

## Fairfax County Pre-Disaster Recovery Plan (PDRP)

Steering Committee Meeting  
May 4, 2011

### **In Attendance:**

Amanda Phan-OEM  
Dave McKernan-OEM  
Hal Cohen-Witt Associates  
Lindsey Holman-Witt Associates  
Bill Lokey-Witt Associates  
Phyllis Black-Springfield Chamber of Commerce  
Marc Barbieri-Health Department  
Matthew Lyttle-Volunteer Fairfax  
Brian Heffern-Management and Budget  
Ron Kirkpatrick-DPWES  
Ian Sterne-National Capital Region –American Red Cross  
Zoning and Inspections  
Teri Flynn-Risk Management  
Leslie Johnson-Planning and Zoning  
Carlton Burkhammer-Fire Marshal  
Jim Stratoudakis-CSB-Mental Health  
Marilyn McHugh-Office of the County Attorney  
Carl Varner-Disability Services Board  
John Turner-Housing and Community Development  
Eric Teitelman-Fairfax Department of Transportation  
Joe Bakos – Department of Planning and Zoning

### **A. Welcome and Introductions**

Ms. Phan thanked everyone from coming and introduced Bill Lokey from Witt associates. She explained that the group would go through departmental updates via round table discussion.

The attendees provided self introductions.

Mr. Lokey provided an overview of his background in emergency management and his work in FEMA, California Emergency Services, and Pierce County, Washington.

Ms. Phan instructed that the hand out given to everyone, titled PDRP-identified pre-event tasks, is a list of items that still need to be addressed once the PDRP is complete. It is broken down by recovery function. She requested that if anyone knows of work that is being done regarding those topics, in your organizations, to notify her of the status and

nature of effort. She stated to the group the importance of ensuring the planning team is staying updated as the pre-event tasks are completed.

### Mass Casualty Planning

Mr. Barbieri asked, regarding Mass Casualty planning, if mass casualty referred to mass fatalities as well. He asked if Ms. Phan was talking about dealing with the deceased or just victims. He explained his thought of how it might be a multiple planning effort.

Ms. Phan replied explaining it would apply to short-term recovery for the notification of families. The gaps analysis done with the county agencies for the PDRP project identified Mass Casualty planning as an area which needs attention.

Mr. McKernan suggested that this be part of response planning rather than recovery

### Homeowner/public outreach program

Mr. Lyttle explained Volunteer Fairfax, Red Cross, and Citizen Corp do a variety of public outreach. He was unsure about the status of outreach that is specific to disaster recovery. He expressed his thought that Volunteer Fairfax, as well as the Red Cross and Citizen Corp would be willing to participate in putting out a message specific to disaster recovery, if needed. He stated, regarding regional recovery, that volunteer centers all over VA have MOUs for support. He explained that the voluntary medical needs self identification program, which Marcello works with, identifies who in the county has special medical needs.

Ms. Phan replied that she aware of that and it might have been listed as a gap prior to when Marcello was hired.

Mr. Cohen explained the gap was identified during one of the focus group sessions, with the notion there might be people which don't self-identify prior to a disaster. As a way of complying with HIPA and other privacy standards, self-identification is crucial. This makes sure there is a structure in place during the event where people can come in and identify themselves as a person with medical needs.

Mr. Lyttle confirmed he understood the concept and asked when referring to pre-event tasks, you want the framework so that during the event some of the services can be executed.

Mr. Cohen answered yes.

## **B. Updates**

Ms. Phan asked the committee if anyone had additional updates regarding the PDRP Pre-event tasks. She stated that she will continue to bring this up at other meetings to keep track of what different departments and organizations are doing. She then provided an

updates regarding the finalization of other plan updates including the Fairfax EOP and NOVA Hazard Mitigation Plan. She notified the committee that the EOP is under review by the Office of Public Affairs. She explained that work is still in progress on the sections addressing ESFs 5, 14, and 2. She explained that the NOVA Hazard Mitigation Plan has been completed. She stated that the planning team is still trying to finalize the portion that addresses the human hazard risk identification. She notified the group that a completion date is not yet set, but the plan should be done around June or July.

Ms. Phan then explained that the PDRP planning team has held additional focus group meetings with the Financial, Insurance and Real Estate sector, Transportation, and Natural and Cultural Resources Focus Groups.

