

North Santiam Basin Strategic Water Management - Emergency Response Planning Summit

Meeting Summary

April 8, 2011 – 10:00 am – 3:00 pm

Stayton Library

515 North 1st Ave.

Stayton, OR, 97383

Document Content Links

1. [Meeting Purpose, Objectives and Desired Outcomes](#)
2. [Participant introductions with description of interest and desired outcomes](#)
3. [How did we get to this point?/Background \(City of Salem, Oregon Consensus and North Santiam Watershed Council\)](#)
4. [Comprehensive Emergency Management Planning – A Primer \(Josh Bruce, Oregon Partnership for Disaster Resilience\)](#)
5. [Response to Question: What is the need for a comprehensive basin-wide Emergency Management Plan?](#)
6. [Response to Questions: What does comprehensive basin-wide emergency management planning mean? What emergencies should be considered and included? If you had to pick one emergency to focus on what would that be?](#)
7. [Response to Question: What purposes and objectives should we establish for a North Santiam Basin Emergency Management Plan?](#)
8. [List of emergency planning efforts currently existing in the North Santiam Basin](#)
9. [Creative suggestions for addressing basin-wide emergency situations](#)
10. [What other entities should be involved in basin-wide emergency planning?](#)
11. [Attendance List](#)

Meeting Purpose– To provide an opportunity to meet as a watershed of the whole and discuss a topic of interest across all of the watershed perspectives.

Meeting Objectives

- Discuss Strategic Emergency Management Planning
- Understand what is in place now watershed-wide
- Understand what might be needed and desired
- Develop next steps for a watershed wide effort, if desired
- Meet and greet the various interests in the watershed
- Network

Desired Outcomes from Meeting – If agreed, develop actions and approaches to pursue a watershed-wide Strategic Emergency Management Plan

Note: For more information please look at the North Santiam Watershed Council Website:

<http://www.nisantiamwatershed.org/>

Introductions

The meeting began at 9:30 with sign in, handout distribution and casual conversation.

Bob Wheeler (Triangle Associates) opened the meeting and introduced Bruce Rogers who attended to represent both the North Santiam Watershed Council (NSWC) and the City of Salem. Bruce described his background with the NSWC, the development of partnerships which grew out from the NSWC over several years, and gave general welcoming remarks to those in attendance.

Bob reviewed the agenda, meeting logistics and handouts. Bob touched on potential meeting outcomes such as the creation of a working or research group at the end of the day, followed by reviewing guidelines for a productive meeting. This included how the group could be creative and innovative while thinking about the basin as a whole.

Each participant introduced themselves, their affiliation and what they hoped to get out of the meeting. (*Attendance list attached*) Participant's desires for the meeting included:

- Gathering ideas and input
- Developing a better understanding of different interests
- Developing a better understanding about what different entities are doing in the watershed
- Improving communication
- Working toward a network and plan
- Understanding how the plans of different agencies intersect and overlap
- Establishing relationships
- Protecting water quality
- Preplanning for emergencies to avoid harm to life or property and facilitate recovery
- Monitoring to detect water quality trends
- Learning how agencies work
- Promoting collaboration within the basin
- Understanding different basin issues, including downstream issues
- To share "lessons learned" in preparing comprehensive emergency management plans
- To look beyond response and preparedness to opportunities for mitigation and long term recovery planning

- Sharing information
- Addressing spill response
- Working toward long term recovery planning
- Preparing for a major earthquake
- Identifying resources that could be used during an emergency event
- Identifying potential problems
- Gaining a better understanding of how USGS information and data could be used to meet needs
- Discussing incident management systems
- ‘Hope is not a plan’
- Creating information pathways for the public
- Working for Oregon Chub and other endangered species
- Identifying resources at risk from an emergency event

How did we get to this point?

Patricia Farrell (City of Salem) discussed the history leading up to the summit. In 2007-2008 there were three different regulatory actions: a permit application for a City of Salem water transmission pipeline, a FERC hydropower application and the Willamette BiOp. There seemed to be little coordination between these actions. The actions were being reviewed or implemented by different people, using different parameters. Patricia and Liz Redon (NSWC) began talking, at that time, about the possibility of a collaborative effort to address water management issues at a watershed level, and via the Governor’s office they approached Oregon Consensus (OC) to have OC investigate the possibility of basin wide collaboration. During OC’s assessment, a number of issues came up that could be addressed through an emergency management strategy. The Detroit dam powerhouse fire also prompted more thinking about emergency management.

