

Fairfax County Pre-Disaster Recovery Plan (PDRP) Steering Committee Meeting
Oct. 6, 2010, 3pm
Government Center Conference Rm. 09-10

In Attendance:

Witt Associates-Hal Cohen, Lindsey Holman, Allison Taylor, VOAD/FCIA-Lewis Saylor, Springfield Chamber of Commerce-Phyllis Black, DPWES-Carol Lamborn, DPZ-Joe Bakos, Volunteer Fairfax-Matthew Lyttle, DFS-Carl Varner, OCA-Marilyn McHugh, OEM-David McKernan, OPA-Jim Person, HCD-John Turner, OEM-Marcello Ferriera, Health Dept.-Marc Barbieri, DOT-Eric Teitelman, FCIA-Sandra Chisholm

A. Welcome and Introductions

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 Springfield Chamber of Commerce.

The contractor thanked the participants for coming, and expressed that he hoped that everyone would take the opportunity to communicate between organizations and agencies that this project is going on and to discuss the issues brought forth in the meeting with the community.

B. Schedule issues and updates

The contractor stated that the regular meeting schedule is the first Wednesday of each month, and the next meeting is November 3rd. He also announced to expect an Outlook invite about the next meeting.

The contractor discussed intending to have the regular monthly meeting in December, but proposed skipping the January meeting and having a larger meeting towards the end of January.

The contractor explained there would be two additional focus group meetings with non-profit and private sector partners, including health and healthcare providers and special needs interests. The meeting dates are TBD. They have also reached out to the FEMA recovery directorate to keep them informed and to make sure everything is consistent, and there are no fundamental changes to the PDRF Draft.

C. Technical Issues related to editing documents

The contractor stated that submitting changes will be done on a document-by-document basis. The easiest way will be to make changes and use the "track changes" feature as opposed to editing through Sharepoint. Marcello/Amanda will keep the working version of the document to ensure document integrity, and everyone will email their changes to Marcello.

D. Discuss Previously Reviewed Draft Plan Elements

The contractor resumed last meeting's discussion of Sec I, Introduction. He asked Marcello if there were any major changes submitted by committee members since the first meeting that the committee should discuss and if anyone wanted to discuss their comments. There were none.

The contractor explained that defining who precisely is meant by "recovery leadership" and "recovery command" will be determined later in the process. The representative from the County Attorney Office

raised the issue that such place holders have been in brackets in the past but in this case (“recovery leadership”) was not, and that this should be consistent. Contractor agreed.

The contractor explained that once all of the edits have been accepted into the document, the new version will be posted on Sharepoint. Any issues will be discussed in steering committee meetings.

The representative from Planning and Zoning asked if members of the steering committee could review documents after they had been posted. The contractor stated that this wouldn’t be the only time people would have the opportunity to review documents. In the case a suggestion is made that may not be acceptable to other county departments, they will be vetted by the Steering Committee before the changes are accepted.

The contractor explained that Marcello is collecting everything and will send to the contractor to keep a record. The contractor will make sure that who presented what changes is tracked.

The contractor discussed the hazard identification risk assessment. Part of what is expected to be developed via the NOVA Hazard Mitigation Plan is a new hazard identification assessment, which Marcelo will acquire once it is available and will be integrated into the PDRP HIRA.

The contractor explained the changes made to the table of contents; the functional descriptions were broken up.

The contractor explained that the proposed recovery structure has been made more consistent with state and federal ESFs and federal recovery guidance. As a result, some previously stand-alone recovery functions (debris management and evacuation, relocation, and quarantine) have been folded into other functions.

E. Review New Draft Plan Elements

The contractor presented parts of Sec VI, Recovery Functions. He explained that the functions will be described in the plan. The contractor charged the Steering Committee to help to be sure that the plan is not assigning tasks and responsibilities to inappropriate organizations or departments.

The contractor stated that the section overview (VI.A) described what the plan is intended to do, and that there is a purpose section (VI.B.1) to describe what the functions are for and how they are intended to fit into an EOP activation that is winding down. The Situation and Activation section (VI.B.2) describes when the plan should be activated and provides an overview of the situation in which this plan is applicable. Three activation criteria are as follows:

- Life safety is no longer an issue,
- the capabilities of the county to function normally are overwhelmed, and
- the situation will not be resolved in the short-term.

The contractor stated that on Page VI-2 it was important to note that this plan should not be activated unless the above criteria are met.

The Volunteer Fairfax representative raised the issue that under Section VI.2 the second bullet is confusing. The OEM representative agreed that it needed to be simplified and that it was too wordy. The contractor agreed.

The contractor stated that the Coordination section (VI.B.3) should be consistent with the ICS structure and NIMS. Regional and state coordination basically states that it will defer to regional and state plans; if there is no liaison designated one will be designated.

The contractor explained that the decisions to activate functions would be made on a function-by-function basis and the language will be clarified.

The County Attorney Office representative discussed the inclusion of a county recovery center and raised the question of there being an EOC equivalent somewhere. The contractor responded and said that this should be discussed, and that the EOP guidance is vague regarding this. There are descriptions of family assistance/disaster centers within the EOP, as well as other entities. The contractor stated that this will be clarified in the future, but that this would not be the PDRP section where the clarification would be provided. The contractor explained that the EOP covers short-term recovery and describes physical place/locations where recovery functions would be located. The County Attorney Office representative replied that it would seem to make sense in this type of situation that another location would be needed to allow the EOC to deal with current emergencies. The OEM representative explained that the county is re-doing the EOP and the family/disaster assistance centers will be revised.

