Fairfax County Pre-Disaster Recovery Plan (PDRP) Steering Committee Meeting
Dec. 1, 2010, 3pm
Government Center Conference Rm. 09/10

In Attendance:
Witt Associates: Hal Cohen (via telephone), Lindsey Holman, Allison Taylor
FFX OEM: Marcelo Ferreira
Springfield Chamber of Commerce: Phyllis Black
Dulles Chamber of Commerce: Bill Bolton
Fire and Rescue: Carlton Burkhammer
DMB: Brian Heffern
DPZ: Leslie Johnson
DPWES: Carol Lamborn
Volunteer Fairfax: Matt Lyttle
OCA: Marilyn McHugh
Mental Health Services: Jim Stratoudakis
DOT: Eric Teitelman
Housing: John Turner
DFS: Carl Varner

A. Welcome and (re) Introductions

The OEM representative welcomed the steering committee and explained that Hal Cohen, with the contractor, was unable to make it to the meeting, but was on via conference call. The OEM representative also explained that Dave McKernan and Roy Shrout also would not be attending the meeting since they were out of town.

The OEM representative asked each attending steering committee member to (re)introduce themselves.

B. Updates

The OEM representative explained that he did not have any updates. The contractor (Mr. Cohen) provided updates on the critical infrastructure and key resources inventory. He had spoken with Becky McKinney in OEM and found that FFX's ACAMS CI/KR inventory would be the best resource, tho it is a non-prioritized inventory. Assets are categorized according to DHS CI/KR typology only. He said that they will be able to refer to ACAMS, which is not public (nor accessible to most county staff), and that as a result of the lack of access and the lack of prioritization within the database, we will be able to do some categorical prioritization, but nothing asset-specific. The OEM representative asked if there were any questions. There were no questions.

The OEM representative commented on the focus group sessions. He explained that the health and healthcare focus group was meeting this Friday, and that the utilities and homeowner's association focus groups are still being coordinated and will most likely be held in January.

The OEM representative asked if everyone had received the public survey pitch and requested that each member send to their networks to get feedback, and asked if there were any questions. There were none.

C. Working Group Meeting

The OEM representative continued going over the schedule and updated the steering committee that the next large Working Group/ Public meeting to update the public on the plan will be scheduled in January and will be held at the MPSTOC. He also explained that Supervisor McKay wanted to attend, so they may have to push back the meeting until early February.

The contractor (Mr. Cohen) explained the content of the Working Group/ Public meeting, which will include direct input on the priorities section and sharing information about the plan content to-date, to make sure people are comfortable about the direction the project is heading.

The OEM representative turned the meeting over to the contractor (Ms. Holman).

D. Previously Reviewed Draft Plan Elements

The contractor (Ms. Holman) discussed previously-reviewed draft elements and asked the steering committee for additional comments. The contractor (Mr. Cohen) thanked everyone for their comments and valuable input. He asked if there were additional comments or questions; no one in the steering committee had additional comments or questions. He added that the comments will be incorporated and the new documents will be available on the SharePoint site within a week.

E. Review New Draft Plan Elements

Sec 3 (Conops) Review
The contractor (Ms. Holman) explained the Concept of Operations materials. Ms. Holman explained that the contractor used the county's definition of special needs, which incorporated both medical and social needs. She also discussed immediate life safety, procedure for activation (i.e. how the EOP will transition to recovery plan), deactivation, and demobilization. She stressed that the plan is designed to be flexible and can be scaled to many situations. She also explained that the recovery functions (RFs) may not all be activated and not all at the same time.

The contractor (Ms. Holman) continued to discuss the remainder of the section. She explained that there is placeholder text in the recovery sites section, since it is still in the development phase. The contractor (Ms. Holman) explained that the steering committee would be informed once the text is finalized.

The contractor (Ms. Holman) discussed how in Section III.B.4.b the terminology has been changed to "intermediate recovery" to maintain consistency with FEMA's framework (currently being developed). The DPWES representative asked if the reviewers notice the previous terminology ("medium") in other parts of the draft if they should let the contractor know. The contractor (Ms. Holman) responded affirmatively.

The contractor (Ms. Holman) asked the committee to review the conops on their own, but wanted to cover the comments made in the margins. The contractor (Ms. Holman) asked the County Attorney representative about the Executive Policy Group (Section III.B.7) to which the County Attorney representative replied that they are currently holding meetings about the EMCC name changes. The representative added that she did not know the current status of the names and will need to check. She also said this might be a question for Dave McKernan.

The contractor (Ms. Holman) asked about a comment made in Section III.C.1 about the IC. The consensus of the steering committee was to ask the question to Dave McKernan. The contractor also acknowledged that there was a similar question in Section III.C.2 that would also be asked of Dave McKernan.