Mr. Cohen explained that through the Financial, Insurance and Real Estate sector focus group meeting, the planning team was able to put more detail into the economic recovery function section. The planning team obtained additional ideas for recovery resources, such as a business disaster recovery center, and ideas for helping businesses relocate, as well as input regarding recovery agency structuring for those functions.

He explained that the natural and cultural resources focus group helped to identify which agencies should be tasked as the lead agency. He explained that an outcome of the focus group meeting was the decision to remove the agriculture function from the plan, due to the small amount of agriculture industry in the county. Mr. Cohen stated the transportation focus group resulted in a better understanding of the county and state's transportation departments' roles and how they coordinate with each other. He also informed the committee that the planning team learned more about tasking for the function, the regional transportation organization roles, and how they relate to maintaining and the recovery of the county's transportation infrastructure. There was also discussion regarding regional MOUs for transportation.

Ms. Phan stated that she would bring up issues and the regional MOUs for transportation at the next regional planning meeting, so that they can look into addressing some of the issues identified during the transportation focus group meeting. She stated she did bring up the MOUs at the last meeting but no one was aware if those agreements would apply to recovery as well as response. She explained that the pre-event brochure task has changed to development of a communications plan and other brochures. As soon as work begins on the development of the brochures, she hopes some of the committee members will be interested in participating. I want the brochures to show how the business and non-profit communities play a role in recovery and will distribute those throughout the community.

### **C. Discuss Previously Reviewed Draft Plan Elements**

Mr. Cohen explained how the planning team has incorporated the comments and reviews that were provided from the committee. He stated the team is currently revising according to the input received at the Financial, Insurance, and Real Estate focus group meeting. He informed the committee that the section should be available by Monday for review.

#### **D. Review New Draft Plan Elements**

Mr. Cohen provided an explanation of the latest ICS Recovery Organization structure. He explained that to date, the planning team has gone through all of the recovery function branches, the recovery coordinator position, and policy board roles. He provided the committee with an explanation of the structure and tasking for the Financial and Administration, Planning, and Logistics sections. He stated the committee will go through the command staff structure roles during the next meeting. Once there is a final draft, the policy board function will be reviewed again to make sure their role is appropriate and clearly stated.

Mr. Cohen explained that the approach for the general sections will behave differently in recovery than in response. Where possible, the PDRP will refer to the Fairfax EOP for organizational structure and roles. He provided an overview of the purpose of the Planning Section and explained the approach to staffing which is basically the same as standard ICS positions. He stated that these positions should be staffed by whoever is the most qualified. The planning team will identify a roster of people that are trained to perform these tasks. The agencies that would likely compile the planning section include: OEM, P&Z, DPWES, and others as appropriate to the situation. The proposed structure includes standard ICS units with the addition of a (Recovery) Transition Unit. For each of the sections the Fairfax EOP ICS organization will be referred to, while also explaining how these sections will behave differently during recovery.

Mr. Cohen provided an overview of the purpose of Long-term community recovery planning and how it is different from the role of the Planning Section. He explained that the Planning Section serves the organization, through on-going Incident Action Planning. Long-term community planning would be in operations because its purpose is to produce a long-term strategic plan for the recovery objectives of the community. The recovery action planning, in the planning section, could be accomplished with staff from outside of the jurisdiction because it is an interchangeable ICS activity. Long-term Planning, in Operations Section, will need to be done by people that are familiar with how the county works and evolves from ESF 14 from the Fairfax EOP.

Ms. Lamborn stated that she saw the long-term recovery plan as a strategic plan; it is looking at the big picture. She explained her understanding that the recovery action planning will lay out what is done first, second, and third etc. She expressed her thought that the long-term recovery action planning should be fleshed out before you can do the IAP piece, which is the actual implementation piece. She explained that she thinks the long-term planning part, they will be working around the boundaries of the policy board, and this is what you work with them on, to come up with the strategic plan. Is that correct?

Mr. Cohen stated that to a degree, the long-term recovery plan is the big operational piece for which you'll want input from a vast amount of stakeholders and the public to make the process and plan legitimate. You want one of them to precede the other. The reality is that they must be developed at the same time.

Mr. Lokey explained that in the process the IAP is the division of the processes and goes on daily laying out the day's tasks and goals. It is an on-going process.