The Public Works and Environmental Services representative asked if they should assume that the contractor has tried to use the same terminology as the EOP, etc. He wanted to be sure the review process was clear to allow them to put this out for review within their departments. Contractor will provide a memo framing the documents to clarify these issues.

The County Attorney Office representative raised the point that it was difficult to understand the difference between a coordinating agency and a support agency on Page VI-6. She also questioned whether that many levels (lead, coordinating, support) were necessary. The OEM representative agreed and commented that the coordinating agencies are the lead agencies that rely on the support agencies to get the job done. The County Attorney Office representative suggested that coordinating agencies should be replaced as support agencies. The Volunteer Fairfax representative explained that when they talk about coordinating agencies, an assumption is made regarding expectations of their role. The contractor explained the intention behind breaking these up is that there are some agencies that are actually providing tangible help, vs. advice and review. The OEM representative suggested consolidating the coordinating agency under the support agency listing. The contractor explained that the plan will assume COOP is operational, but that this does not imply that organizations are not expected to be up and running no matter what just because they have a COOP; some situations may exceed COOP capabilities.

The contractor discussed the policies (VI.B.4) are all taken from best practices and the EOP, but that OEM may want to think about this issue.

The contractor posed the question to the steering committee whether the emergency manager will always be the county executive or designee. The County Attorney Office representative replied that the emergency director will always be the county executive. The contractor agreed that the county executive should therefore likely be cited as "recovery command." The County Attorney Office representative asked the group who made the decision during the flooding incident. The OEM representative replied that the person who signs off on decisions will be the county executive or designee.

The contractor explained that the priorities section in (VI.B.5) describes the prioritization of ethical decisions (preserve life safety, preserve liberty, etc.) and are listed in rank order. He asked the

committee to review the order of priorities and ask if they should be modified or re-ranked. The Family Services representative suggested that in the “iii” bullet the word “basic” should be removed, since there are no “basic” social service needs. Contractor and representative agreed that “essential” is more accurate.

The Public Health representative asked what the list of priorities was pulled from. The contractor explained that similar standards are used when they do continuity planning, but this is not from any specific guidance. The VOAD representative stated that their initial reaction to the priorities was the hierarchy of needs and were curious how the contractor came to these or if there is a lot of space between them. The Public Health representative stated that the priorities may be subjective when considering the public. The contractor agreed to look at what has been done post-Katrina regarding general statements of prioritization. The contractor raised the question if the group wanted “improve” to compete with “maintain and restore” (in terms of rank order).

The OEM representative asked if this prioritization should even be in Sec VI, and suggested that it should be pulled up in a higher level section (I or III). Contractor agreed.

Contractor requested any changes to the list of organizations on page VI-5 (VI.D.2) and requested to be notified if there were any changes to the groups listed. The Family Services representative stated that the “Dept. of Community and Recreation Services” should be changed to “Neighborhood and Community Services,” and that “Dept of Mental Services” doesn’t exist and should be removed. The Volunteer Fairfax representative explained that VOAD and Citizen Corps are separate but fall under the coordination of Volunteer Fairfax; he and Marcelo will discuss which of these groups should be listed.

The contractor explained the pre-event recovery function responsibilities (VI.D.3) are all pulled from interviews and guidance/best practices, and that following these are short-term, and medium/long-term issues and responsibilities (VI.D.4-5). The short-term are pulled largely from the EOP. They have functions that are described in the EOP, and the leadership transitions from that structure.

The Family Services representative suggested adding “client confidentiality standards” under VI.D.3.d.

The contractor instructed the committee that whether to leave VI.D.3.e in the plan is up for discussion. Related to this, the County Attorney Office representative explained that they are not part of Finance and Admin; they deal with the policy but that is all.

The VOAD representative asked if the current EOP makes reference to the PDRP in terms of handling the issues of transition. The OEM representative explained that the county hasn’t gotten that far with the new EOP. The contractor discussed that the current EOP does in a way but does not specifically refer to this plan. The current EOP does provide for the transition from response to recovery.

The contractor explained that item VI.D.4.b was added from interviews with departments and should probably move to short-term.

The OEM representative suggested that on VI.D.5.c change “maintain and restore” to “restore and/or maintain.”

The contractor explained that the Health and Healthcare recovery function (VI.E) text has a similar intro section to Social and Human Services.

Pre-event issues (VI.E.3) in some cases are mainly similar, with some exceptions. For example, developing casualty management plan was identified in focus group. Section VI.E.3.e related to self-

identification of medical needs was brought up in discussion with private/NGO orgs. The Volunteer Fairfax representative suggested referencing the special needs registry. The contractor replied the point is to be pro-active and voluntary.

The contractor explained the short-term issues/responsibilities (VI.E.4) in this section is derived from the EOP as well. Section VI.E.5 explains each med/long term function; quarantine has just been added and will need to be expanded upon.

The contractor instructed the committee that two more pieces to look at this month are (1) the RSF-ESF Comparison Matrix, which lays out how this structure compares to federal, state, regional, and local planning guidance. For the most part it matches up well with all. The contractor explained how there are some response functions that do not have a recovery function equivalent. Also, he explained that (2) the outline for the Concept of Operations is essentially the instruction manual of how a disaster plan works. The contractor asked the committee to review and note changes and consider if the priorities would be a better fit here. This should be fairly straightforward, includes basic definitions, activation criteria, and operational function.

F. Next Steps

The contractor asked the committee that any additional comments, questions, and concerns should be put in to an electronic document and emailed to Marcello. The next meeting is November 3rd, where Public Safety, CBRN Safety, and Structural Safety will be covered.

The OEM representative instructed the committee that the due date for comments submission is 2 weeks from today, and the contractor added that he would send out a reminder.

G. Adjourn Meeting