Background

Oregon Consensus Interviews and Watershed Options

Gail McEwen (Oregon Consensus) explained that OC worked with the NSWC and City of Salem to identify and interview a number of stakeholders. Interviews revealed there was a large interest in collaborative planning and noted interest in infrastructure, data management and communication, fish, endangered species, water quality, and balancing conflicting basin uses. Additionally, the interviews showed people felt a lack of coordinated efforts. The conclusion was that a basin wide emergency management plan was the best umbrella to capture all of the different needs and interests at the same time. OC hired Triangle Associates to design and facilitate a collaborative process.

Survey Monkey Outcomes

Liz Redon (NSWC) first thanked Stayton for donating the meeting room and Trexler Farm for providing a generous discount for catering. She then presented a power point presentation which contained the results from the survey monkey. The presentation began by discussing a few points about watershed councils and that they: are formed from state statutes, partner with landowners on stream restoration, provide non-regulatory collaborative venues for local citizens and private and public land managers to plan and implement natural resource management projects which utilize partnerships, sound science and local action. This was followed by a display map of the basin which showed much of the basin is in public ownership, timber, agriculture, and recreation. Survey results show the distribution of stakeholders surveyed, how stakeholders ranked importance of potential basin emergencies in terms of planning need, what purposes or objectives a water management emergency plan could have, and stakeholder's top three purposes and objectives. Survey responses also included voluntary feedback on harmful algal blooms, erosion, and economic impacts.

It was commented that there are inter-relations between issues, for example between climate change and drought, and as we move forward we need to bear in mind how the basin is an interdependent system and issues should never be looked at in isolation.

Comprehensive Emergency Management Planning – A Primer

Josh Bruce (Oregon Partnership for Disaster Resilience) gave a presentation on disaster planning and management in order to set a frame for comprehensive emergency management planning. The presentation contained three topics.

- *Disaster Cycle*

A community goes through four phases before and after a natural disaster. These are: Mitigation -> Preparedness -> | natural disaster occurs | -> Response -> and Recovery. Much work has been done on preparedness and response; less work has been done on recovery and mitigation. Points to consider: after an event, what will it take to get your social and economic infrastructure back up and running, how do you establish priorities, how do you respond to different impacts from disaster which could be economic or social in nature.

- *Understanding Risk*

This slide touched on the fact that natural disasters will happen and there is probably nothing we can do to ultimately prevent them from occurring. However, we can look for actions to reduce the risk of disaster. The group can look at vulnerable systems and try to make them stronger. To do so, investigate the population, the economy, land use, facilities, etc, and assess how sensitive to damage they are. What are important are the ability, willingness and physical resources to implement the Disaster Cycle above.

- *Comprehensive Emergency Management Model*

This model was displayed for the group overhead, was essentially a structure for which agencies, or who, would have what responsibilities in the Disaster Cycle. The importance of having decision making bodies involved in the process, and well grounded in the planning process was emphasized. Here it was emphasized that all facets of emergency management planning should be driven by some sort of strategic plan, and that efforts should be emphasized where the need is greatest. For example, an area may have a strong response plan but a less developed recovery strategy.

Comments:

It was noted Public Health was not in attendance and that they are a key partner in emergency response, and most emergency management plans have an advisory committee which can act as a common hub for planning and communication.

It was asked if the Comprehensive Model above has been implemented anywhere or if it is more of a vision. The model is mostly a vision but has been introduced in southern Oregon; all feedback is welcome.

A comment was made that the model appears to be a representative structure for emergency management. Most emergency management structures are made up of advisory committees with subject matter expertise. There are existing bodies that meet these needs at a city, county and state level. Since water is key, it would be helpful to include someone involved in water management.

Plenary with Focused Questions for Participant Response - During this portion of the meeting the group answered three broad questions.

What is the need for a comprehensive basin-wide Emergency Management Plan?

The group discussed their feelings and thoughts regarding the need for an EMP. The general sense from the group's feedback was that there is a need to understand:

- A) what other agencies are doing and how we can collaborate with them and their plans,
- B) the need for central communication and messaging,
- C) how to create the actual physical implementation necessary for preparation and response.

