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INTRODUCTION

We live in a world with increasing threats and vulnerabilities to natural, technological, and manmade disasters. In addition to our Nation’s growing risks, changing demographic and economic characteristics challenge us to be better prepared and more resilient. As disasters become more frequent and severe all levels of government face pressure to respond efficiently and effectively. Local governments in particular are at the forefront. Emergency response begins at the local level with first responders, such as police officers or fire fighters when they arrive on the scene. When an event occurs, the local government is responsible for coordinating available resources while assessing the needs of the community. Depending on the scale of the event and capabilities of the local community, the state or federal government may be asked for assistance (Haddow, Bullock, & Coppola, 2008). While assistance from the state or federal government may be necessary, local governments lead the response efforts and need to be fully prepared.

Developing high quality emergency management plans to mitigate against, respond to, and recover from disasters can better prepare a community. Berke and Godschalk (2009) state that “if plans are to achieve their full potential, they should reflect the highest quality of thought and practice.” Moreover, researchers argue that inefficient emergency planning can lead to discrepancies in resources and procedures in local government response (Alexander, 2005). Scholars have studied the plan quality of hazard mitigation and recovery plans using principles derived from land use planning literature. However, response plans have not yet been studied using this plan quality analysis approach.

My research addresses the question: **What constitutes a high quality local government emergency management response plan?** To answer this question, I developed an evaluation tool (see Appendix B) to measure the quality of local government emergency management response plans. This study applies a similar methodology to plan quality studies that have been completed for hazard mitigation and disaster recovery plans (Berke, Smith & Lyles, 2011; Smith & Flatt, 2011). The evaluation tool that I developed is framed using plan quality principles derived from standards used in planning practice. Furthermore, the indicators in each principle were developed through an iterative process which I will explain in the Methodology section.

My research is intended to better inform researchers, practitioners, and policy makers as to what constitutes a high quality response plan. A detailed analysis of local government emergency management response plans has not been done before using this approach. As such, the results of this project will be useful to:

- practitioners and local government officials in developing or improving emergency response plans;
- scholars in studying the quality of response plans across jurisdictions;
- state and federal emergency management officials in providing plan development guidance and training for local governments; and
• policymakers at the local, state, and federal level to develop policies in emergency management response planning.

Recent response planning initiatives at the federal level indicate that federal support for response planning is increasing. The Post Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006 (PKEMRA) was enacted in response to the Federal Government’s shortfalls during Katrina. PKEMRA has pushed the federal government to emphasize deliberate (or proactive) planning in responding to catastrophic disasters. New and emerging FEMA doctrine such as the Comprehensive Preparedness Guide 101 (CPG 101) has provided guidance for state and local governments to develop response plans. Furthermore, Presidential Policy Directive 8 (PPD-8) was established in March 2011 to develop an integrated national planning system that covers preparedness, mitigation, response and recovery at the federal level. As a result, planning doctrine will be revised in the next couple of years to comply with PPD-8. Underlying this push in response planning at the federal level is the increasing importance of having high quality operational plans that enable effective and efficient response in any emergency. Increased preparedness at the local level can also decrease the need for resources from state and federal governments. My research is therefore timely and will further inform FEMA and emergency management practitioners about how to measure the quality of our Nation’s response plans.

LITERATURE REVIEW

RESPONSE PLANNING

Emergency Management is defined by four parts or phases: mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery. For the purposes of my research, I have focused on preparedness and response. However, response plans should integrate all phases of emergency management. This concept of integration is reflected in the evaluation tool.

Response includes the actions before and during an event to protect public safety and infrastructure (Perry & Lindell, 2007). In an event where the local government’s capabilities are insufficient and the costs of the impacts exceed those that the locality is able to bear financially, the state government is asked for assistance. If the state does not have the capacity to adequately respond to the disaster then a request is made to the President to make a declaration and provide federal government resources to the communities affected (Haddow, Bullock, & Coppola, 2008). While all levels of government are involved in disasters, my research focuses on local government emergency response plans because they are the first to respond and are responsible for all types of hazards at any scale.

Preparedness is the state of readiness to respond to any event. Much of preparedness involves developing and exercising or testing response plans (Haddow, Bullock, & Coppola, 2008). Planning is a continuous process that involves monitoring a community’s vulnerabilities, resources, and organizational structure and developing policies to be implemented during an event (Perry & Lindell, 2007). Plans help manage emergencies as well as better prepare our
communities for response. The written plan should be a dynamic document in which personnel are actively trained on its contents and the plan is exercised. Exercises enable a jurisdiction to evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of their plan, while testing the systems, facilities, and personnel involved in implementing the plan (Haddow, Bullock, & Coppola, 2008). Lessons learned from exercises should be reflected in an updated planning document to maintain an accurate and reliable plan which will increase the community’s readiness to respond.

Local government response plans are typically called Emergency Operations Plans (EOPs). The Federal Emergency Management Agency’s (FEMA’s) Comprehensive Preparedness Guide 101 (CPG 101) provides guidance to local governments in developing an EOP. CPG 101 outlines the traditional format of an EOP which includes a basic plan and specific annexes or appendices. The basic plan contains the purpose and scope of the plan as well as the jurisdiction’s risk assessment and information on plan development and maintenance. In addition, some details of response are included, such as roles and responsibilities, direction and control, and communications procedures. The annexes or appendices are varied depending on how the jurisdiction chooses to organize its resources, capabilities, and response operations (FEMA CPG 101, 2010). Furthermore, EOPs may have hazard-specific appendices if a jurisdiction is prone to a specific hazard.

Response planning presents challenges because it is two-fold: it includes both pre-event or deliberate planning and crisis action planning. Deliberate planning is the process of collaborating with stakeholders to develop and update the plan. In developing the plan, jurisdictions should understand their vulnerabilities and risks to hazards, the available and required capabilities needed for response, and how to fill gaps in resources required to meet local needs in the aftermath of an emergency or disaster. Deliberate planning should influence and inform the policies addressed in the crisis action element. Crisis action planning includes the policies or actions that will be implemented in an event, such as public warning systems or evaluation routes. This also includes continuously updating the community’s situational awareness to create strategic plans during an event as required. Both deliberate and crisis action planning should be adaptable and flexible to meet the varying needs of each event.

**Plan Quality**

Plan quality principles derived from land use planning have influenced the development and application of important measurement tools. Many of these studies have applied plan quality principles to emergency management plans such as mitigation and recovery (Berke, 1994; Berke, 1996; Berke, Smith, & Lyles, 2011; Smith & Flatt, 2011). Until now, however, none have applied plan quality principles to response plans. These principles are continuing to evolve as plan quality studies mature and their significance gains support from government officials. Through a meta-analysis of plan quality studies, Berke and Godschalk (2009) identified two conceptual dimensions used in plan quality evaluation—internal and external plan quality. Internal plan quality includes the key components of a plan—vision statement, fact base, goals, policies, implementation, monitoring and internal consistency. External plan quality focuses on
maximizing the use and influence of the plan; including the organization and presentation of the plan itself, inter-organizational coordination, and consistency with federal and state mandates.

Berke has further brought the concepts of internal and external plan quality dimensions to life by redefining the principles as direction-setting or action-oriented. Direction-setting principles are the fundamental aspects of the plan that are driven by the alignment of community vulnerabilities, capabilities, goals and actions. Action-oriented principles involve plan development (the planning process) and its use. Table 1 outlines the principles within each category based on plan quality literature by Berke & Godschalk (2009); Berke, Smith, & Lyles (2011); and Smith & Flatt (2011). I have explored the applicability of these principles in my research and will further analyze each principle as it relates to response plans in the *Analysis* section.

**Table 1: Plan Quality Principles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction-Setting</th>
<th>Identification and Vision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification and Vision</td>
<td>Identification provides the basic information of the evaluation and the plan document such as the jurisdiction and date of the plan. The vision defines the themes and intent of the plan. It should set the stage for the plan and its policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fact Base</td>
<td>The fact base is an analysis of current and future vulnerabilities including population, natural environment, and infrastructure. Additionally, the fact base should include an assessment of the community’s capabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Goals state desired outcomes or conditions. They provide a framework for the policies and actions of the local jurisdiction in response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>Policies are intended to guide decisions during an incident. They should be aligned with specific actions that help achieve the plan’s goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action-Oriented</td>
<td>Participation includes the persons and organizations involved in preparing the plan. This includes other government agencies and departments, and non-profit and private sectors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Conversation with Dr. Philip Berke on September 13, 2011.
Inter-organizational Coordination is the horizontal and vertical integration of organizations involved in response. This includes organizations on a horizontal axis such as government entities, neighboring jurisdictions, private sector, non-profit sector, and community organizations and on a vertical axis such as state or federal agencies. In addition, this section includes the alignment of policies and plans across emergency management sectors (hazard mitigation, preparedness, and recovery) and at the federal and state levels.

Implementation involves executing the policies and actions outlined in the plan. This is measured through the identification of resources and roles and responsibilities of different organizations and persons in response. Implementation also includes plan clarity which is measured by the organization and presentation of the plan document.

Monitoring and Evaluation involves exercising or testing the plan to assess the effectiveness and feasibility of response policies. It also includes updating the plan based on changes in the fact base or goals and feedback from exercises or a real-life incident. Furthermore, it involves identifying those responsible for monitoring, evaluating, and updating the plan to increase accountability in maintaining an accurate and reliable plan document.

As mentioned, the principles defined in Table 1 have been derived from land use planning practices. A disconnect often exists between emergency management and land use planning. Land use planners have tools, methods, and processes that have been refined and shaped over time, but they are often overlooked when developing emergency plans. This relationship can be improved through collaborative planning practices (Pine, 2009). My research also shows how the field of emergency management can learn from land use planning in developing higher quality plans.

