Fairfax County Pre-Disaster Recovery Plan (PDRP) Steering Committee Meeting
Nov. 3, 2010, 3pm
Government Center Conference Rm. 07

In Attendance:
Witt Associates: Hal Cohen, Lindsey Holman
FFXOEM: Marcelo Ferreira
Dulles Chamber of Commerce: Bill Bolton
Health Dept.: Marc Barbiere
DPZ: Leslie Johnson
Springfield Chamber of Commerce: Phyllis Black
DOT: Eric Teitelman
OCA: Marilyn McHugh
Volunteer Fairfax: Matt Lyttle
Housing: John Turner
DPWES: Carol Lamborn
OPA: Jim Person
DMB: Brian Heffern
CSB: Jim Stratoudakis
DFS: Carl Varner

A. Welcome and Introduction

Marcello welcomed participants and introduced himself as the interim project manager for FFX OEM.

Participants then provided introductions, including a new steering committee member from the Dulles Chamber of Commerce.

The contractor thanked the participants for coming.

B. Updates

Conops overview (slides)
(See also "management transition structure.ppt"). The contractor provided an overview of the agenda and explained the discussion with OEM regarding the higher level structure of the PDRP. The contractor then explained the transition between disaster phases into long-term recovery and the characteristics of each (Response, short-term recovery, and medium/long-term recovery). There is no standard for defining these phases, although the EOP does define these phases and the new draft of the FEMA NDRF also discusses these phases. The contractor then discussed the way the EOP, COOP, and COG are intended to interact over time. The EOP goes into short-term recovery and will transition to the PDRP for medium/long term recovery and then eventually phase back to normal functions.

The contractor explained the following transitions:

- the controlling plan during response will be the EOP, which will transition to the PDRP for med/long term recovery, then devolve to normal operations. During *short-term recovery*, the controlling plan will be in transition.

- the command/coordination site during response will be the incident command post and the EOC, which will transition to the Recovery Coordination Center for med/long term recovery. During *short-term recovery*, the EOC will transition to virtual and then stand down.
- Under the short-term recovery the IC is in charge; during med/long term this is the Recovery Coordinator. During *short-term recovery*, the response IC will be in command and the person to become Recovery Coordinator will be the deputy; this will flip once the transition from EOP to PDRP takes place
- During response, ultimate authority rests with the Director of EM (County Executive) under emergency powers; during recovery, the County Exec and BOS hold their normal authorities (also assumes COG plan is operational)
- During response each ESF is activated as needed these would transition to RSFs on a case-by-case basis, except for ESF14, which becomes the staff for the Recovery Coordinator during the short-term recovery transition
- The contractor provided an illustration of the transition from response to recovery org structures (see "management transition structure.ppt".)
    - Response: Executive Policy Group > Unified Command/Director of EM > General and Command Staff
    - Transition/ Short-term recovery: Recovery Coordinator set up with ESF14 under; as ESFs transition to recovery they report to the Recovery Coordinator
    - Med/Long term recovery: County Exec and Board of Supervisors > Recovery Committee/Recovery Coordinator/FFX Co. Recovery Agency > RSF Leads (detailed full-or part-time recovery agency) > RSFs (functionally operate out of agencies.)

The contractor encouraged the committee to provide their opinions and suggestions regarding the higher level organizational structure.

Other updates

The contractor introduced Marcelo Ferreira and stated that he will provide an update on the EOP and Mitigation Plan.

Marcelo explained that the county is updating the EOP and is expecting completion by the summer. The main difference will be a shift to the ICS Structure. Those that have participated in the EOC should be familiar with how that will look. The county will work to plug in different ESFs into the ICS structure. In terms of context of the plan there shouldn't be much difference. Marcelo will provide an update on the Hazard Mitigation Plan once available.

The contractor provided an update on PDRP meetings. The project staff had a focus group meeting with representatives from special needs groups, the FEMA Disaster Recovery Directorate and the FEMA Office of National Capital Region Coordination. During the meeting with FEMA the contractor laid out the intentions of the project to which FEMA expressed that they were comfortable with the project. The contractor explained that Marcelo is currently working to set up more focus group meetings with utilities and other lifelines, health and medical services, and homeowner associations.

The contractor explained the purpose of the memo provided in the handout materials regarding the survey that is intended for stakeholders and the public. The contractor encouraged the committee to publicize it throughout their organizations and the public. The memo is for general use to invite people to participate in the survey. Once it is determined how widely used the survey is the project team will start to target specific populations.

C. Critical Infrastructure/Key Resources (CI/KR) Prioritization

The contractor explained that there are resources in OEM that give a sense of critical infrastructure and prioritization. Anything involving the snow plan will provide the prioritization for streets etc. There are facilities that are not public sector. The contractor asked if anyone is aware of resources that would describe critical infrastructure and key resources.