The group's specific comments included:

- The need to develop a chain of communication with other stakeholders. Everyone has their own plans, but how do we bring those together so there is coordination between responses?

- How might agencies respond to a spill, what about impacts on fish and wildlife and home owners?
- How does communication with people in the local communities occur?
- We need one communication lead and central messaging, so everyone is saying the same thing not only during an event, but during recovery and mitigation.
- A central email communication strategy.
- To identify or designate:
 - Authorities (i.e., what authority do you have to do what you are doing)
 - Who is in charge of each phase of an emergency
 - Alerts and Warnings
 - Standard scope of operations – what steps you will take
- To create priorities in order to minimize impact, and accelerate recovery – created in advance to avoid becoming bogged down in bureaucracy at the last minute.
- A risk and vulnerability assessment is needed to establish priorities. How to prioritize on a watershed level?
- Risk assessments are challenging because: 1) they are subjective; 2) funding is difficult to obtain; 2) risk assessments for different resources/topic areas need to be prepared using a similar timeframe.
- To identify resources available for use during a disaster and the chain of command for accessing these resources.
- To compile existing plans – what are others doing in their plans? Compiling existing plans may reveal shortcomings.
- The plan should reflect real world priorities.
- Third level communications – in a really big disaster, there is no communication via cell phones or phone lines.
- Identifying where we are strong and weak, what others are doing with their plans, who has responsibility for specific types of incidents, bringing everyone together and using Incident Command Systems.
- Flood and landslide response is more chaotic than other types of response. It is difficult to tell who does what.
- To identify stresses and find out what resources those stresses are using.
- There needs to be a plan for evacuating the public during certain emergency events.
- Scope and size of the emergency event needs to be considered.
- “table top” exercise may be good way to identify command structure, process, and gaps

What does comprehensive basin-wide emergency management planning mean? What emergencies should be considered and included? If you had to pick one emergency to focus

on what would that be? The group provided full and detailed response to these questions in several topical areas.

Hard and Soft emergencies:

There was discussion about the difference between a hard emergency which is fast and sharp (like a large earthquake) and a soft emergency which would build up and persist over time, like invasives. The plan needs to address both. This led to the question of how trigger points for emergencies are created and at what point does an event become an emergency?

Vulnerabilities:

The group discussed that the emergency action plan needs to focus on vulnerabilities, not just hazards. The plan needs to identify priority vulnerable systems that we want to focus emergency response efforts on (such as water supply). These priorities will drive the kinds of emergencies that we want to address.

Resources:

There was strong support for understanding what resources are available in the event of an emergency, and for having an electronically available list or database of available resources. Further, there should be pre-set relationships and agreements between departments and resources for mutual aid. The group could utilize emergency management plans which already exist in many jurisdictions.

Planning:

Planning had the most number of comments. In the North Santiam Canyon, residents feel they are on their own in an emergency and a plan needs to include smaller communities. It was asked what Lyons, Gates and Detroit are doing for emergency planning. The group touched on the idea of continuity of operations (COO) and continuity of governance (COG) planning. It was noted that emergencies are always local in nature and so there should be local plans and a decision matrix to help move through emergencies because they are, by definition, unexpected.

It was also noted that in many disasters the event itself is so rapid there is no time for response so there is a real need to educate the public so they can take care of themselves should they need to.

Response:

There was discussion about 'levels of response' and that emergency response should have different levels of escalated response related to how severe an emergency is or is becoming,

such as early warning alerts which utilize trigger points in the process. It was also noted that a siren for flood drills and warning, could be useful.

Purposes and Objectives

The group broke for lunch for 30 minutes and reconvened to give feedback on several more questions. The first question posed to the group asked: ***What purposes and objectives should we establish for a North Santiam Basin Emergency Management Plan?*** The group discussed this question at length and provided many responses in several categories.

Resources

The group discussed the need to inventory resources and plans that currently exist, identify roles and responsibilities and to create a resource directory which would include Who, What, Where, When, Why and How and make this directory electronically available. Collecting this information will also help identify gaps.

Communication

Many discussion points touched on communication needs, such as sharing data, creating ways to freely access data, establishing clear lines of communication, creating a common operating picture that brings the resource directory together with a task list (perhaps using a GIS format), creating or confirming emergency reporting procedures, and knowing how to manage bureaucratic communication so response can happen swiftly – this point included creating pre-existing Mutual Aid agreements. There was also a need voiced for public education and finding what educative needs exist within the public.