**Addressing Plan Quality in Response Plans**

Alexander (2005) argues that a higher quality response plan can help increase the effectiveness of a local government in responding to an emergency. A detailed tool to measure the quality of local government emergency management response plans based on planning principles has not
been done before. In order to develop a sound tool, my research draws on the plan quality literature as well as national response policies and programs.

Perry & Lindell (2003) synthesize previous response planning literature in providing guidelines for the response planning process. They argue that practitioners should focus on the planning process, and not simply the plan itself. While my research focuses on the plan document, an evaluation of the planning process is embedded within the principles listed in Table 1 and thus the evaluation tool. Alexander (2005) developed a list of standards for an emergency planning evaluative approach and, based on his criteria, created a list of categories to evaluate the quality of emergency plans (see Appendix C for a description of the standards and categories). My evaluation tool is grounded in Alexander’s proposed standards and principles, but I have further expanded upon his ideas. For example, he argues that the plan must be grounded in research, including the future impacts of hazards and a full audit of capabilities. My evaluation tool expands upon this concept in the Fact Base section by listing specific indicators for a jurisdiction to include in their plan (such as the exposure of socially vulnerable populations and critical infrastructure to hazards). Table 2 outlines the categories in which Alexander developed a checklist to evaluate response plans and how my evaluation tool has built on his research.

Table 2: Expansion of Alexander’s Evaluation Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alexander’s Categories</th>
<th>My Evaluation Tool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legislative and Organizational Context</td>
<td>This covers policies and legal frameworks within the jurisdiction for the plan. This information is embedded within the capability assessment of my evaluation tool. I have expanded this section to include federal, state, and local policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of Objectives</td>
<td>This is a broad category that involves general objectives of the plan. Through my research, I have defined important goals in response; those include protecting the lives of the public and first responders, effective communication and coordination, and ensuring continuity of government. These goals should guide the policies and actions in response operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazard, Vulnerability and Risk Analysis</td>
<td>This category is in line with what I have put forward in my evaluation tool. Alexander’s evaluation checklist includes identifying the hazards in which a jurisdiction is at risk, causes and impacts of hazards, the likelihood of future occurrences, and past history of events. My research, however, expands on the vulnerability assessment in identifying specific components of a community that are susceptible to hazards; such as socially vulnerable populations, and government services and infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Logistics

Logistics include command structures, resources, communications systems, and other critical services. I have portrayed these elements as critical in the capability assessment and the policies section of my evaluation tool. Whereas the capability assessment identifies what the jurisdiction has available or has pre-determined as a need in response, the policies represent the immediate actions of the jurisdiction in response while using those capabilities. Understanding the capabilities will enable effective policies to be made in response, thus these critical logistics are addressed in both sections.

Recovery of Infrastructure and Basic Services (Plans for Specific Sectors)

The restoration of infrastructure and basic services is a critical policy issue in disaster response because it involves the transition from response to recovery. I have expanded this policy to also include transitional housing, reentry policies, and debris removal. In addition, throughout the evaluation tool, I address the coordination of different plans.

Arrangements

Alexander argues that plans need to be tested, updated, and disseminated appropriately. The Monitoring and Evaluation section of my evaluation tool addresses these elements, however I expand on this further to include more detailed information on exercises, plan evaluation, and updating protocols.

Alexander’s research begins to uncover critical elements that should be addressed in a response plan evaluation tool. As discussed in Table 2, my response plan evaluation tool is more comprehensive, but uses Alexander’s research as a foundation.

The federal government has taken some steps to improve and evaluate response plan quality. As mentioned, FEMA doctrine such as the Comprehensive Preparedness Guide 101 has provided guidance for state and local governments to develop response plans. While this doctrine is helpful for practitioners, it is only a guidance document and does not provide sufficient information on determining the quality of a plan. FEMA’s National Response Framework, however, defines criteria to measure key aspects of response planning; those include acceptability, adequacy, completeness, consistency and standardization of products, feasibility, flexibility, and interoperability and collaboration (see Appendix C for more detailed information on each criteria) (GAO, 2010). This criterion also provides a foundation for my research and both CPG 101 and NRF are used in the development of the evaluation tool. While the NRF criteria are relevant and important to response planning, they are broad and do not provide clear evaluation measures that would adequately determine the quality of a local government emergency management response plan. The criteria include the plan’s compliance with policies, collaborative planning processes with stakeholders, flexible policies in that the
plan can adapt to different incidents, and an accurate identification of available and required resources. My evaluation tool is grounded in these concepts. However, I wanted to create a tool that would provide a more detailed outline of the measures in which a plan should be evaluated.

Moreover, a second review of response plans was completed by the Department of Homeland Security in 2010 (the first review was in 2006). The Nationwide Plan Review covered all states’ and 75 major cities’ emergency operation plans (response plans) and involved two steps: a self-assessment by the state or city and an assessment by FEMA regions. The evaluation tool was based on CPG 101. The evaluation asked if different sections of the plan met CPG 101 criteria (“yes” or “no”); those sections include the basic plan, functional appendices (such as warning, health and medical, and recovery), and hazard-specific annexes. However, the CPG 101 criteria are not clear. The questionnaire then asks, on a five point scale, if the plan is adequate, feasible, or complete. The Nationwide Plan Review is the only response plan review completed at the federal level in which state and local response plans have been measured. The review was comprehensive in that it evaluated plans across the nation and covers critical topics, however, the criteria was unclear, the questions were subjective in nature, and the data could easily be skewed based on the evaluator. My evaluation tool provides specific indicators of those items that a plan should include. I believe that this helps to measure plan quality more objectively and provides clear distinctions on how a plan can be improved.

The Emergency Management Accreditation Program (EMAP) is a non-profit, standard-based voluntary assessment and peer review accreditation process for government programs responsible for coordinating prevention, mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery activities for natural and human-caused hazards. The EMAP accreditation process is nationally recognized, though few local jurisdictions and state governments have been certified. Accreditation is based on compliance with a collaboratively developed national standard, titled the Emergency Management Standard. The Emergency Management Standard requires that response plans address plan purpose and scope, authority, situation and assumptions, roles and responsibilities, logistics and resources, concept of operations and plan maintenance. This information is similar to what is outlined in CPG 101. However, this is simply a list of topics to be included. The criteria do not address any specifics to adequately evaluate a response plan. As mentioned, the evaluation tool in which I developed expands on these topics and provides a more in depth look at what local governments should evaluate and depict in their response plans.

Emergency management practitioners often do not know the quality of their plans (Alexander, 2005). Evaluating plan quality can identify strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities for improvement (Berke & Godschalk, 2009). My research is intended to fill the gaps in the response planning literature by identifying specific indicators that help determine what elements are important in a high quality plan. I do not believe that the response planning evaluation literature referenced above would provide sufficient feedback for local governments to evaluate and improve the quality of their response plans. I would consider the NRF criteria, Nationwide Plan Review questions, and EMAP Standard as a framework for response plans.
rather than a tool to evaluate the quality of the plan. However, I have used this literature as a foundation for my evaluation tool. Furthermore, Alexander’s research begins to identify necessary elements of a response plan, but I have taken it a step further, as I discuss in the Methodology and Analysis sections.

**Methodology**

I have developed a tool that measures plan quality in local government emergency management response plans (see Appendix B). The measurement tool is framed using the plan quality principles described in Table 1. Specific indicators for each principle were developed through an iterative process of synthesizing literature, evaluating existing plans, and collecting expert feedback. Figure 1 depicts the process in which I developed the evaluation tool.

Figure 1: Methodology

The first phase represents a synthesis of response planning literature, government documents, and example plans (literature by topic is listed in Appendix A). I began populating the planning principles with research findings from the emergency response field. I then read and analyzed government documents such as Federal Emergency Management Agency’s Comprehensive Preparedness Guide 101 and the National Response Framework to gain more insight into what should be included in a response plan. Lastly, I reviewed two Emergency Operations Plans in North Carolina, including Dare County and Wake County. After this initial research, I went back to other scholarly work and started the process again. Once I felt that the indicators were repeating themselves, I created the first draft of the evaluation tool in Microsoft Excel.
My evaluation tool applies a research technique called content analysis. Content analysis is an established methodology used in multiple disciplines such as communications, journalism, and social sciences across a variety of means including newspapers and plans (Krippendorf, 2004). My research uses two scales to measure the content of a response plan; a 0 to 1 binary scale or a 0 to 2 ordinal scale. This measurement system has been used in previous plan quality studies (Berke, 1994; Berke, 1996; Berke & Godschalk, 2009; Berke et. al, 2011; Smith & Flatt, 2011). The binary scale is simple: a 0 indicates that the item is present in the plan while a 1 indicates that the item is not present. The ordinal scale involves marking a 0 if the item is not present, 1 if it is mentioned and 2 if the item is provided in detail (Smith & Flatt, 2011).

After the first draft was complete, I tested the evaluation tool on three North Carolina local government response plans. The purpose of using the evaluation tool on three plans was to test its applicability to local government emergency management response plans and its usability among potential evaluators. I used North Carolina plans for the review and testing phases, in part, because North Carolina is nationally recognized as a state with a strong emphasis on training local emergency managers. North Carolina also has frequent flooding, severe storms, and tornadoes and a diverse terrain; the eastern part of the state borders the ocean, the western part is in the mountains, and the central part is the more urbanized piedmont region. In addition, as a graduate student at the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, and one that has reached out to the state’s emergency management community while working in the Department of Homeland Security Center of Excellence – Coastal Hazard Center, it has been easier to obtain the plans necessary for my research.