Mr. Cohen stated that both plans will have to be developed at the same time. He explained that IAPs consist of operational period cycles that will change (8 hours, 1 day, 1 week, and 1 month). You will be developing the Long-term plan as you are creating IAPs on a regular basis.

Ms. Lamborn stated that an ideally an IAP would not be put in place that truly did not fulfill the long term goals and objectives. She stated that it would be important to ensure the two plans and processes will not conflict each other.

Mr. Cohen explained that during the recovery planning cycle, there must be continuous confirmation that the IAPs and long-term plans are in sync. They need to check in on a period planning cycle basis.

Mr. McKernan asked if the intention for this planning process is that the IAP is actually pieces of the long-term plan and will address accomplishment of small pieces of the long-term recovery plan over time.

Mr. Cohen answered yes, that is the goal but doesn't always work that way.

Ms. Phan stated that when you talk about long-term recovery planning. It has to incorporate the HMP, COMP Plan, the Revitalization Plan and all those other plans. She asked Leslie Johnson, if this concept makes sense.

Ms. Johnson explained the COMP plan is the long-term plan for the county. The department, Planning and Zoning, review and update the COMP plan every 3-4 years. It is also about policies such as the housing policy. During recovery, there will need to be changes to that plan to reflect what has happened. The revitalization areas are components of the COMP plan.

Mr. Cohen explained further that the long-term recovery plan is always drawn from other plans. The Long-term Recovery plan will serve as an overlay to those other county plans to note the major disruption and prioritize the recovery projects consistent with the objectives and goals outlined in the other plans. It also becomes the place holder against the next revision of the COMP plan, etc. The long-term plan captures the disruption so that the next revisions of the other plans are consistent with the objectives of the long-term recovery plan.

Ron Kirkpatrick, DPWES, asked if the long-term recovery plan is that publicly vetted.

Mr. Cohen replied yes, FEMA doesn't specially tie funding to this plan, unlike the HMGP, but they do have a process that is prescribed in terms of identifying issues, reaching out to the public. He asked Bill if it is necessary to have the plan approved by an elected body.

Mr. Lokey responded that usually the signature of the executive/county board for approval of the plan. It is necessary for the document to go through the public process according to the official policy of the jurisdiction. The other thing you will find, it is the balance between rapid recovery and smarter recovery. This gives you a way to focus on the long-term recovery to build back better and smarter.

Mr. Cohen explained that the process can be complicated, but the end result is defensible and can be presented to FEMA as such. It also helps to protect the county from backlash, if the formulation of the plan hadn't included obtaining input and vetting through the public process.

Mr. Lokey explained the balance between rapid recovery and smarter recovery. The long-term recovery plan provides a way to focus on the long-term recovery to build back better and smarter.

Ms. Lamborn asked if the rationale of putting the long-term planning in operations. It sounds like it's an actual plan thing.

Mr. Lokey responded that the Operations Section's purpose is to serve the public interest, which is what this plan will focus on. The Planning Section will help on the long-term recovery plan but serves the recovery organization (ICS) through resource planning and action planning for the agencies effort.

Ms. Phan explained that the planning team intends on drafting an annex specifically for the long-term recovery planning function.

Mr. Cohen explained that the PDRP will include an annex addressing the long-term plan that is adapted for Fairfax County from the FEMA 13 step process.

Ms. Phan addressed that Mr. Cohen and Mr. McKernan have mentioned the need to figure out how to train the people who will fill these positions during recovery. These people who will staff the recovery agency are not generally involved in EOC response. Part of this process with includes figuring out how to get the players involved and familiar with the plan and processes pre-disaster.

Ms. Johnson stated that the training and involvement of staff is a policy decision. She stated her concern regarding her department's capability to handle their role. She explained that a lot of the tasks involve the department working with task forces and facilitate, which they can handle. However, she explained for some of these other roles, the department doesn't have the expertise or number of staff to handle it.

Mr. Cohen explained that most of the case studies for long-term disaster recovery agencies involve people taking on roles which they are not familiar, but since they have the expertise of how the county functions, they are the best person/department for that function. He stated that they must be a facilitator for the all the moving parts of the function, Planning

and Zoning has the generalist view necessary for accomplishing that for the long-term recovery planning function.

Ms. Johnson stated that the department is consumed already by dealing with day-to-day operations. For this role, they would need additional staff.

