

Manzanita Emergency Supply Recommendations

We have accomplished a considerable amount of work and are approaching some reliable data for the City to use as they begin to navigate emergency supply spending. Our efforts have taken us from the original eighteen supply categories to six while emphasizing the more critical emergency needs. We then arranged the specific elements inside the six remaining groups to arrive at a prioritized list of recommendations.

Our challenge moving forward is finding consensus and paring costs to a maximum of \$30K. There will be a few options on the table to achieve this goal. Team input was critical in creating a successful report to City Council. We need to realize that this exercise is the first of several emergency supply spending opportunities for our City. Estimates range from \$600-800K to satisfy projected needs for as many as 2,500 refugees.

Following are comments based on our recent work for each of six supply categories with a chart of associated costs.

SHELTER

Team support unanimous for the large medical/ command tent. (Several of you thought this was already purchased by the City). The tent was supplied via EVCNB monies with the hopes that the City will reimburse us later. Meanwhile we can continue to drill with the tent and provide the City with a solid proof of concept. That \$2600 still needs to show in the proposed budgeting.

We all seem to approve of the family style camping tents, canopies, and privacy tents. The numbers recommended may well change to reduce costs.

We chose to eliminate the individual personal tents.

Andy thought doubling the number of tarps and rope was beneficial and relatively inexpensive. Changes include: Command tent cost less in proof of concept, reduced # of family camping tents by one half, eliminated individual tents, 50% more tarps and rope.

CATAGORY	#/ 100	COST/ ITEM \$	COST/ 100 PERSONS \$
SHELTER			
Command/medical tent	1	2,600	2,600
Family camping tents	5	200	1,000
Individual tents	0	0	0
Privacy tents	5	40	200
Canopies	4	200	800
Tarps	30	20	600
Rope	3	70	210
			TOTAL \$5410

WARMTH

Most of the team considered eliminating sleeping bags.

Mylar blankets were not popular due to the limited use factor.

Thermal blankets and cots and sleeping pads were almost unanimous yes.

The team shared mixed reviews on the fleece blankets.

Woolen blankets received support

Steve suggested replacing ponchos with garbage bags.

Strong support for hats and gloves.

Changes include: Eliminating sleeping bags and mylar blankets, replacing fleece blankets with a lesser number of woolen ones, swapping out ponchos with garbage bags.

WARMTH			
Mylar blanket	0	0	0
Thermal blanket	40	20	800
Fleece blanket	50	9	450
Rain ponchos	0	0	0
Sleeping bags	0	0	0
Cots	20	35	700
Sleeping pads	50	20	1,000
Gloves (pr)	100	4	400
Stocking hats	50	4	200
Woolen blanket	100	9.50	950
			TOTAL \$4,500

WATER

All categories received moderate to unanimous support.

WATER			
55 Gallon barrels/ pumps	4	100	400
Bottled	1,000	0.40	400
Auga Munda	1	500	500
Cups (paper)	200	0.10	20
			TOTAL \$1,320

SANITATION

A very troubling aspect of emergency planning, sanitation provides several difficult and challenging hurdles.

Trenching supplies, toilet tissue, and urinals all received significant support from the group.

The two bucket WaSH type system was dismissed by about half the group. It is cost effective, but not really the most suited for many users.

Portable toilets received lots of support and can be used at local events rather than renting.

Trash cans, bags, gloves, and masks were nearly a clean sweep for support.

The team thought urinals were an effective means of separating pee and poo

Opinion varied a lot with storage and disposal of pee and poo. Some thought that NBWA would pay for a septic system at our temporary encampments. They do not have funding to entirely support that. The infrastructure system installed at Nehalem was 33% TPUD funded with the remaining \$10K picked up by NBWA. There is little reason to believe they would fund more than that amount regardless of the size of a system here. The Tillamook County Sanitarian has been asked to come to our proposed sites to determine the best system types for our emergency needs based on soils, sizing, and numbers of users. He may not be able to make it here for weeks. This results in incomplete data for this part of the exercise.

SANITATION			
Trenching supplies	5	40	200
Portable toilets	5	630	3,150
2 bucket WaSH system	0	0	0
Septic system	0	0	0
Urinals	4	175	700
Toilet tissue (rolls)	1,200	0.80	960
Garbage cans (40 gal.)	10	40	400
Garbage bags	200	0.80	160
Disposable gloves (boxes)	10	20	200
Masks (N-95)	200	1.50	300
			TOTAL \$6,070

FOOD

All categories were supported.

Clearly nutritional needs can be approached in many ways. Having some number of packaged, easy to prepare meals is warranted. The challenge is trying to determine the "right" number knowing that their usefulness will someday expire. Careful, preplanned analysis must be done along with monitoring the storage and product dates.

FOOD			
Nutritional bars	35	9	305
Dehydrated meals	800	2.50	2,000
Freeze dried meals	800	3	2,400
Meals ready to eat	800	8	6,400
2 meals/day twelve days /100			
Wood fired cook stove	1	600	600
			TOTAL \$11,705

HYGIENE

Most all the supplies listed for hygiene received support except the foot operated WaSH style bucket system which is more suited to family use.

HYGIENE			
WaSH style system	0	0	0
Foot operated basins	6	100	600
Foaming hand soap	40	3	120
Hand sanitizer	100	4	400
			TOTAL \$1,120

Grand total this exercise \$30,125