The three plans I chose to test the evaluation tool include Hyde County, Watauga County, and Winston-Salem/Forsyth County. I chose these based on their differing locations throughout the state; Hyde County borders the ocean, Watauga County is in the mountains, and Winston-Salem/Forsyth County is located in the piedmont. I also chose Winston-Salem/Forsyth County because the City of Winston-Salem Emergency Management Department operates collaboratively with Forsyth County. Moreover, Winston-Salem is one of the largest urban areas in the state.

I evaluated Hyde County first and then refined the tool based on that experience. I then used the updated tool to evaluate Watauga County and repeated the same process with the third plan. As I marked the indicators in the evaluation tool, I became more confident in the tool itself. After each plan, I developed a list of changes to the tool and items to think about when evaluating the following plan.

In the last phase, I asked four experts in the field to evaluate the tool. (Note: I received a determination from UNC’s Office of Human Research Ethics that my research does not require Institutional Review Board approval). I chose three practitioners with varied experience in the public and private sectors as well as one hazard scholar. The four expert reviewers included:

- Scott Wells: former FEMA coordinating officer who has worked at the federal level creating policy doctrine for response planning. Mr. Wells is currently a private consultant.
• Ellis Stanley: Emergency manager with over 35 years of experience in local governments including serving as the General Manager of the City of Los Angeles’ Emergency Preparedness Department.
• Sandy Sanderson: Emergency Management Coordinator for Dare County, North Carolina.
• Dr. David McEntire: Professor at the University of North Texas. His research and classroom teaching focuses on emergency management.

Appendix D includes detailed reviewer biographies, the guidance documents the reviewers received to prompt their feedback, and the reviewer comments on my evaluation tool. During this phase, I also completed an analysis of the tool to understand where concepts overlap and to remove redundancies throughout the evaluation tool (see Appendix 2 of the evaluation tool located in Appendix B). Improvements were made based on the expert feedback and my analysis of the tool, and the evaluation tool was finalized.

**ANALYSIS: DEVELOPMENT OF THE PLAN QUALITY TOOL**

The complete response plan evaluation tool is located in Appendix B. The tool includes a section for each planning principle identified in Table 1. Principles include Identification and Vision, Fact Base, Goals, Policies, Participation, Inter-organizational Coordination, Implementation, and Monitoring and Evaluating. I added a final section for the evaluator to identify any best practices in the plan. The tool also includes general instructions for the plan evaluator, a definitions section to clarify the language used in plans, and a guide that provides information on the indicators that are located in more than one section. Each section has subsections and within those subsections are indicators. For example, Section 2: Fact Base has subsections 2.1 to 2.5. Subsection 2.1: Existing Conditions contains indicators such as Geographic Extent, General Population and Economic Characteristics. The plan is evaluated based on the indicators present or not present in the plan.

The principles used are grounded in land use planning and my evaluation tool shows that these plan quality principles can be translated to response planning. An emergency response plan, similar to a comprehensive plan, should be driven by an overall vision, supported by goals and clear objectives or actionable items. Prior to developing goals and policies, a jurisdiction needs to understand its risks to natural hazards, technological accidents, and acts of terrorism and the impacts of those risks on the existing environment. The jurisdiction should also be aware of the capabilities it needs for an efficient and effective response. Moreover, the plan should include coordination and collaboration with varying agencies in plan participation, implementation, and evaluation. These basic planning concepts are critical in response planning and important in developing a high quality response plan. Creating the evaluation tool through these principles, however, does not indicate that this is the ‘best way’ to evaluate local government plans. This notion will be further explored in greater detail in the Issues and Limitations section.
The following sections provide an explanation for the specific indicators in the local government emergency management response plan evaluation tool.

**DIRECTION-SETTING**

**FACT BASE**

The *Fact Base* represents foundational elements of the plan which includes the critical information collected and analyzed on the jurisdiction’s current conditions and future threats. The response planning literature has described this information as ‘understanding the situation’ (FEMA CGP 101 & RPG, 2010) and these elements are typically addressed in the base plan section of an Emergency Operations Plan under ‘Situation.’

The *Fact Base* (as defined in the plan quality evaluation tool) is divided into four sections: existing conditions, vulnerability assessment, hazard identification and risk assessment, and capability assessment. Perry and Lindell (2003) argue that preparedness results from understanding a community’s vulnerability to all types of disasters, the potential impacts, and the community’s capabilities to deploy resources for response and recovery. The *Fact Base* expands upon these concepts and provides a more detailed list of the information in which a jurisdiction should assess.

**Existing Conditions.** Existing conditions is an assessment of the jurisdiction’s demographic, geographic, and economic characteristics. Demographic information should include the total population and annual growth rate, age distribution, median income, race and ethnicity. This section should also include a detailed description of the geographic areas affected by hazards. Including maps of those areas provides the jurisdiction with a greater understanding of what happens where, and who and what could be impacted.

The economic characteristics and land use trends of the jurisdiction should also be assessed. What types of industry are located in the community? Does the jurisdiction rely heavily on agriculture or manufacturing? A community also needs to understand the spatial components of population density, major highways and transportation routes, in addition to the location of new development and those areas that are more prone to disasters. This information will be critical in developing transportation, evacuation, and sheltering plans for response.

**Vulnerability Assessment.** The vulnerability assessment addresses specific components of a community that are susceptible to hazards. A significant concern for communities, and a recognized limitation in many planning processes by the academic community, is the safety and security of socially vulnerable populations (Perry & Lindell, 2007). Those populations include elderly persons, children, those with disabilities, low-income, and persons that lack proficiency in English. Aging populations, for example, can pose new medical and transportation problems for a community. Other vulnerable populations include persons without automobiles and
household pets and service animals. Animals that have been left during evacuations have caused major problems during and after an event (FEMA IS-10.a, 2010). Moreover, persons may not want to evacuate without their pets, thus sheltering should be arranged to accommodate these persons (McEntire, 2007).

Beyond the population, the vulnerabilities of government services and infrastructure should be analyzed. Are the community’s sanitation and law enforcement services vulnerable to varying levels of disasters? How would critical facilities such as hospitals, bridges, schools, and treatment plants be impacted? How would the water, sewer, electric power, and telecommunications systems withstand an event? Furthermore, how does the vulnerability of these systems affect the ability of first responders to perform key response activities such as search and rescue, the delivery of water and food, and the provision of emergency shelter?

**Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment.** One of the most critical components is identifying the natural, technological, and manmade hazards in which a community is at risk. Those hazards could include flooding, hurricanes, earthquakes, tornadoes, winter storms, pandemic influenza, terrorist attacks, dam failure, and chemical spills. Pine (2009) defines risk as the product of the probability of occurrence and its consequences. A local government should, therefore, assess each identified hazard based on its likelihood of occurrence and the projected estimated impacts on its community (Pine, 2009). Hazards should be prioritized based on this risk assessment. Hazard identification and risk assessment enables the local government to assess the capabilities needed for response, actions taken to offset any cascading effects of the hazard (such as erosion, landslides, and dam or levee failure), and ensure public safety.

**Capability Assessment.** The capability assessment addresses the legal, administrative, and technical abilities of the local government (Smith, 2011) and the evaluation of existing state, federal, and national policies, programs, and laws and how they effect a local government’s ability to respond to a disaster. In the case of response, the capability assessment also involves the jurisdiction’s analysis of their available and required resources to respond efficiently and effectively in different disaster scenarios (FEMA Regional Planning Guide, 2011). Resources include budgetary allocations such as the general operations budget and reserve funds; equipment, vehicles, and supplies including communications equipment, sandbags, traffic barricades, and environmental monitoring equipment; emergency operations centers, assembly and staging areas, and other facilities; first responder units (police, fire, and emergency medical services) and the vehicles, personnel, and other capabilities of those units; and sheltering capabilities. Assessing the required versus available capabilities will provide a basis for the jurisdiction to determine the resource gaps. The resource gaps should be filled through mutual aid and pre-positioned agreements with other jurisdictions, private sector agencies, non-profit organizations, community organizations, or educational institutions.

Other necessary local government capabilities include the organization of an emergency operations center. Furthermore, training programs for emergency management personnel, first responders, and others is critical. Training will not only increase preparedness for response, but it will also maintain the safety of persons during an event.
State and federal governments are involved in response when a local government does not have the capacity to respond with its own resources. Funding, personnel (such as trained emergency response teams), and equipment may be requested from the state and federal government with the appropriate procedures. The jurisdiction should assess the programs and procedures in which it can receive funding prior to, during, or after a disaster. National policies and standards such as the Incident Command System, National Incident Management System, and the Emergency Management Accreditation Program (EMAP) are important to recognize because they provide information on the jurisdiction’s organization during response, their eligibility to apply for specific funding, and whether or not the jurisdiction meets nationally recognized standards.

VISION AND GOALS

For the purposes of this paper, the vision and goals are combined into one section because their explanation is similar. FEMA’s Comprehensive Preparedness Guide 101 states that plans should clearly identify a mission and goals. The mission, or vision, of a response plan should guide the overall response. That vision should be clear and concise and set the stage for the plan. Goals state the desired outcomes or conditions during and after an event. The stakeholders involved in the planning process should develop the goals to provide a framework for the policies and actions of the local jurisdiction in response (Smith & Flatt, 2011). The goals listed in the evaluation tool progress from immediate response to the community’s transition to recovery and demobilizing response operations or returning back to normal operating conditions. The response goals include protecting the lives and well being of the public and first responders, maintaining ample communications systems and internal and external coordination, and collecting information continuously to perform assessments. Other goals include stabilizing the incident, protecting the environment, ensuring continuity of government, supporting transition to recovery, and demobilizing response operations.