The contractor reiterated that the recovery sites section was placeholder text.

The contractor asked if there were any questions regarding the conops so far; no one on the committee had any questions.

Sec. 6 (Recovery Functions) Review

The contractor (Ms. Holman) moved the discussion on to RFs. She explained that the additional functions were similar to ones the committee had discussed before, and that the contractor had taken generalized tasks and inserted them into a separate section, as well as restructured existing functions.

The OEM representative explained that he had spoken with Joel, the NIMS coordinator, to make sure the branches/groups terminology is consistent with FEMA standards. He asked the committee to disregard the highlighted terminology relating to those. The contractor (Mr. Cohen) discussed how the NDRF and ICS do not always connect well, but that they are working hard to make the "seams" less visible.

The DPWES representative asked if the group lead and lead agency were the same thing, which the contractor (Mr. Cohen) replied that it was the same thing.

The contractor (Ms. Holman) discussed the **General Tasking for Recovery Groups and Branches** (Section C) and explained that it was laid out how other recovery functions are laid out. She asked the committee to make sure they are applicable and for recommendations on additions.

The contractor moved on to discuss the **Infrastructure and Utility Restoration Group Annex**, and asked the committee to make sure agency names were current/appropriate in the section.

The Planning and Zoning representative said that VDOT was listed, but that she didn't see the county DOT listed. The DOT representative explained that they function as a support agency with VDOT, so it was fine if they were not listed.

The DPWES representative remarked that Comcast and Verizon were not on the list, and that they would play a large role in restoring telecommunications. She asked if anyone else like them is in the county. The Volunteer FFX replied that Dominion is in the county as well, and questioned whether they were private or not. The OEM representative replied that he thought they were. The contractor (Mr. Cohen) noted that it may be possible to pull out a section for private companies in the "organization" subsection, and that in any case we would figure out how to make a coherent public/private distinction.

The Management and Budget representative suggested changing the "Fairfax County Facilities Management Division" to "Fairfax County Facilities Management Department."

The Fire Marshal representative said that Fire Rescue and Fire Marshal's office were two separate entities, but that it was fine how it was listed. He also asked that the second "L" in "Fire Marshall" be removed.

The Volunteer FFX representative suggested adding "County" to "Fairfax Office of Emergency Management." He also asked about the previous discussion on private companies and separating them, asking about the Dulles road that is private. The DOT representative replied that it was actually not private. The Planning and Zoning representative thought it was not public, and pointed out that WMATA is not "public" from a standpoint of zoning, etc. The Volunteer Fairfax representative suggested that since there will be a private utility section, that it might be wise to put private roads on there as well. The DOT representative returned to the Planning and Zoning representative's comment and asked if they should list regional entities (such as WMATA) separately. The contractor (Ms. Holman) said that she thought that would be appropriate. The debate continued but was not resolved.

The DPWES representative suggested changing DPWES "Code Enforcement" to "Department of Code Compliance."

The DOT representative commented on the road and rail infrastructure. He brought up the airport, and how they clearly have control over some critical infrastructure. The contractor (Ms. Holman) responded that that might fall under capital repairs and reconstruction, and that bigger structures may fall under separate categories. The DOT representative said that they have VDOT and suggested FFX DOT, but added that they do not necessarily deal with utilities. The OEM representative differentiated between infrastructure and transportation, saying that transportation was the actual means to move. The DOT representative expressed confusion over that section. He said he saw that as more of a utility section, and that roads and rail would be there, but other infrastructure would be under capital repairs (Airports, etc.).

The contractor (Mr. Cohen) responded that the distinction between infrastructure, transportation, utilities, and capital reconstructions was an issue they wanted feedback on. There are arguments for putting those things all together (for coordination purposes) or separately (due to how they are implemented/ funded). He did not think there was a national best practice.

The DOT representative expressed stated that roads tie in with land use, and infrastructure does not tie in with land use. He said that he did not have a strong opinion in the matter. The Dulles Regional Chamber of Commerce representative asked if these could appear more than once, and put in both infrastructure and capital repairs and reconstruction.

The contractor (Ms. Holman) responded that in any case the functions would be working together (they are in the same Branch) and have lots of coordination.

The contractor (Ms. Holman) continued with the discussion in Section 3 about **debris removal** under the RF, and explained that a debris removal plan already exists. The DPWES representative agreed. The DPWES representative explained that she was going to forward the document to the solid waste people and let them comment re the debris management plan.