Data

The group identified several needs with regard to data. This includes finding out what data is currently collected by whom, and with what level of confidence, coordinating data collection between agencies / groups so there is not wasted effort and duplication, identifying what data is currently needed and where there are information gaps in the data, and developing mechanisms for data sharing.

Roles and Responsibilities

There was concern expressed about the need for people to know who was responsible for what in all phases of emergency management and planning, how members of the summit can fit into that realistically from the standpoint of their agencies or groups, and how members of the summit can act proactively from within those roles and responsibilities.

Response Structure and Planning

A large number of comments focused on the structure of response and the structure of an emergency management plan. These included looking for multi-objective strategies and actions during implementation and finding ways to leverage assets and resources during implementation; creating or finding emergency triggers and identifying at what point emergencies are over; looking at the speed and sequence of response; and identifying potential basin-wide planning roadblocks within silos and existing plans. The need to identify priorities in the mitigation and recovery stages of emergency response was mentioned. There was concern voiced about response implementation with the example of Incident Management Teams being sent out during an emergency with no clear direction on what to do when they arrive. The need to educate people on the process for getting resources from the Governor's office or Federal government was also mentioned. The group discussed that planning could entail a degree of preventative measures (i.e. by identifying accountability and responsibility for preventing emergencies), and lastly it was suggested that the group could use if/then table top strategy exercises to help with planning efforts.

The group then created a ***list of emergency planning efforts currently existing in the North Santiam Basin*** which is useful in the development of a basin-wide plan.

- The County has an Emergency Operations Plan, a Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan, a Continuity of Operations and Continuity of Governance Plan, and Community Wildfire Protection Plans. The County Health Department also has a response plan.
- The Army Corps of Engineers has incident plans for high-hazard dams. (Some information in these plans is not available to the public).
- The Army Corps of Engineers has an Emergency Action Plan and a Continuity of Operations and Continuity of Governance Plan.
- The City of Salem and City of Stayton have the same.
- The City of Salem has an emergency plan for their water treatment plant.
- Most cities have a source water assessment plan that addresses risks to drinking water.
- Cities and counties have Comprehensive Plans.
- Several small communities in the watershed have very old plans.
- Public Health has strategic plans.
- The Oregon Department of Forestry has fire management plans.
- And there are spill response plans, water curtailment and water conservation plans locally.
- City and county comprehensive plans also have a Goal 7 element that deals with certain types of hazards.
- Statewide drought plans.

After this the group identified several gaps. These included a poor response to floods, poor plans for local level coordination, lack of recovery plans, gaps in recovery at the state level, that in all cases there are communication gaps (both communication between agencies and communication with the public), lack of understanding about the Incident Command System (ICS) and who has responsibility and authority, that forums (such as this summit) are missing and there is no venue to share lessons learned, there is no recurring watershed stakeholder forum, there are large funding gaps, there are not enough pre-existing inter-agency agreements for Mutual Aid, lack of equipment inventories, and there are infrastructure plan gaps. Additionally it was noted that plans should be living documents which are updated regularly and that we may be faced with a memory gap – remember what the plan says.

Other Parties

The group spent several minutes thinking about what other parties should be involved with this process as it moves forward, or other parties which could have beneficial information. *(Attached)*

Creative Ideas

The group then made ***creative suggestions for addressing basin-wide emergency situations.*** These included:

- A comprehensive website, perhaps with different tabs with information about different types of emergencies
- A visual database to identify what resources we have, like a pin map or a GIS system. The database could also include information on vulnerable resources, land use, and land ownership.
- A document that spells out the sequence of response for different emergencies
- Conducting a table top/if then exercise for the basin
- Documenting procedures for getting assistance from the Governor's office during an emergency
- Identifying what records need to be kept to ensure cost recovery from FEMA
- Training city managers in FEMA protocol
- A preparedness education campaign
- Create a system of information flow control and have an information officer
- A list of all the people in attendance and information about what they do, what plans they work under and what their skill sets and areas of expertise are
- An updated resource directory
- A list of existing interagency agreements

- Meeting once or twice per year to share information on priorities, issues and agency initiatives– this was suggested as a feeling that the summit was taking on a wide array of ideas and that regular meetings could dramatically aid in emergency planning and response
- Meeting to discuss data collection – what data is being collected, how often it is being collected, what data standards are being used. This could also be helpful to identify data gaps.
- Being careful about data quality; once data is put into a database people consider it to be accurate.