POLICIES

The Fact Base, Vision and Goals are the foundational elements of the plan (Berke & Godschalk, 2009). The jurisdiction should collect information, complete an analysis on its current conditions, potential threats, and projected impacts, and then develop a vision and goals for a positive, effective, and efficient response. Those sections should inform the Policies. The Policies are the actions intended to guide decisions during an incident. Although overlap exists in the indicators of the Fact Base and Policies sections of the tool, they represent different aspects of response planning and operations. Whereas the capability assessment identifies what the jurisdiction has available or has pre-determined as a need in response, the policies represent the immediate actions of the jurisdiction in response while using those capabilities. The existing conditions, vulnerability assessment, and hazard identification should provide a
framework for the policies in that the jurisdiction and should be prepared to target specific areas, socially vulnerable persons, or critical infrastructure.

The evaluation tool aligns the goals with the policies to encourage internal consistency in the plan document and provide a basis for the jurisdiction to achieve its goals. At least one policy should exist within each goal. The next several paragraphs describe policies that should be addressed in local government response plans.

Protecting and saving the lives of the public is typically the most important goal of a local government in responding to an incident. The safety and security of the public includes both physical and mental health policies such as evacuation and sheltering, medical care including feeding and hydration, search and rescue, disease prevention and control, and crisis counseling. Evacuation and sheltering should also include procedures for household pets and service animals.

Efficient and effective communication is imperative during an emergency (FEMA National Preparedness Goal, 2011). Communication systems are used to effectively relay information to the public and emergency management personnel regarding any threat or hazard and, as appropriate, the actions being taken, and the assistance available. The messages should be clear, concise, and accessible to the whole community, including socially vulnerable populations such as persons who do not speak English (FEMA National Preparedness Goal, 2011). Local governments use public warning systems such as sirens, telephones, broadcast media, and emergency alert systems. The jurisdiction should also have procedures in place for emergency personnel to communicate with one another and the emergency operation center. Aside from verbal communication, field guides and checklists can be provided to personnel to ensure their duties are adequately performed. Furthermore, a jurisdiction should have policies in place to manage the media, including controlling rumors. The media can provide a positive outlet for local government during a disaster, however, it can also negatively impact the public if the wrong information is conveyed (Haddow, Bullock, & Coppola, 2008; McEntire, 2007).

Coordination is a critical element of response. For the purposes of my research, coordination includes both internally within the emergency management agency or jurisdiction and externally to other levels of government and the private and non-profit sectors. Internal coordination involves designating who is in charge, how the operations centers are activated, and what is the command system to be used in response. During response, a jurisdiction needs to match urgent needs with appropriate resources. This can be done through managing the available resources and requesting resources from other jurisdictions, state or federal governments (if the appropriate declaration protocols are in place), or private and non-profit sectors. Mutual aid and pre-positioned agreements should be made in advance to increase the possibility of acquiring necessary resources during and after an event (McEntire, 2007).

Throughout a response operation, the division in charge will need to conduct situational assessments to understand who and what has been impacted, what is the current status of the hazard or threat, where the resources have been deployed, what resources are still available,
and where resources need to go. Continuously collecting the appropriate information will better inform decision-makers ultimately impacting the decisions made in the field during a response.

Emergency management agencies often indicate that response ends and recovery begins when the emergency operation center is deactivated. However, this transition is not necessarily that clear cut. Response plans should specify policies to support a successful transition to recovery. These policies should focus on enabling the community to restore basic services and community functionality, including the restoration of energy and utilities, debris removal, and stabilizing transportation corridors. Furthermore, the response plan should address short term housing issues such as providing transitional housing and relocation assistance.

The Policies should answer the question: what needs to happen in order for an effective and efficient response operation to take place. While the policies need to be clear and detailed to minimize confusion during a disaster, they also need to be flexible and adaptable to allow for unforeseen contingencies.

**ACTION ORIENTED**

**PARTICIPATION**

The planning process is as important as the plan itself and should be described in the plan document. Participation includes the persons and organizations involved in preparing the plan. Stakeholders play a significant role in plan development and implementation. The planning process includes coordinating resources and assigning roles and responsibilities to implement response policies. The appropriate stakeholder involvement will increase the local government’s access to resources, buy-in of the plan, and better prepare those involved in implementation during response (FEMA CPG 101, 2010).

Participation should include representatives from local government agencies and departments such as emergency management, budget and finance, economic development, fire, police, higher education, emergency medical services, public health, public works, school district, social services, and transportation. State and Federal agencies such as the State and Federal Emergency Management Agencies, State and U.S. Department of Transportation, National Weather Service, and Military may also participate in the planning process. Other participants may include representatives from the general public, non-profit organizations such as the American Red Cross, and private sector agencies such as contractors, the media and home improvement retailers.
Inter-organizational Coordination

Inter-organizational Coordination is critical in response operations and thus should be reflected in any response plan (Perry & Lindell, 2003). For the purpose of my evaluation tool, I have defined inter-organizational coordination as the collaboration of efforts within the emergency management organization as well as those outside of the organization on both a horizontal and vertical axis. This phenomenon is typically called horizontal and vertical integration and has been applied to hazard mitigation (Berke, Smith, & Lyles, 2011) and disaster recovery (Smith & Flatt, 2011; Smith, 2011) plan quality studies.

Horizontal coordination refers to relationships across a horizontal axis; those include government entities, neighboring jurisdictions, private sector, non-profit sector, and community organizations such as faith-based organizations or neighborhood groups (Berke, Smith, & Lyles, 2011; Smith 2011). Developing an understanding for shared resources through mutual aid or pre-positioned agreements will greatly benefit the region as a whole in responding to a disaster. Neighboring jurisdictions, for example, can provide personnel and equipment to remove debris or restore energy and utility services. Non-profits such as the American Red Cross can have agreements with local governments to manage volunteers and donations. Furthermore, the local government should consider collaborating with these entities on developing emergency plans, training emergency personnel, and completing exercises to further increase community preparedness.

Vertical coordination refers to relationships to the jurisdiction on vertical scale; those include state or federal organizations (Berke, Smith, & Lyles, 2011; Smith & Flatt 2011). State and Federal Governments can provide necessary resources to local governments. Coordinating with State and Federal plans will enable the local government to comply with the appropriate standards and procedures. In addition, the jurisdiction will have an understanding of the State and Federal Governments’ roles and responsibilities in response. The local government should also coordinate with state agencies such as the State Emergency Management Agency and State Department of Transportation and federal agencies such as FEMA, the National Guard, and the National Weather Service in response.

Implementation

Implementation involves executing the policies and actions outlined in the plan. For the purposes of my research, implementation is measured through the identification of roles and responsibilities of individuals and agencies and the organization and presentation of the plan document itself. Clearly identifying the roles and activities of each and every participant in response will help avoid uncertainties during an event and can be used to hold those responsible for implementation accountable over time (Alexander, 2005).
National policies such as the National Response Framework (NRF) and Incident Command System (ICS) provide ways in which local communities can organize response efforts and designate responsibilities in their response plans. The NRF groups federal resources and capabilities into functional areas that are most frequently needed in responding to an event. These are referred to as Emergency Support Functions (ESFs). Examples include transportation, communications, emergency management, and public health and medical services. Some local jurisdictions have adopted this format to organize their resources and capabilities. Functional or Support Annexes are similar to ESFs and provide another way in which jurisdictions can organize their response operations. Lastly, the ICS is a standardized organizational structure that is intended to help coordinate response activities among responders. The ICS is divided into four sections (operations, planning, logistics, and administration/finance) and response plans may follow this format.

The evaluation tool recognizes that a jurisdiction will determine how to organize its response plan. The critical element is that the plan designates who is responsible for specific response operations. Furthermore, local governments should provide a list of responsibilities for specific persons such as the sheriff or police chief, emergency management coordinator, public works director, and public health director.

To implement a plan it must be clear and concise for its users. Plan clarity includes plan contents such as an executive summary, table of contents, plan purpose, glossary of terms, and type of plan or approach (such as an all-hazards or capabilities-based approach). The distribution and accessibility of the plan enables those responsible in response operations as well as the general public to be able to read the plan. Plan implementation also involves training administration and personnel, elected officials, first responders, the general public, and volunteer groups on the plan and its policies (Perry & Lindell, 2003).

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

Including procedures to monitor, evaluate, and update the plan will increase its applicability and use. Moreover, developing clear measures of plan implementation allow for the tracking of compliance over time. In the response planning field, exercising or testing a response plan ensures that roles and responsibilities are clear and concise, policies and procedures are effective, and shortfalls in capabilities are addressed. Exercises range from small scale drills to discussion-based procedures called tabletop exercises, and to more comprehensive and time intensive functional and full-scale exercises (Haddow, Bullock, & Coppola, 2008). Feedback and lessons learned from these exercises should be incorporated into the plan.

In addition to completing exercises, a plan should have procedures in place to evaluate its progress over time. Changes in a community’s threats to hazards, vulnerabilities, and capabilities need to be reflected in the plan. Outlining who is responsible and how often the plan is evaluated will help to ensure that the plan will be continuously updated. Furthermore,
the response plan should be updated after a disaster. The event will enable the local government to evaluate its response operations during a real-life situation and provide valuable feedback to the response plan. *Monitoring and Evaluation* bring the plan to life, making it a dynamic document that does not collect dust on a shelf.