The DPWES representative asked about the pre-event task related to **prioritization of restoration/ reconstruction** in this section and in the capital repairs section. In particular, she questioned DPWES leading this instead of the county decision making body. The contractor (Mr. Cohen) responded that due

to the limitation of what information is available through ACAMS, this is likely a moot issue, and that this task will need to be reconceived. The Planning and Zoning representative suggested putting a group together to make that priority list. DPWES suggested that this might go to Dave McKernan and have him decide what group of people would work on this kind of thing. It was generally agreed that post-event prioritization should be a command function. The OEM representative said he would push that on to Dave.

The DOT representative commented that the VDOT was listed as a support agency, but thought that VDOT (which owns the roads) would not take a subservient position in restoring road infrastructure. He also pointed to WMATA, and said that he didn't think they would allow FFX County to take the lead position to do the planning to reestablish their infrastructure. The DPWES representative noted that in a catastrophe, there would need to be coordination of restoration/ reconstruction prioritization across infrastructure systems, and she suggested that that would be a discussion for some executive group. The contractor (Mr. Cohen) said that the DPWES representative's comments are along the lines of what they envision.

The DOT representative again questioned who the lead agency would be, and suggested rather than combining into one or two categories, break it down into areas of ownership. He said that land use dictates who takes the lead (for example, with right of ways, VDOT owns the land, so they can decide what utilities use it). He also raised the question of how to bring multiple agencies together in this long term recovery planning effort, citing the high amount of ego in existence. The Planning and Zoning representative suggested the County Executive Office over DPW in response to the DOT representative's question. The DOT representative suggested bringing in multiple agencies to decide how the infrastructure is going to be rebuilt, rather than the county presuming to play "lead." The contractor closed the discussion by noting that "lead" in this case should be understood as mainly a "coordinating" role, rather than directly dictating outcomes. The text will be reconsidered in light of this discussion.

The contractor (Ms. Holman) moved the discussion to looking at Section 3 (Page VI-24) and the **provision of lifelines**. She posed the question to the group and asked if the section on coordinating gas, food, heating oils, etc. belonged in this section or Human Services. The DPWES representative suggested social and human services section. The DOT representative agreed, and said it didn't fit into the current structure. The contractor (Mr. Cohen) clarified that the question here is how to provide lifelines while the infrastructure is down (e.g., in the absence of water, who's going to be in charge of making sure there are enough bottles of water?). The DOT representative said that it makes sense if talking about portable things, but that it was not utility and infrastructure.

The Planning and Zoning representative pointed out that this is after an incident has been contained, so an agency would need to make alternative arrangements to get people access to water. She was not sure who that would be. The DOT representative said that it would not be DPWES or DOT, and possibly handled through the County Executive Office or OEM and should be coordinated with Social and Human Services. The contractor (Ms. Holman) questioned whether it should be split between Social and Human Services and Economic Recovery. The contractor (Mr. Cohen) replied that sometimes the easiest way to provide lifelines is to get Wal-mart up and running, so people can provide themselves with supplies. The Family Services representative said it was a "parking lot issue."

The County Attorney noted that this would be a longer term issue, so Isabel would not provide ample precedent. The Planning and Zoning representative explained that is why she thinks it should be DPWES. The DPWES representative said that this is more basic than what they handle.

The County Attorney representative posed a question to the group about a catastrophic situation impacting other jurisdictions, and with limited resources, people, and dollars, where they would start. She said that it would be an issue for the CAO level. The DOT representative asked where short term recovery ended, and made the comparison that being out of power for two weeks is much different that 12 months or two years.

The Family Services representative asked if there were lessons learned from Katrina in terms of restoration. The Housing representative suggested looking into the example of the California earthquake in the 1990s that was a long term recovery effort. The County Attorney's representative suggested getting those that were sent from FFX to help in Katrina together for a brainstorming session. The OEM representative expressed his liking of brainstorming with the FFX county members that went to Katrina, and said he would work on getting that together. The contractor (Ms. Holman) noted that there is heavy federal involvement if it is a catastrophe, and in terms of the short-run with Katrina, that the big-box stores were very helpful.

The Planning and Zoning representative discussed the need to keep it in the perspective that this is a pre-disaster situation, putting plans in place to make priorities. The DOT representative said that he thought the purpose of the plan was to lay out the relationships between the different agencies. The OEM representative explained that how decisions are made is an important piece. The DOT representative asked who made the decisions and policy frameworks. The contractor (Ms. Holman) said that this had yet to be developed for this plan. She acknowledged that the discussion and opinions from today's meeting have been helpful and said there was a need to look into this further.

The contractor (Ms. Holman) noted that Florida has done work like this in terms of best practices, but the contractor (Mr. Cohen) cautioned that Florida knows what the hazards are – mainly hurricanes and storm surge – and therefore how the communities are going to suffer, so there is more specificity. The FFX plan is more about the framework about making the decisions, rather than thinking in advance of the specifics.