Sub-Groups & Action Items

The group spent several minutes thinking about how to move forward from this summit with productive tasks assigned in groups.

Group	Owner
Research Group – what research is out there, who is doing it	USGS ACOE
Annual Sharing Group – arranging annual stakeholder sharing sessions	City of Salem NSWC
Education Group / Public Outreach	NSWC & Suzette Boudreaux
Risk Map Group	DLCD

Action Items

Survey Monkey

Owner - Liz Redon

Liz will make two Survey Monkeys.

- One to vet purposes and objectives for an emergency management plan and identify priorities
- A second to collect the expertise, research areas, and skill sets of summit members, a list of interagency agreements, information on the data they are collecting and data format and standards.

Water2100

Owner – Dave Halemeier (for information and contact information on Water 2100)

The Water2100 project might be able to accomplish some of the objectives this group has been discussing. Dave Halemeier will provide information and contact information for Water2100.

Potential Action Items which need owners

Table-Top if/then strategy exercise
Compiling Resource List (and copy to summit members)
Creating / Arranging training sessions
Launch Education Campaign

Due to time constraints, Next Steps was removed from discussion; however how to move forward was present in much of the conversation, especially in Sub Groups and Tasks.

3:00 Adjourn

Attachment 1

What other entities should be involved in basin-wide emergency planning?

1. Utilities (power, gas, telecommunications)
2. National Weather Service
3. TeleCom
4. Detroit recreational interests
5. Public Health
6. Private Sector
7. Media
8. Oregon Drinking Water Program (DWP)
9. Department of Human Services (DHS)
10. State
11. Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)
12. Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)
13. Oregon Emergency Management (OEM)
14. Lyons
15. Scio
16. Tangent
17. Gates
18. Marion County
19. Smaller Jurisdictions
20. Volunteer Organizations
21. Ham Operators
22. Oregon Volunteers Active in Disaster (ORVAD)
23. Schools
24. Fire & Police
25. National Guard
26. Warm Springs Tribe
27. Bridge Inspection people
28. Environmental Protection Agency

Attachment 2

Attendance List

Present?	Last	First	Organization	Interest	E-mail	Primary Phone	Title
√	Bangs	Brian	ODFW	State	Brian.bangs@oregonstate.edu	541-757-4263 x224	
√	Beard	Tanya	Marion County	County	tbeard@co.marion.or.us	503-365-3149	Matt Knudsen will be the main contact Environmental Specialist
√	Boudreaux	Suzette	Prudential Real Estate/NSWC	Business	suzetteb@prurep.com	503-949-4643	
√	Bruce	Josh	Community Service Center Oregon Partnership for Disaster Resilience	NGO	jdbruce@uoregon.edu	541-346-7326	Assistant Director
√	Burchfield	Stephanie	NMFS	Federal	Stephanie.Burchfield@noaa.gov	503- 736-4720	Fish Biologist
√	Chandler	Robert	City of Salem	Municipal	rhandler@cityofsalem.net	503-588-6008	Assistant Director Public Works Department

North Santiam Basin EMP Summit Summary

Present?	Last	First	Organization	Interest	E-mail	Primary Phone	Title
✓	Cohen	Abra	Intern	U of O			
✓	Cross	Darren	USFS	Federal	dmcross@fs.fed.us	503-854-4212	
✓	Ek-Collins	Greg	ODOT	State	John.G.Ek-Collins@odot.state.or.us	503-986-3020	
✓	Farrell	Patricia	City of Salem	Municipal	pfarrell@cityofsalem.net	503-588-6211	Natural Resource Specialist
✓	Fencel	Tom	NSWC	Private	TFencel@wavecable.com	503-897-2740	
✓	Foster	Alan	Triangle Associates	Facilitator	afoster@triangleassociates.com	206-583-0655	
✓	Garner	Kim	USDFWS	Federal	Kim-garner@fws.gov	503-231-6926	
✓	Glantz	Olivia	Linn County Planning	County	oglantz@co.linn.or.us	541-967-3816 x2368	Assistant Planner
✓	Graham	Fritz	State Senator Wyden aide	Federal	Fritz_graham@wyden.senate.gov	503-589-4555	