**Issues and Limitations**

Developing an evaluation tool to measure the quality of local government emergency management response plans presents a number of issues and challenges. To begin with, the quality of the plan document does not necessarily indicate a high or low success rate in response operations as the tool has not been used to assess the relationship between plan quality and the quality of response operations (a potential area of future study). A number of factors contribute to a successful response and a single assessment of a jurisdiction’s response plan may not adequately reflect all of these elements during a real-life incident. For example, a community may have a detailed plan, but no capacity to implement the policies. Or a community may not have a written plan, but due to strong leadership and cooperation it may be more resilient and able to adapt during a disaster. However, this evaluation tool is designed to include all aspects of response. The tool evaluates whether response plans include participants in the planning process, roles and responsibilities in implementation, inter-organizational coordination, and protocols to exercise and update the plans. These elements, along with policies that are grounded in the fact base, all have an impact on the success of response and should be included in the plan document.

A second issue with the evaluation tool is the weighting of indicators. As mentioned in the Methodology section, my tool uses binary and ordinal scales. While the scaling may imply that each item is of equal weight, this is not the case. However, as discussed in the Next Steps and Future Directions section, more empirical data (such as example response plans) and resources would be required to develop a scale that would adequately prioritize the critical elements in a response plan. I chose to simplify my approach to avoid random or arbitrary decision making in creating the tool. The use of these two scales has been successful in previous plan quality studies and it serves the purposes of this evaluation tool. In addition, practitioners will use this evaluation tool as a checklist to measure the quality of their own plans. The equal weighting enables the tool to provide a comprehensive set of indicators which will help practitioners understand the strengths and shortfalls of their response plans.

In scoring the indicators it also appears that the absence of an item would indicate that the plan is of poor quality. While in many cases this may in fact be true, this is not always the case. Each section needs to be reviewed as a whole because some items relate to one another. For example, in the Vulnerability Assessment section under Section 2: Fact Base, one indicator reads “Plan references mitigation plan or other relevant resource for a detailed vulnerability assessment.” If the plan does reference another resource that has a detailed vulnerability assessment then the vulnerabilities may not be discussed in the plan at all. The fact that the vulnerability assessment is absent from the plan is not important and does not indicate that this
plan is of poor quality since the plan indicated that a vulnerability assessment was completed in another plan (the same is true for the Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment section). The question then becomes, is the referenced information used to guide the development of appropriate response policies? And are those assigned this task held accountable as part of a rigorous monitoring and implementation process? In addition, the community’s assets need to be taken into consideration. For example, a community might not be eligible for an Urban Areas Security Initiative grant from the federal government and therefore would not receive a score for that indicator.

Through my research I uncovered the complexities of developing an evaluation tool for local government response plans. I developed my tool based on the principles derived from planning practice. The specific indicators in the evaluation tool were developed through a synthesis of response planning literature, evaluation plans, and expert input. This was successful for the purposes of my research. However, I have considered other ways to organize a response plan evaluation tool if given the time and resources to continue this further. The first would include developing an evaluation tool based on the traditional organization of Emergency Operations Plans (as described in the Literature Review section). I would develop the tool to include sections for each part of the plan - the Base Plan, ESF Annexes, Support Annexes, and Hazard Specific Annexes. The same indicators would be used, but some would be repeated in each section and others would be section specific (such as certain policies). Another way in which a tool could be organized would require more empirical data and resources to define the most important components of a response plan. This approach would be more concise and succinct, focusing on critical elements that should be addressed rather than a comprehensive list of indicators.

**Next Steps and Future Directions**

The purpose of the response plan evaluation tool is to better inform researchers, practitioners, and policy makers as to what constitutes a high quality response plan. I intentionally developed a comprehensive tool that includes the development, implementation, and revision of the plan document itself in addition to critical response policies. All aspects of response planning are included to broaden the scope of the tool’s potential. The following sections outline future research opportunities and practical applications of the evaluation tool and my research.

**Research**

The evaluation tool can be used to analyze the quality of response plans individually as part of a practice-based effort and across jurisdictions. Studies can be designed to include jurisdictions within a state or region or throughout the United States. This approach would allow for a larger comparative analysis tied to a set of established dependent and independent variables. A larger sample size (in terms of the number of plans evaluated) would increase the value added
to the field in that the results would capture the weaknesses and strengths in response plans across a geographic region and allow for statistical inferences across identified variables. Using the tool in this manner requires an appropriate research design and the training of individuals responsible for plan coding.

As mentioned in the Methodology section, the tool uses a binary and ordinal scale which has been used in previous plan quality studies (Berke, 1994; Berke, 1996; Berke & Godschalck, 2009; Berke et. al, 2011; Smith & Flatt, 2011) to objectively analyze the plan’s content. The researcher will need to determine how to best reconcile the data. In previous plan quality studies, the results from the ordinal scale were either collapsed to a 0 to 1 scale (Smith & Flatt, 2011) or the items on the binary scale were doubled (Berke et. al, 2011). Both studies resulted in an equal weighting of all the indicators. Statistical analysis (such as mean, standard deviation, t-test, analysis of variance or ANOVA) can be used to compare the data across jurisdictions (Berke & Godschalck, 2009).

To increase the reliability of the plan quality assessment, the study should be designed for two persons to evaluate each plan. With a sufficient number of persons involved in the study, plans can be evaluated with different sets of evaluators to reduce evaluator bias. Training should include the use of the tool on a few plans to increase the evaluators’ familiarity and clarify questions or concerns with the tool. Each plan should be reviewed independently by the evaluators. The evaluators will then meet to discuss their individual evaluation and create a reconciled evaluation score. An intercoder reliability score should be calculated to understand the percent of agreed upon indicators between the evaluators. Intercoder reliability is a measure of agreement in how the coders evaluate the plan. This percentage helps to validate the analysis because if the evaluators understood the response plan indicators in the tool, the evaluation of the plan would be similar from both persons. Intercoder reliability has ranged from 70 to 97 percent in plan quality studies. Measuring intercoder reliability is critical to the validity of the data generated by the content analysis (Berke & Godschalck, 2009).

I have provided some tools to help guide future evaluators. The introduction sections of the tool (see Appendix B) outline the purpose and organization of the tool and general instructions. In addition, the evaluation tool includes a comprehensive definitions section and a guide which provides information on the indicators that are located in more than one section. This paper can also be used to provide background information and context to the tool.

I developed my evaluation tool in Microsoft Excel. As is, the evaluator will have to evaluate the plans by hand and write in the appropriate score, page number, and any additional comments. The scores will then need to be inputted into excel for analysis. In recent plan quality studies, however, a qualitative data analysis tool called Atlas Ti has been used. Atlas Ti is a computer software program that enables evaluators to upload an electronic document of the plan and use a drag-and-click system to evaluate the plan using the tool. The data can be downloaded to Microsoft Excel for further analysis. For the purposes of my research, I have uploaded the Fact Base section into Atlas Ti (see Appendix E for images). The program provides an easier way to evaluate plans and my evaluation tool can easily be adapted for use in Atlas Ti.
A research study using this evaluation tool would uncover shortfalls in response planning in addition to best practices. Research may indicate that descriptions of the existing conditions or vulnerability assessments may lack depth. In addition, research may imply that policies are not informed by the fact base. Best practices are methods or techniques that are considered to be exemplary practice in emergency management. Researchers may uncover best practices within the response plans, such as exercising practices. Scholars can also use the results from a content analysis study for further research on the causes of plan quality (such as local capacity or state mandates) and effects of plan quality on response operations or other outcomes (Berke & Godschalk, 2009). As disasters become more frequent and severe, this research could have major implications for policy development at all levels of government and emergency management practitioners.

**Policy and Practice**

The primary goal of this project is to better connect research to practice by providing a useful tool for local governments to evaluate their response plans and a tool that can be used to conduct future research.

As described in the Methodology section, I used the tool to evaluate three plans. While the purpose of evaluating the plans was to improve the tool itself, I did find three areas which could be further improved in local response plans, including:

- **The planning process:** Elements of the planning process were not included. Including the persons that participated in plan development and information on the process itself can increase buy-in and use of the response plan. Furthermore, collaborating with stakeholders from different sectors will increase the jurisdiction’s capabilities in providing access to various resources. In addition, bringing stakeholders to the table encourages the concept of shared responsibility in response operations. As mentioned in the Literature Review, emergency management practitioners should collaborate with land use planners in the emergency planning process. Land use planners can take an active role in the process by gathering critical information, analyzing spatial data, engaging stakeholders, and developing action-oriented policies (Pine, 2009).

- **Situational information:** The Fact Base lacked depth. A jurisdiction needs to understand its risks and the capabilities and policies it needs for an efficient and effective response. This should be reflected in the plan document.

- **Alignment of the goals and policies:** Alignment of a clear vision, goals, and policies did not exist in the plans reviewed. This alignment can influence the success of response operations.

While local government response plans are typically operations based (referred to as Emergency Operations Plans) and focus on the actions in a response operation, the areas listed above are critical in response plans. Scholars argue that a written plan is a ‘snapshot’ of the planning process at a specific point in time (Perry & Lindell, 2003; Canton, 2007). While this
may be true in practice, I would argue that the written plan needs to be more dynamic to stay relevant and active. Including planning elements in response plans would increase its usability, accuracy, and consistency; this includes documenting stakeholders in the planning process, aligning goals to effective response policies, exercising the plans, and providing responsible parties for implementing policies and updating the plans.