Mr. Cohen explained that issue has been part of planning discussion. If the long-term recovery plan is going to take 3 people from Planning & Zoning, the higher level officials will need to address the need of additional staff or changing the prioritization of tasks that are completed elsewhere. He explained that is an issue in any recovery operation.

Mr. Cohen stated that by the next Steering Committee Meeting, the text that describes the long-term recovery function and planning section will be drafted and ready for review.

Mr. Cohen described the Logistics and Finance and Administration Sections. He explained that Logistics will basically follow the same organization as stated in the Fairfax County EOP. He explained that Logistics will track resources as they move through the system. They will also identify resource needs during recovery, which might be scaled down to just getting resources for the recovery agency itself. During response the county is intending to move towards single point ordering. During recovery, how resources are obtained will be through a multi-point ordering system. To the degree that those things are pushed in to operations, they are managing their own efforts. It becomes Logistics job to receive reports and track the resources, but they will not actually obtain and distribute resources.

Mr. Barbarie stated that logistics will be going from single point ordering to multi-point ordering, that is just making sure that logistics knows what the departments are ordering.

Mr. McKernan stated that OEM intends to utilize WebEOC to for that purpose.

Mr. Kirkpatrick asked if logistics will set up streamed lined protocols for purchasing during recovery.

Mr. Cohen stated that the conversations with the Department of Purchasing Management, their guidance was that during recovery, procurement would go back to normal. If you have a pre-existing contract, that puts the recovery in a better position, but during recovery the concern isn't so much life and safety, as it is just building things back, which would likely involve normal procurement and contracting.

Mr. McKernan stated that during the response there may be some lee way on how procurement and purchasing in handled. Once in recovery, the county will move back into normal procurement policies. We should check to see if there is a way to streamline procurement during recovery as well; it may be a gap that we need to address.

Mr. Cohen explained that one thing that logistics does it do prioritize ordering, if conflicts arise. Logistics would point out conflicts to command and prioritize resources as necessary,

this usually occurs during the response phase. Once in recovery, you have crossed the line of maintaining life and safety. That is when the procurement would go back to normal.

Ms. Phan asked if there any best practices for how to accelerate procurement when you aren't under emergency rules any longer.

Mr. Kirkpatrick described ways to expedite the procurement/purchasing process (design build (bill?)), the way things are set up with the county, there are a lot of check points with the BOS. The departments can try to get through the process as quick as possible, in this case; maybe something could be worked out with the BOS to streamline the process. He suggested a temporary arrangement with the board. If there are multiple projects, there would have to be prioritization.

Ms. Phan stated the planning team could perhaps coordinate something to facilitate that discussion pre-disaster so that the county is better prepared during a disaster.

Mr. Kirkpatrick stated that DPWES takes most of its guidance from DPSM. They have some authority that is delegated to DPWES for purchasing, but DPSM is one of the lead agencies for that. Once a certain threshold is reached, many of the contracted are not equipped to handle that scale of projects.

Ms. Phan stated that, when considering competing with other jurisdictions for contractors, the streamlined procurement process would become critical.

Mr. Cohen explained that procurement was one of the things discussed with OCA. He suggested identifying a suite of things that the BOS do to provide a stream lined or pre-approval of policies or procedure to expedite some of the necessary processes.

Mr. Kirkpatrick stated he is interested in seeing what other jurisdictions have done regarding modification of process for disaster recovery.

Mr. Lokey instructed the group that one of the areas is getting a management structure in place, so people in authority are getting the right information to make decisions. Regarding Public Works, California was able to work with the Federal Highway Admin, to develop incentives for highway contractors to shorten the time of construction. It is also important to have the authorities laid out pre-event, so the decisions can be made appropriately and expedited. The county should have to have the legal authority for say....purchasing of resources. FEMA will come down on the jurisdiction during the recovery reimbursement process if the jurisdiction doesn't follow appropriate legal authorities.

Mr. Kirkpatrick asked if the federal protocols will be part of the FEMA process.

Mr. Lokey answered that considerations such as environmental and historical issues must be addressed. He explained the governing polices and regulations which guide the FEMA Public Assistance process.

Ms. Phan explained that the planning team covers those issues during the development of the Liaison function. She stated that the planning team intends to meet with State and FEMA officials.

Mr. Cohen described the agencies which will serve as the Logistics staff, consisting of OEM and others as appropriate depending on the situation. The proposed organization structure will follow standard ICS, under facilities; logistics will be responsible for ensuring access and that they have ventilation etc.