North Santiam Basin EMP Summit Summary

Present?	Last	First	Organization	Interest	E-mail	Primary Phone	Title
✓	Graham	Perry	U of O				
✓	Gramlich	Nancy	ODEQ	State	nancy.h.gramlich@state.or.us	(503) 378-5073	
✓	Grimes	Bill	Lyons-Mehama Water District	Local	www.lyons-mehama.waterdistrict.com	503-859-2367	
✓	Halemeier	Dave	USFS	Federal	dhalemeier@fs.fed.us	(503) 854-4217	Hydrologist
✓	Hess	Glen	USGS	Federal	gwhess@usgs.gov	503-251-3236	
✓	Hughes	Marc	Lyons/Mehama Water District	Local	marc@wvi.com	503-859-2504	
✓	Kinney	Dave	City of Stayton	Municipal	dkinney@ci.stayton.or.us	503-769-2919	
✓	Kline	Roger	USACE	Federal	roger.m.kline@usace.army.mil	541-937-2131	Operations Superintendant
✓	Marx	Steve	ODFW	State	Steven.D.Marx@state.or.us	541 757-4186 x224	South Willamette Watershed District Manager

North Santiam Basin EMP Summit Summary

Present?	Last	First	Organization	Interest	E-mail	Primary Phone	Title
✓	McCord	Mike	OWRD	State	mike.l.mccord@wrд.state.or.us	503 986-0889	
✓	McEwen	Gail	Oregon Consensus	Facilitator	mceweng@pdx.edu	503-362-2983	
✓	McMahan	Grady	USFS	Federal	gmcmahān@fs.fed.us	503-729-1702	
✓	Mills	Keith	OWRD	State	Keith.a.mills@wrд.state.com	503-986-0840	Dam Safety Engineer
✓	Norris	Barry	OWRD	State	barry.f.norris@state.or.us	503 986-0840	
✓	Redon	Liz	North Santiam Watershed Council	NGO	liz_redon@msn.com	503 930-8202	Watershed Council Coordinator
✓	Rinella	Joe	USGS	Federal	jrinella@usgs.gov	503-251-3278	
✓	Rogers	Bruce	Former Salem City Councilor and NSWC board member	Local	brogers729@gmail.com	971-239-9431	

North Santiam Basin EMP Summit Summary

Present?	Last	First	Organization	Interest	E-mail	Primary Phone	Title
✓	Ross	Dustin	ODOT	State			
✓	Shirley	Chris	DLCD, Natural Hazards	State	christine.shirley@state.or.us	503-373-0050 x 250	
✓	Sleeman	Trevor	Office of Congressman Kurt Schrader	State, OR District 5	Trevor.Sleeman@mail.house.gov	503.588.4054	
✓	Steele	Mark	Norpac	Industry	steele@norpac.com	503-769-1159	
✓	Stevenson	Roger	City of Salem	Municipal	rstevenson@cityofsalem.net	503-763-3331	City of Salem Emergency Manager
✓	Stevenson	Brent	Santiam Water Control District	Local Special District	brents.swcd@wvi.com	503 769-2669	
✓	Stonewall	Adam	USGS	Federal			
✓	Sunken	Stacey	City of Salem Public Works	Municipal	ssunken@cityofsalem.net	503-584-4625	
✓	Taylor	Greg	USACE	Federal	Gregory.a.taylor@usace.army.mil	541-937-2131	

North Santiam Basin EMP Summit Summary

Present?	Last	First	Organization	Interest	E-mail	Primary Phone	Title
✓	Tucker	Jon	NSWC	Local	jlstucker@wvi.com	503-551-7835	
✓	Vanderzanden	John	Marion County	County	jvanderzanden@co.marion.or.us	503-365-3133	Marion County Emergency Manager
✓	Webster	Adam	City of Salem	Municipal	awebster@cityofsalem.net	503-588-6063	Watershed Program Coordinator
✓	West	Scott	ODF	State	Swest@odf.state.or.us	503-859-9334	
✓	Wheeler	Robert	Triangle Associates	Facilitator	rwheeler@triangleassociates.com	206-583-0655	