers are exposed to in the wet season. I've no evidence post-Oso that the official government attitude has changed toward passenger trains running below unstable bluffs.

I urge the Commission to take strong action toward resolving the shoreline railroad landslide issue I have described here, as part of its follow up to absorb lessons learned and take appropriate follow up action after Oso.

One possibility for Commission action is simply to identify and publicize the names and titles of the local, regional, state and federal government officials who could be charged with criminal negligence if a train is knocked in the water by a landslide similar to the one that killed people in Oso.

Respectfully submitted,



John Niles

## SR530 Commission

Tuesday, November 04, 2014

Good evening – I am Dominic Marzano, Division Chief with Kent Fire Department – RFA and the Emergency Manager for the City of Kent. Thank you for the opportunity to address this issue.

In reviewing the draft report dated October 31, 2014 I have some serious concerns regarding the commission's position and recommendations regarding state mobilization. The cornerstone for the state response to disasters and major events is definition of statewide mobilization. There is definitely a need to provide clarity to the definition of All Hazard Mobilization. Most importantly, this definition must also include ALL DISCIPLINES. **This document reflects a continued focus on mobilization as a Fire issue.** This single discipline view of mobilization will **NOT** address the overall resource needs in disasters or major events. The direction and recommendation of the commission must provide for the development of an all hazard and all discipline mobilization process.

Several Points:

***First***, Fire Mobilization works. We will always have a wild land interface threat in Washington. We live in a state that has significant forest land and a population that desires to be part of that landscape. As such a very robust and effective fire response to interface fires has been developed and refined over time. It works so we should keep it !! There is no need to abandon or change what is working.

**Second**, Regardless of how many, as the report states, “firefighting resources” (people, ladders, ropes, chainsaws, axes, certain heavy equipment, and the like) that are dispatched to an event, they cannot address all problems presented by the event. Believe it or not fire firefighters cannot solve all problems. Not that they will not try but why not develop a process that identifies and provides for the right tool for the job.

**Third**, These facts speak to the development of a type and kind resource list initiated at the county level and pushed up to a master list at the state logistics level. This type and kind listing addresses the all hazards, all disciplines issue and is the answer to an appropriate response resources identification and request.

\*\* **KIND** refers to the kind of resource: building inspectors, technical rescue, communications, law enforcement, geologist, search & rescue, water rescue, *etc.*

\*\* **TYPE** describes the compliment or mission capability: number of personnel, equipment, expertise, availability duration, *etc.*

**Fourth**, this Type and Kind development fills the greater need of mission ready response packages. This is the organization of teams, capability resources or other identified resource into a defined package. The package includes: personnel, equipment, travel and sustainment needs and costing for all parts of the package. This is the methodology used in the national program called EMAC – Emergency Management Assistance Compact. A result of many years of state to

state assistance, finalized after Hurricane Katrina, of which Washington is a signatory.

These mission ready packages, once developed, will also help to facilitate the statewide mutual aid process, WAMAC. A tool that was attempted to be used in the SR530 event and ran into numerous issues due to lack of definition and process.

*Fifth*, the all hazard all discipline statewide mobilization process, including Fire Mobilization, should be managed and administered by Washington Emergency Management Division (WA EMD). WA EMD is the only all hazards all discipline agency in the state. Any mobilization process managed under a single discipline will ultimately be influenced by the focus, needs, understanding and direction of that discipline. This is not to suggest that any discipline would be malicious or lacking in action, it is just that an all hazard view must be from an all hazard mentality. That is the view of an EMD agency, all hazards; all discipline all-encompassing view.

In conclusion, a statewide mobilization process that truly speaks to all hazards and all disciplines is critical to the successful disaster or major event response in Washington. Any recommendation that wishes to move to a more comprehensive and true all hazard all discipline response must address these issues.

Thank you

**From:** Shari [<mailto:shari3@frontier.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 04, 2014 3:07 PM  
**To:** SR 530 Commission (GOV)  
**Subject:** Comments

Thoughts on procedure.

As far as contractors go in an emergency situation if there is prior training as to the forms to fill out, copies of insurance, etc. Any contractor has the where with all to gather that information as all of us have offices and know the drill when it comes to contracts and government regs. In other words it is good if you have a FS or other office but the contractors can organize the information needed. The frustrating thing that is that we were asked 4 different times to fill out the form and submit our liability broad form insurance. The Fire Dept was in charge and the person asking for the info was a hair dresser who did not have a clue.

So in advance City Hall can keep a contractors list with copies of up to date insurance and this should be upgraded every fall. The county public works, Puget Sound Interagency Office located at USFS Supervisor's office in Mt Lake Terrace. 425 783 6150 <http://www.nwccweb.us/contacts.aspx> .

The lists would need to be updated yearly as companies change and agency personal changes.

I see that just having a list of resources such as Medical (Dr, nurses, CNA, etc.

It would be helpful for funding for CPR and Wilderness First Aid Classes. It would also be helpful to have train the trainer classes and find folks in each community to do the training. This should also be a public list of folks who want to apply to learn how to be train the trainer and not just the fire dept or city hall favorites.

There was \$6 million donated to Red Cross for Darrington/OSO so use some Red Cross funds for training in CPR and Wilderness First Aid. And use these fund projected out for renewal or refresher courses over the next 10 yrs if possible.

Just some thoughts.