Marcelo answered that the access OEM has to this type of critical infrastructure prioritization is through DPWES.

The DPWES representative explained that one such facility that should be considered as critical is the Waste Water Treatment Plant.

The contractor also asked for lists of Hazmat facilities and so forth which will also provide some sort of prioritization to ensure the project staff is exhausting all resource possibilities.

The DPWES representative asked the contractor if they have reviewed VDOT data/prioritization on roads and explained that VDOT is responsible for all snow clearing of all roads in FFX.

The contractor asked DPWES if they coordinate with VDOT at all.

The DPWES representative answered that they do not, but they receive a lot of calls during snowstorms and forward them to VDOT.

The DOT representative said that VDOT snow priorities do account for the destinations of roads (e.g., hospitals), not just throughput

D. Discuss Previously Reviewed Draft Plan Elements

The contractor discussed some outstanding issues from last month. The draft of the materials from last month will be up on the website with two versions (tracked changes and clear version).

There were a few questions raised during edits that the contractor needed further guidance on. In the intro section, someone made reference to a CWS model in terms of mental health and spiritual support and counseling. No one in attendance was familiar with this reference.

The OCA representative explained that there was a question in the Sec. 1 on “cities.” The comment said the plan was not intended to apply to Fairfax City and Falls Church. The text regarding cities will be taken out by the contractor.

The question was raised about how the group should provide feedback regarding the comments of others after everyone has reviewed the other comments. The contractor explained to the committee that they can either discuss them in this meeting or email them to the project group/contractor. The contractor encouraged everyone to review the tracked changes version of the documents.

The contractor discussed a comment directed at the descriptions of the recovery functions in general (whether they should be integrated into the text or should be stand-alone). The contractor stated that

unlike an EOP, this is something that would be considered over days and weeks and that response pressure would not be there. The Health Dept. representative commented that having the plan separated out makes it easier to read. The DPWES representative agreed that it is helpful to have it as a "grab and go" document. Contractor said this structural change would be accommodated.

As a matter of style, the contractor stated that the plan will capitalize the words "branches" and "groups" to make clear the sections are referring to specific Branches and Groups. "The County" will be capitalized when talking about county government. When referring to it as a geographic point it will not be capitalized.

The Volunteer FFX representative suggested an "all functions must" section, in order to reduce redundancy between functions' "to-do" lists. The contractor agreed and asked if anyone had objections.

The contractor asked about a comment regarding what the health function was with basic sanitation and ensuring adequate sanitation. The contractor explained the need for clarification on the term "sanitation" and how the health department is involved with that. The Health Dept. representative stated he would confirm its function in sanitation operations and report back.

The contractor explained that the project team has done some research of best practices from a variety of plans regarding the previously discussed "priorities" text. The committee has a summary of the findings in the handout packet. For the most part, other plans (i.e., best practices) do not cover what team is intending to do with the PDRP – providing high-level ethical guidance. The general consistency among other plans is that life-safety comes before anything else. None mentioned safeguarding liberties, legal, and privacy safeguards. The analysis of other plans basically demonstrates a broad consistency with what has been proposed nationwide. It was requested last time that the project team review some best practices for policies and this is the result of that. The contractor expressed the thought that this should be arrived at by a large group of citizens or can be discussed through email.

The CSB representative asked if "human" services can be added to the second priority. The contractor answered yes.

The OCA representative stated that regarding the Minnesota policies, what they have ranked as #4 is coordination between the public and private sector. The OCA representative wanted to make sure something isn't missed that should be a priority. The contractor explained that coordination between the sectors is explicitly stated in the PDRP "goals" text. FFX's "priorities" intend to set general decision making principles. Other plans have a better understanding of the threats they will face, so what they term "priorities" are more concrete. The contractor is confident that most of the goals/priorities established in other plans are covered in our more concrete goals statements.

E. Review New Draft Plan Elements

The contractor explained to the committee that they have materials from section 6 and section 7 for review today. If members of the committee have a clear and specific change they should notify the project team through the review of the text and inserted comments.

In Sec. 7 the organization and implementation of the plan, maintenance, training and exercise, etc. is described. The committee should think of additional things that should be part of a training regimen.

The committee should also consider how often there should be a table top exercise of the PDRP plan. OEM has suggested that annual exercises would be too often. The reasoning behind that would to not over burden participants when considering the full exercise schedule. Marcelo explained the potential to tie PDRP exercises into the annual review process. The Health Dept. representative commented that annual review is not too often for exercising this plan. The Volunteer Fairfax representative asked if there is a way to pick a target group every year or 6 months to participate in the exercise. Marcelo explained that OEM could potentially tie the PDRP to some other exercises. The DPWES representative agreed that integrating the PDRP into other exercises or exercising either every other year would work. Marcelo stated that he would check on integrating and see if there would be any issues.