The tool can also impact policymakers and practitioners at the state level. While the evaluation tool is exhaustive, it does outline specific sections that should be addressed in plans. States should consider implementing policies that require certain information to be included in response plans. The State of Florida’s emergency management law mandates that the state have an emergency plan that addresses specific sections, including evacuation, sheltering, coordinated deployment of resources, communications and warning systems, and guidelines and schedules for exercises. The Florida law requires that all counties and municipalities with emergency management programs have emergency management plans that are consistent and coordinated with Florida’s State plan. Florida, however, is ahead of the curve and other states can learn from its practices. From my analysis, I would propose that states consider adopting policies that require the following information in state or local response plans:

- Vulnerability assessment that identifies threats and impacts of all hazards on the geographic area, physical environment, and population, specifically socially vulnerable populations;
- Capabilities assessment of available and required resources available to use during an emergency (facilities, equipment, supplies, personnel) and identify resource gaps and solutions through strategic planning and intergovernmental coordination;
- A clear connection between the fact base and adoption of specific policies;
- Roles and responsibilities of agencies and organizations involved in a disaster including governmental, non-profit, private, and community organizations;
- Evacuation and shelter plans to protect the population;
- Communications and warning systems for the emergency operations center, responders, and the public;
- Connection between disaster response and recovery to ensure that recovery actions are initiated while response is in progress;
- Plans to exercise the emergency management plan to test its functionality; and
- Procedures to continuously update the plan.

North Carolina is also well-respected for its Division of Emergency Management (NCDEM). Currently North Carolina State law does not require local governments to have emergency response plans, however it does give NCDEM the authority to review local plans biennially and provide State financial assistance to local plans that meet State standards. NCDEM’s standards are measured using a checklist that was developed from the FEMA’s Comprehensive Preparedness Guide 101. While the checklist does cover a number of relevant topics, my research can be used to further improve North Carolina’s standards.
My evaluation tool can also be used to better inform national standards and policies. As mentioned in the Literature Review section, the National Response Framework, Nationwide Plan Review, and Emergency Management Accreditation Program Standards provide frameworks and general criteria for local and state response plans. However, they are not comprehensive. My findings can educate policymakers on ways to improve response plan criteria and evaluation standards, adding detail to their broad categories. Furthermore, this research could influence state and federal policies to provide pre-event support to local governments to develop higher quality local response plans.

**Final Thoughts**

The increasing frequency and severity of disasters continue to cause physical, social, and economic impacts to our local communities. Local governments have an obligation to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public. They need to be fully prepared for any disaster by developing high-quality emergency response plans. Good planning can help increase a local government’s capabilities to respond efficiently and effectively to a disaster. Currently, an evaluation tool that determines the quality of local government response plans does not exist. My research is intended to fill this gap. The tool has been developed using response plan literature, existing plans, and expert feedback. It will help improve response plans across jurisdictions and could have major implications for emergency management policies at all levels of government, furthering the development of standards, requirements, and funding opportunities for response plans.
APPENDIX A: REFERENCES BY TOPIC

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

Dare County, North Carolina. (2007). *Dare County Emergency Operations Plan.*


**PLAN QUALITY**


**RESPONSE PLANNING**


APPENDIX B: EVALUATION TOOL
PLAN QUALITY EVALUATION TOOL FOR

LOCAL GOVERNMENT EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT RESPONSE PLANS

BY

RACHEL MEYERSON

MCRP/MPA CANDIDATE 2012
THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL

SPRING 2012
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Purpose and Organization of the Plan Quality Evaluation Tool ................................................................. 31
General Instructions for the Plan Evaluator .................................................................................................. 33
Plan Quality Evaluation Tool ....................................................................................................................... 34
   Section 1: Identification and Vision ........................................................................................................... 34
   Section 2: Fact Base ................................................................................................................................... 36
   Section 3: Goals ......................................................................................................................................... 49
   Section 4: Policies ..................................................................................................................................... 50
   Section 5: Participation ............................................................................................................................... 64
   Section 6: Inter-organizational Coordination ............................................................................................. 69
   Section 7: Implementation ......................................................................................................................... 77
   Section 8: Monitor and Evaluation ............................................................................................................ 93
   Section 9: Best Practices ......................................................................................................................... 98
Appendix A: Definitions ................................................................................................................................. 99
Appendix B: Evaluation Tool Guide ............................................................................................................. 112
The purpose of this document is to evaluate the content of local government emergency management response plans and inform emergency managers about new ideas and best practices.

The absence of an item does not indicate that the plan is of poor quality. Each section needs to be reviewed as a whole because some items relate to one another. For example, in the Vulnerability Assessment section under Section 2: Fact Base, one indicator reads “Plan references mitigation plan or other relevant resource for a detailed vulnerability assessment.” If the plan does reference another resource that has a detailed vulnerability assessment then the vulnerabilities may not be discussed in the plan at all. The fact that the vulnerability assessment is absent from the plan is not important and does not indicate that this plan is of poor quality since the plan indicated that a vulnerability assessment was completed in another plan (the same is true for the Hazard Identification and Assessment section). In addition, the community’s assets need to be taken into consideration. For example, a community might not be eligible for an Urban Areas Security Initiative grant from the federal government and therefore would not receive a score for that indicator.

The plan is divided into nine sections. Sections 1 through 8 are defined by the following planning principles: Identification and Vision, Fact Base, Goals, Policies, Participation, Inter-organizational Coordination, Implementation, and Monitoring and Evaluation as defined below:

- **Identification and Vision** – Identification provides the basic information of the evaluation and the plan document such as the jurisdiction and date of the plan. The vision defines the themes and intent of the plan. It should set the stage for the plan and its policies.

- **Fact Base** – an analysis of current and future vulnerabilities including population, natural environment, and infrastructure. Additionally, the fact base should include an assessment of the community’s capabilities.

- **Goals** – state desired outcomes or conditions. They provide a framework for the policies and actions of the local jurisdiction in response.

- **Policies** – intended to guide decisions during an incident. They should be aligned with specific actions that help achieve the plan’s goals.

- **Participation** – includes the persons and organizations involved in preparing the plan. This includes other government agencies and departments, and non-profit and private sectors.
• **Inter-organizational Coordination** – the horizontal and vertical integration of organizations involved in response; this includes organizations on a horizontal axis such as government entities, neighboring jurisdictions, private sector, non-profit sector, and community organizations and on a vertical axis such as state or federal agencies. In addition, this section includes the alignment of policies and plans across emergency management sectors (hazard mitigation, preparedness, and recovery) and at the federal and state levels.

• **Implementation** – involves executing the policies and actions outlined in the plan. This is measured through the identification of resources and roles and responsibilities of different organizations and persons in response. Implementation also includes plan clarity which is measured by the organization and presentation of the plan document.

• **Monitoring and Evaluation** – involves exercising or testing the plan to assess the effectiveness and feasibility of response policies. It also includes updating the plan based on changes in the fact base or goals and feedback from exercises or a real-life incident. Furthermore, it involves identifying those responsible for monitoring, evaluating, and updating the plan to increase accountability in maintaining an accurate and reliable plan document.

Section 9: Best Practices is intended for the evaluator to list any best practices located in the response plan. Each section has subsections and within those subsections are indicators. For example, Section 2: Fact Base has subsections 2.1 to 2.5. Subsection 2.1: Existing Conditions contains indicators such as Geographic Extent, General Population and Economic Characteristics. The plan is evaluated based on the indicators present in the plan.
GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE PLAN EVALUATOR

The number scheme 0-1-2 will be used by the evaluator to code each plan, except Section 1: Identification and Vision which asks for information about the evaluator and the plan (e.g. evaluator name, date published, plan title), and Section 9: Best Practices. In addition, the end of each section asks for a summary from the evaluator.

The evaluator should be familiar with the entire evaluation tool and review all of the items in each section prior to coding a plan. Having a strong understanding of the evaluation tool in advance will make the evaluation easier and more accurate. To help guide the evaluator, a list of relevant definitions is available in Appendix A. Moreover, Appendix B is a guide that provides information on the indicators that are located in more than one section.

Unless otherwise specified in the evaluation tool, follow the directions below.

1. Complete each item in the section of the evaluation tool as follows:
   a. Read the instructions in the ‘Comments’ column as your guide.
   b. Put a ‘2,’ ‘1,’ or ‘0’ in the appropriate ‘Score’ box as described in the ‘Comments’ section (Note: some sections only indicate a ‘1’ or ‘0’).
   c. Mark the page number(s) where the item material can be found in the ‘Page#’ section; if no corresponding page number leave blank.
   d. At the end of each section, summarize the overall quality of the section as determined by coding the plan.
   e. Make any notes you feel are appropriate in the white space to the right of the table.

2. Review your evaluation of each section to ensure that all items have been completed fully and accurately.

Note:

Indicators without a section number in the left column fall under the category of the preceding numbered indicator.