Mr. McKernan suggested that additional agencies be added to the Logistics Section.

Mr. Lokey described the purpose of the Service branch. He stated the role of this branch is to provide food, water, etc. services to the recovery agency only, not the public. The public will be provided these services through a different function with the Operations Section.

Mr. Barbarie suggested that DPSM be part of the Logistics Section. OEM will probably be in Finance and Administration to track the costs, but DPSM might be a good fit because they can track the purchases made for countywide purposes.

Mr. Cohen provided clarification regarding the role of DPSM, he stated that DPSM suggested they would be a useful asset, but would not be appropriate as Section Chief. Mr. Barbarie brought up the point that the recovery organization will need to train people for the recovery organization during the actual recovery as well, to build depth of skills within the counties departments.

Mr. Cohen provided a description of the Finance and Administration Section's the organizational structure. He explained that the structure would follow the standard ICS structure, as described in the Fairfax County EOP, with an additional unit for Disaster Recovery Programs, which will handle the management of other sources for recovery funding such as CDBG, SBA, etc.

Mr. Cohen then asked the committee for additional questions or comments.

Ms. Phan asked Ms. Flynn asked if she thought Risk Management would have a role, similar to their role in the Financial Recovery Annex of the EOP, in being placed with that recovery agency to still work closely in dealing the management of recovery funding. (Risk management working with Diane)

Ms. Flynn replied that she thinks there would absolutely be a role. The claims unit is under the safety officer as well. But I think it applies here as well. She stated that the department performed that role through the recovery from the recent snow storms. The Claims function is placed under the Safety Officer in the ICS structure, so when you get to the safety officer portion, you need to make sure the two claims (occupational safety claims (for the EOC) vs. recovery funding reimbursement claims) functions should be differentiated.

Ms. Flynn explained that if her department's role is consistent with the existing County ICS structure, claims will go under the safety officer. In the recovery role, it would be better in the Finance and Administration Section.

Mr. Cohen suggested calling the unit within the Finance and Administration the Property Claims Unit.

Ms. Flynn agreed with Mr. Cohen's suggestion.

## **E. Next Steps**

Mr. Cohen provided a list of agencies which have been part of the planning process through interviews, meetings, and/or discussion. He also provided a list of ongoing outreach and the organizations which have participated. He explained that the additional meetings will include, FEMA, VDEM, NOVA regional agencies. These meetings will take place over the summer. He explained the additional outreach meetings will take place during the summer. He also stated that the planning process is now to the point where in depth discussion with the county executive is required. He stated that the planning team will also provide briefings to all of the agencies that are identified as lead and support, so they have another opportunity for input before the final draft is complete.

Ms. Phan explained the reason for the additional outreach, is because the public stakeholder meetings have been voluntary. Many agencies that are listed as support have not attended the meetings. The planning team will set up separate meetings for each recovery branch, so they are all aware of the functional role and are presented with a project overview. She urged the committee members to invite people within their organization that are interested in learning more about the PDRP and the planning process. She stated that this effort would also take place late this summer.

Mr. Heffern suggested that the planning team schedule the meeting with county departments and other organizations during August due to possible scheduling conflicts.

Ms. Phan replied she thought it would be appropriate to begin holding the meetings in September.

Mr. Cohen agreed that September would be a good timeframe in relation to the rest of the planning process.

Ms. Phan confirmed with the group that setting up meetings for the RFs in September was acceptable.

Mr. Turner asked how the military bases will fit into the PDRP.

Mr. McKernan replied the planning team has asked them to participate in a logistics and planning section drill. The response from the military facilities was if it is not an immediate

response, they would not be able to provide logistical resources. Federal and military assets are not allowed to go to state and local. That is role of the National Guard.

Mr. Sterne explained during any recovery, there may be issues for which they will want input.

Mr. Cohen provided clarification to the committee that the military would need to be invited as an external jurisdiction.

Ms. Phan explained the military facilities have been invited to the public stakeholder meetings, but have not participated. She stated she will work to try to get them involved.

Mr. Cohen provided an overview of the remaining PDRP materials to be drafted and reviewed. The table top exercise development will begin during mid-fall and take place sometime in January. The functional exercise will take place in Nov. or Dec.

Ms. Phan asked the committee for final questions and comments before the meeting is adjourned.

**Meeting Adjourned**