The Volunteer Fairfax representative discussed, with regards to staff turn-over, if there is a way to establish a group liaison to catch up new staff in regards to the PDRP due to the fact that participants are all from so many different agencies and groups. Marcelo provided thoughts that OEM will house the plan and be responsible for it. Someone in OEM will be responsible for the recovery function.

The contractor explained that in discussion with the FEMA Recovery Directorate, the plan would be scalable rather than having it only serve as a catastrophic recovery plan. The contractor explained his lack of preference and has stated this FEMA recommendation for consideration by the committee. FEMA is thinking in terms of ESF 14 and the outcome they want of prioritized list of projects. The Health Dept. representative asked if that could also be addressed under the ESF 14 responsibility in the EOP. The OCA representative stated that when considering disasters in the Fairfax County area there are tornados and flooding. Recently, in CA and Boston there have been major explosions of gas lines that level multiple blocks, which is a level above the Huntington Flooding or Centerville Tornados. That type of disaster may not be catastrophic but is certainly bigger than some of the things the county has had to deal with. The contractor explained that if the committee wants to implement this, criteria for activation would be modified. The plan is meant for a rare occurrence anyway; the question raised is whether there would be a benefit with setting up a recovery agency for a year and a half to facilitate the recovery. The OEM representative expressed their opinion that questions regarding this should be directed to the County Executive and OEM Director. The DOT representative stated that the county already has plans for short-term recovery and this document is supposed to be for long-term recovery, which they don't have. The contractor explained that the PDRP as written provides nothing stopping it from being used in a mid-level disaster recovery setting. The final determination was that scalability would NOT be explicitly accommodated.

The DPWES representative asked, in regard to the "plan monitoring" process, where the list of tasks and action items came from. The contractor explained that the action item list comes from the action list for each RF. The DPWES representative asked whether whoever is in that RF would develop the action items to be addressed. The contractor answered yes, that it is all of those things in the RF text that lists the tasks for each RF. The DPWES representative asked if this will deal with the gaps and addressing those as well. The contractor answered yes, each should be reviewed and addressed as appropriate. The DPWES representative asked if each lead agency is responsible for making sure that action item is addressed and who puts that list together. The contractor answered yes and explained that they have been sampling the first part of that list and annually the Recovery Group or agency would review and amend as necessary. The contractor also explained there will be an appendix providing the "to do" list for each RF.

The contractor reiterated that individual agencies should make changes in writing with track changes and stated that if the issue is something that should be discussed prior to changing please provide those

suggestions through inserted comments. Specific to public safety, the contractor asked if item C (martial law) is a to-do item that needs to be addressed. The OCA representative asked how much detail should be included in this plan. The authorities for that function are specifically provided in VA Code and understood within county government. The contractor explained that all that will be needed is the reference to the law in the PDRP if OCA is confident that the powers are in place and the authority is understood.

The Volunteer Fairfax representative asked why the safety and security group is not in its own branch. The contractor explained that is mainly because the NDRF describes 6 RF branches but safety and security is not one of them. The project team tried to place safety and security in the most appropriate branch while still maintaining consistency with the FEMA NDRF structure.

The DMB representative suggested changing the compliance with regulations and standards section so that the broad point should be made instead of listing each standard and regulation.

The contractor stated if something is thoroughly described already within their damage assessment plans DPWES should edit at will and make sure the corresponding plans are described correctly. It is our of assumption that this function shouldn't have much left to do because it is adequately described in the EOP/annexes. The contractor asked whether the Damage Assessment Annex and the LDS plan are the same – DPWES said she would check.

The contractor explained that the CBRN section isn't intended to discuss managing the event but cleaning it up. This is the first recovery function that the Feds will claim jurisdiction. Through contractor's work with other NOVA jurisdictions for CBRN planning, the Feds have made it clear that once response is complete, the locals will take it over. The project team will meet with the Fire Marshall and Dept. of Health to make sure they sign off on this section.

The DPWES representative noted the text stating that the group lead "ensures" each participating entity has a COOP and explained the concern regarding "ensuring" vs "encouraging." Marcelo agreed that the term "encourage" would be more appropriate. He also explained that OEM just got a COOP Coordinator who will work with task as well. Contractor will make this change.

The contractor instructed the committee that if there are other instances where there is wording in which you are not comfortable (shall v should, etc.) feel free to make those changes/suggestions.

F. Wrap up and Adjourn Meeting

The contractor explained that at this point the project is focusing on plan development. The next round will smooth down the quantity of what is in the RFs via use of the "all RFs must" text.

Document reviews for the new sections are due Nov. 17. Marcelo stated that he will send out an email reminder for the Nov. 17 due date. The contractor explained the project team is keeping a file of everyone's individual edits.

The next steering committee meeting is December 1st. The project team will get materials to the committee in advance. There will not be a January Steering Committee meeting; the meetings will pick up in February. The contractor then asked for any other questions from the committee.