No instructions in the ‘Comments’ column indicates that the item is a category and the evaluator is not required to fill in any score or page number.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 1: Identification and Vision</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 1.1 Identification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1 Evaluator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2 Dates of Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill in date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill in date task is completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entered into Database</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill in date task is completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercoder Reliability Check</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill in date task is completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3 State</td>
<td></td>
<td>E.g. North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.4 Regional Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>E.g. Winton-Salem/Forsyth County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.5 Jurisdiction Specific</td>
<td></td>
<td>E.g. Dare County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.6 Title of Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Full title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.7 Date of Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>E.g. November 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.8 Author/Preparer of Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>List primary agency and contractor (if noted in the plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.9 Agency Contact</td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
<td>Address (if provided)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agency or plan website (if provided)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 1.2 Issues Identification and Vision</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Page #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1 Overall Mission or Vision Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2 Response is defined in the plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If definition is present, what is it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3 How is the plan organized? Based on Emergency Support Functions, Incident Command System, Functional Annexes, or hybrid form?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 1.3 Identification and Vision Section Summary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1 In a few sentences or bullet points, characterize the issue identification and vision—the approach or style used, strengths and weaknesses, best practices, and any other notes on the overall quality of the section.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 2: Fact Base

#### Section 2.1 Existing Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Page #</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2.1.1 Geographic Extent</strong>&lt;br&gt;2 - Detailed description of the specific geographic areas that are affected by hazards within the jurisdiction; should include maps of geographic extent of identified hazards&lt;br&gt;1 - General, or brief, description of the geographic areas that are affected by hazards within the jurisdiction&lt;br&gt;0 - No description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2.1.2 Demographics (General Population)</strong>&lt;br&gt;2 - Detailed assessment of the jurisdiction's demographics; applies to the general population not to especially vulnerable populations, which is covered in (2.2.2); should include spatial representation of population at risk (such as maps)&lt;br&gt;1 - General, or brief, assessment of the demographics&lt;br&gt;0 - No description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2.1.3 Economic Characteristics</strong>&lt;br&gt;2 - Detailed narrative description of the economic characteristics (such as agriculture or industry) of the jurisdiction; should include spatial representation of the economic characteristics at risk (such as maps)&lt;br&gt;1 - General, or brief, description of the jurisdiction's economy&lt;br&gt;0 - No description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2.1.4 Land Use Trends</strong>&lt;br&gt;2 - Detailed description of land use and development trends and their risks; includes transportation, population density, location of new development; should include maps of land use trends at risk&lt;br&gt;1 - General, or brief, description of land use and development trends&lt;br&gt;0 - No description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2.2 Vulnerability Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1 Plan References Mitigation Plan or other relevant resource for a detailed Vulnerability Assessment</td>
<td>1 - Plan refers to mitigation plan or other relevant resource for a detailed vulnerability assessment 0 - No reference to mitigation plan or other relevant resource for vulnerability assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2 Socially Vulnerable Population</td>
<td>2 - Detailed assessment of the vulnerability of especially vulnerable populations (e.g. minorities, low income, elderly, children or people with disabilities) to hazards 1 - General, or brief, description of socially vulnerable populations 0 - No description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3 Household Pets and Service Animals</td>
<td>2 - Detailed assessment of the vulnerability of household pets and service animals in the community 1 - General, or brief, assessment of the vulnerability of household pets and service animals 0 - No description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.4 Critical Facilities</td>
<td>2 - Detailed assessment of the vulnerability of critical facilities to hazards; includes facilities such as hospital, bridges, sewage treatment plants, water treatment plants, schools, power plants, police stations, and fire stations. Description should align critical facilities with their locations in a spatial element (such as maps) 1 - General, or brief, description of vulnerability of critical facilities 0 - No description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.5 Infrastructure</td>
<td>2 - Detailed description of the vulnerability of infrastructure systems (fuel, electric power, water sewer, telecommunications, transportation); should include maps of infrastructure at risk 1 - General, or brief, description of infrastructure systems 0 - No Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.6</td>
<td>Governmental Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|         | 2 - Detailed assessment of the vulnerability of governmental services in a disaster (e.g. sanitation, road maintenance, fire and rescue, law enforcement)  
|         | 1 - General, or brief, description of vulnerability of governmental services  
|         | 0 - No description |
| 2.2.7   | Neighboring Jurisdictions |
|         | 2 - Detailed description of risks facing neighboring jurisdictions and how that could impact this jurisdiction  
|         | 1 - General, or brief, description of risks of neighboring jurisdictions  
|         | 0 - No description |
| 2.2.8   | Environmental Assets |
|         | 2 - Detailed assessment of the vulnerability of environmental assets (e.g. dunes, wetlands, forests, water supplies, ecosystems, species) to hazard events; should include maps of environmental assets  
|         | 1 - General, or brief, assessment of environmental assets  
|         | 0 - No description |
| 2.2.9   | Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear (CBRN) |
|         | 2 - Detailed description of risks of chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear including location and number of facilities in region; should include maps  
|         | 1 - General, or brief, description of CBRN (includes if plan indicates the jurisdiction does not have any risks)  
|         | 0 - No description |
| **Section 2.3 Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment** |
| 2.3.1   | Plan References Mitigation Plan or other relevant resource for a detailed Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment |
|         | 1 - Plan refers to mitigation plan or other relevant resource for a detailed hazard identification and assessment  
|         | 0 - No reference to mitigation plan or other relevant resource for hazard identification and assessment |
| 2.3.2   | Hazards at Risk or Not at Risk | 1 - Plan lists the hazards in which the jurisdiction is at risk or not at risk  
0 - No hazard identification |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2.1</td>
<td>Identifies Hazards at Risk or Not at Risk</td>
<td>Please list the hazards identified below:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.3.2.2 | Characteristics of Hazards at Risk (Causes and Impacts) | 2 - Detailed description of the different causes of hazards (e.g. rainfall, storm surge) and the different impacts (e.g. damage to property and/or infrastructure, loss of life and injury, environmental change)  
1 - General, or brief, description of causes and impacts  
0 - No description |
| 2.3.2.3 | Likelihood of Hazards at Risk | 2 - Detailed description, including spatial representation (e.g. maps) indicating multiple likely scenarios  
1 - General, or brief, description indicating likelihood of hazards  
0 - No description |
| 2.3.2.4 | Magnitude and Severity of Hazards at Risk | 2 - Detailed descriptions and maps of the projected magnitude and severity of prevalent hazards  
1 - General, or brief, description of the projected magnitude and severity  
0 - No description |
| 2.3.2.5 | Previous Events | 2 - Detailed description of the previous history of hazards in jurisdiction, including historic data, number of events, severity and impacts  
1 - General, or brief, description of the previous history  
0 - No description |
| 2.3.2.6 | Jurisdiction Prioritizes Hazards | 1 - Hazards are ranked in terms of their potential risks to the jurisdiction. Prioritization could be based on hazard likelihood/frequency, geographical distribution, potential magnitude/severity, and previous history. 0 - No prioritization |
| 2.3.3 | Hazard-Specific Appendices | 1 - Plan has Hazard-Specific Appendices for those hazards that are more prevalent. 0 - No Hazard-Specific Appendices |

**Section 2.4 Capability Assessment**

### 2.4.1 Local Government

#### 2.4.1.1 Legal Framework

- **Jurisdiction's Emergency Management Ordinance**: 1 - Description of jurisdiction’s applicable emergency management ordinance. 0 - No description of jurisdiction's ordinance.
- **Statement of Approval or Evidence of the Adoption of Response Plan**: 1 - Statement of approval or evidence of the adoption of response plan by jurisdiction's governing body; should include signatures of all responsible departments, agencies, and partners. 0 - No evidence of statement of approval or adoption of response plan.

#### 2.4.1.2 Organization

- **Organizational Structure of Emergency Management During Response**: 2 - Detailed description of the organizational structure during response. 1 - General, or brief, description of the organizational structure during response. 0 - No description.