The contractor (Ms. Holman) moved onto **Capital Repairs and Reconstruction**. She asked the members to review agencies, etc. and acknowledged the note in the section that would have to be checked through OEM.

The DPWES representative explained that she was looking again at it in reference to making decisions and priorities, but didn't think hers should be the lead agency on that. She promised to talk to her constituents about this type of work.

The DOT representative said that this was the same as the other list, but should add FFX DOT. The Planning and Zoning representative pointed out that FFX DOT was already listed. The Management and Budget representative said that the "Department of Community and Recreation Services" should be changed to "Department of Neighborhood and Community Services," and that the DPWES "Code Enforcement" should change to "Department of Code Compliance."

The contractor (Ms. Holman) asked the members to look at the state agencies and make sure they were applicable to FFX County and send the changes. She added that they were waiting for the federal framework to be released before confirming the federal items.

The contractor (Ms. Holman) asked the group to look at that section and make sure everything is considered that needs to be.

She moved the discussion on to the **Natural, Agricultural, and Cultural Resources Branch annex**.

The Planning and Zoning representative said she would send it out to her group, and asked if Planning and Zoning should be a lead agency. She added that she thought it would be a support agency, and that the Environmental Council is not an agency, but rather appointed by the Board. The contractor (Mr. Cohen) responded that with this function in particular it is still being worked out as far as who will be in charge of it.

The Planning and Zoning representative suggested the Park Department, and explained that Planning and Zoning has an inventory and staffs a history commission. She added that the County Executive has an environmental coordinator out of their office. The County Attorney representative replied that that is a single system without a support staff. The Planning and Zoning representative suggested that her department could be the support, but maybe the County Executive could take the lead.

The DOT representative asked if the Park Department reviewed cultural resources. The Planning and Zoning representative said yes, and explained that throughout the comprehensive plan there is a list of these facilities. She explained that there are lots of groups that are stewards to these, and suggested that the National Trust for Historic Preservation be added.

The Planning and Zoning representative suggested adding the Mount Vernon property too, although it is state run (although VA Dept of Historic Resources is on the list). She said she would send this to her planning group.

The Volunteer Fairfax representative suggested adding Volunteer Fairfax under supporting agencies.

The contractor posed the question to the group about the amount of agriculture in FFX. The Planning and Zoning representative replied that they have tax abatements on agriculture, and that there are quite a few A&F districts. She has that information and can provide it. The Family Services representative replied to the contractor that there is for-profit agriculture in the county. The Planning and Zoning representative said that more of it is in terms of preservation (Tax breaks for keeping land forested) and that there are a few horse areas. The contractor (Ms. Holman) asked if there were major production farms, which the Planning and Zoning representative replied that there were not.

The contractor (Ms. Holman) brought up an issue with the section. She explained that there is no ESF dedicated to this work in the EOC/ EOP, so they are trying to figure out what to transition from. The OEM representative explained that Dave McKernan and the rest of OEM would work on this.

The contractor (Ms. Holman) reviewed Pre-Disaster Issues and Tasks (a) and asked the group to add resources if they were known and to track changes. She also asked if they had a historical inventory, which the Planning and Zoning representative replied that the County's History Commission would have that inventory.

The contractor (Ms. Holman) asked the group about developing a plan to monitor plant and animal disease outbreaks and whether this would apply to this RF, or the health and medical group. She also asked what departments and agencies would be involved. The Planning and Zoning representative said

that domestic animals are handled through animal control and the police department, which does wildlife management. The County Attorney said that the Urban Forestry division of Land Development Services has an integrated pest management program, and that the Public Health Department handles issues such as West Nile, Lyme disease, etc.

The Planning and Zoning representative commented that she could see a separation between cultural and historical resources and pests, animals, etc, but that she wasn't sure what group to put them under. The contractor (Mr. Cohen) explained that this category comes right out of the NDRF, but that they could break it up into groups. The Planning and Zoning representative suggested breaking it up into subgroups, since there are distinct lines of authority. The OEM representative pointed out to the group to keep it in mind that with the entire plan, ICS can expand and contract depending on the scenario.

The contractor (Ms. Holman) wrapped up the reviewer notes and asked if there were any questions or concerns. There were none.

F. Next Steps

The OEM representative discussed the upcoming next steps. He asked the Steering Committee to have their edits in two weeks from now (December 15), and reminded the group that there is no January meeting due to the holiday season. He explained that the next meeting would be February 2nd, and that Amanda will be back by then so they may not see him as often. He will send out a calendar reminder, and reminded the group that the working group meeting will also be pushed forward.

G. Wrap Up

The contractor (Mr. Cohen and Ms. Holman) wrapped up the meeting and thanked everyone for their time.

Meeting adjourned.