#### 2.4.1.3 Emergency Operations Center (EOC)

- **EOC Activation Levels**: 2 - Detailed description of the different EOC activation levels. 1 - General, or brief, description of the EOC activation levels. 0 - No description.
- **Location of EOC**: 1 - Indicates the location of the EOC. 0 - No location indicated.
- **Alternate location of EOC**: 1 - Indicates the location of an alternate EOC. 0 - No location indicated.
| Person or group responsible for activating EOC | 1 - Lists person or group responsible for activating EOC  
0 - Does not list |
| List of participants that will be located at the EOC | 1 - Lists participants  
0 - Does not list |
| List of agencies represented in the EOC | 1 - Lists agencies  
0 - Does not list |
| Standard Operating Procedures of EOC | 1 - Indicates SOPs for EOC  
0 - No SOPs for EOC indicated |
| Resources | |
| Available Resources | |
| The plan indicates that the jurisdiction determined its available resources | 1 - Plan indicates that jurisdiction determined resources available  
0 - No indication |
| Financial Resources | 2 - Detailed description of the available financial resources of the jurisdiction that could be used in an emergency (e.g. information on general operating budget)  
1 - General, or brief, description of the available financial resources of the jurisdiction that could be used in an emergency  
0 - No description |
| Equipment/Vehicles/Supplies | 2 - Detailed description of available equipment, vehicles, and supplies used in disaster events including any back-up capabilities (e.g. communications equipment, sandbags, respirators, traffic barricades, toxic gas monitoring equipment)  
1 - General, or brief, description of available equipment, vehicles, and supplies  
0 - No description |
| Facilities | 2 - Detailed description of available facilities used in disaster events, including emergency operation centers, assembly/staging areas, shelters and/or "safe havens" from extreme environmental conditions  
1 - General, or brief, description of available facilities  
0 - No description |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>First Responder Units (Police, Fire, EMS)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Sheltering</strong></th>
<th><strong>2.4.1.4.B Required Resources</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2 - Detailed description of available first responder unit capabilities, including vehicles, equipment, departments, personnel, fire districts, dispatching  
1 - General, or brief, description of available first responder unit capabilities  
0 - No description | 2 - Detailed assessment of available capability related to sheltering (plans, maps, studies, measures or investments related to sheltering population in hazard event)  
1 - General, or brief, description of available sheltering capability  
0 - No description | 1 - Plan indicates that jurisdiction determined required resources  
0 - No indication |
| **Financial Resources** | **Equipment/Vehicles/Supplies** | **The plan indicates that the jurisdiction determined its required resources (or resources necessary for jurisdiction to respond adequately)**  
1 - General, or brief, description of the required financial resources of the jurisdiction in an emergency  
0 - No description |
| 2 - Detailed description of the required financial resources of the jurisdiction in an emergency  
1 - General, or brief, description of the required financial resources of the jurisdiction in an emergency  
0 - No description | 2 - Detailed description of required equipment, vehicles, and supplies needed in disaster events including any back-up capabilities (e.g. communications equipment, sandbags, respirators, traffic barricades, toxic gas monitoring equipment)  
1 - General, or brief, description of required equipment, vehicles, and supplies  
0 - No description | 2 - Detailed description of available first responder unit capabilities, including vehicles, equipment, departments, personnel, fire districts, dispatching  
1 - General, or brief, description of available first responder unit capabilities  
0 - No description |
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| Facilities | | 2 - Detailed description of required facilities used in disaster events, including emergency operation centers, assembly/staging areas, shelters and/or "safe havens" from extreme environmental conditions  
1 - General, or brief, description of required facilities  
0 - No description |
| --- | --- | --- |
| First Responder Units (Police, Fire, EMS) | | 2 - Detailed description of required first responder unit capabilities, including vehicles, equipment, departments, personnel, fire districts, dispatching  
1 - General, or brief, description of required first responder unit capabilities  
0 - No description |
| Sheltering | | 2 - Detailed assessment of required capabilities related to sheltering (plans, maps, studies, measures or investments related to sheltering population in hazard event)  
1 - General, or brief, description of required sheltering capability  
0 - No description |
| 2.4.1.4.C Filling the Resource Gaps | | |
| Pre-event process used to determine and evaluate capabilities | | 1 - Describes a pre-event process used to determine and evaluate capabilities  
0 - No description of a pre-event process |
| Limitations in capacity for local government to respond | | 2 - Detailed description of jurisdiction's limitations in responding to a disasters  
1 - General, or brief, description of jurisdiction's limitations  
0 - No description |
| Strategic Plan to increase capacity at the local level | | 1 - Mentions a strategic plan to increase capabilities at the local level  
0 - No mention of a strategic plan |
| Mutual Aid Agreements | 2 - Detailed description of mutual aid agreements with other jurisdictions; should include resources available for loan and their locations, who pays for the resources and bears liability, and condition in which contract begins  
1 - General, or brief, mention of mutual aid agreements  
0 - No description |
| Pre-positioned Agreements or Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) | 2 - Detailed description of pre-positioned agreements/MOUs with private sector agencies, non-profits, community organizations, or educational institutions; should include resources available for loan and their locations, who pays for the resources and bears liability, and condition in which contract begins  
1 - General, or brief, mention of pre-event agreements  
0 - No description |
| 2.4.1.5 Response Committees and Teams |  |
| Local Emergency Response Committee | 1 - Indicates that a Local Emergency Response Committee exists  
0 - No indication |
| Response Teams | 1 - Indicates that the jurisdiction has response teams (such as Citizen Emergency Response Team, Search and Rescue, Rapid Response Team, HazMat Response Team)  
0 - No indication |
| 2.4.1.6 Plans and Procedures |  |
| Standard Operating Procedures of Emergency Management Agency | 2 - Detailed description of SOPs of Emergency Management Agency  
1 - General, or brief, description of SOPs of Emergency Management Agency  
0 - No description of SOPs |
| Concept of Operations (CONOPS) | 2 - Detailed description of CONOPS  
1 - General, or brief, description of CONOPS  
0 - No description of CONOPS |
| Continuity of Operations (COOP) | 2 - Detailed description of COOP  
1 - General, or brief, description of COOP  
0 - No description of COOP |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 2: Fact Base</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Transportation Plans** | 2 - Detailed assessment of transportation plans (e.g. traffic controls, alternative routes, road clearing plans, contingencies for road and bridge washouts)  
| | 1 - General, or brief, description of transportation plans  
| | 0 - No description |
| **Evacuation Plans or Procedures** | 2 - Detailed description of evacuation plans or procedures  
| | 1 - General, or brief, description of evacuation plans or procedures  
| | 0 - No description of evacuation plans or procedures |
| **Communications Plans or Procedures** | 2 - Detailed description of communications plans or procedures  
| | 1 - General, or brief, description of communications plans or procedures  
| | 0 - No description of communications plans of procedures |
| **2.4.1.7 Training and Education** |  |
| **Training Program** | 2 - Detailed description of training programs  
| | 1 - General, or brief description of training programs  
| | 0 - No description |
| **Training of emergency management personnel** | 1 - Mentions training emergency management personnel in emergency procedures and protocols  
| | 0 - No mention of training |
| **Training of non-emergency management local personnel** | 1 - Mentions training non-emergency management local personnel in emergency procedures and protocols  
| | 0 - No mention of training |
| **Training of first responders, search and rescue teams** | 1 - Mentions training first responders in emergency procedures and protocols  
| | 0 - No mention of training |
| **Methods for assessing training needs** | 1 - Identifies methods for assessing training needs  
| | 0 - No identification |
| **Training Content** | 1 - Identifies content of training programs  
| | 0 - No identification |
| **Frequency of training** | 1 - Identifies the frequency of training programs  
| | 0 - No identification |
| **Incident Command System Training (FEMA Independent Study Courses)** | 1 - Identifies Incident Command System training programs  
| | 0 - No identification |
| Pre-incident public education | 1 - Describes pre-incident public education  
0 - No description |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| 2.4.2 State                  | 2 - Detailed description of the process by which the state declares a disaster  
1 - General, or brief, description of the process by which the state declares a disaster  
0 - No description |
| 2.4.2.1 State Disaster Declaration Procedures | |
| 2.4.2.2 State Programs, Policies, and Laws | 1 - Description of state regulations and laws applicable  
0 - No description of state regulations and laws |
| State legal framework       | 1 - Describes any state mutual aid and assistance agreements  
0 - No description |
| State Mutual Aid and Assistance Agreements (e.g. Emergency Management Assistance Compact) | |
| State Hazard Mitigation Planning | 1 - Describes State Hazard Mitigation Planning programs or policies  
0 - No description |
| State Disaster Recovery Assistance | 1 - Describes State Disaster Recovery Assistance programs or policies  
0 - No description |
| State Emergency Response Agency | 1 - Lists State Emergency Management Agency  
0 - No mention |
| State Emergency Response Team (SERT) | 1 - Brief description, or mention, of State Emergency Response Team (SERT)  
0 - No description |
| 2.4.3 National Policies and Standards | |
| Incident Command Structure (ICS) | 1 - Plan describes the use of ICS  
0 - No description of ICS |
| National Incident Management System (NIMS) | 1 - Plan indicates compliance with NIMS  
0 - No indication |
| National Fire Protection Association Standard 1600 | 1 - Plan indicates the jurisdiction's compliance with the National Fire Protection Association Standard 1600  
0 - No indication of compliance |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.4.4</td>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.4.1</td>
<td>Federal Disaster Declaration Procedures</td>
<td>2 - Detailed description of the process by which the federal government declares a disaster  1 - General, or brief, description of the process by which the federal government declares a disaster  0 - No description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.4.2</td>
<td>Federal Programs, Policies, and Laws</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stafford Act</td>
<td>1 - Brief description, or mention, of the Stafford Act  0 - No description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americans with Disabilities Act</td>
<td>1 - General, or brief, description of how shelter facilities, evacuation/movement, warning procedures accommodate the provisions of the ADA  0 - No description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA: Hazard Mitigation Grant Program</td>
<td>1 - Brief description, or mention, of the HMGP  0 - No description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA: Homeland Security Grant Program</td>
<td>1 - Brief description, or mention, of the HSGP  0 - No description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA: Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program</td>
<td>1 - Brief description, or mention, of the PDM  0 - No description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA: Post Disaster Community Development Block Grant Funding</td>
<td>1 - Brief description, or mention, of the Post Disaster CDBG  0 - No description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA: Public Assistance Program</td>
<td>1 - Brief description, or mention, of the Public Assistance Program  0 - No description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA: Individual Assistance Program</td>
<td>1 - Brief description, or mention, of the Individual Assistance Program  0 - No description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Areas Security Initiative</td>
<td>1 - Description of the UASI program and if this jurisdiction is eligible for grant money  0 - No description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Medical Response System</td>
<td>1 - Description of the MMRS program and if this jurisdiction is eligible for grant money 0 - No description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident Management Assistance Teams</td>
<td>1 - Description of IMAT 0 - No description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Disaster Medical System</td>
<td>1 - Description of NDMS 0 - No description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 2.5 Fact Base Section Summary**

2.5.1 **In a few sentences or bullet points, characterize the fact base—the approach or style used, strengths and weaknesses, best practices, and any other notes on the overall quality of the section.**
## Section 3: Goals

### Section 3.1 Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Page #</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Note: Goals may not be explicitly listed in the response plan, but may be discussed in an introduction or listed as objectives.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.1 Protect the lives and well being of the public 1 - Present 0 - Not present

3.1.2 Protect the lives of first responders 1 - Present 0 - Not present

3.1.3 Communication systems 1 - Present 0 - Not present

3.1.4 Internal and external coordination 1 - Present 0 - Not present

3.1.5 Collect information continuously to perform assessments 1 - Present 0 - Not present

3.1.6 Stabilize the incident 1 - Present 0 - Not present

3.1.7 Protect the environment 1 - Present 0 - Not present

3.1.8 Ensure continuity of government 1 - Present 0 - Not present

3.1.9 Support transition to recovery 1 - Present 0 - Not present

3.1.10 Demobilize response operations 1 - Present 0 - Not present

3.1.11 Other 1 - The plan lists other goals than the ones indicated above 0 - No other goals are present

### Section 3.2 Goals Section Summary

3.2.1 In a few sentences or bullet points, characterize the goals--the approach or style used, strengths and weaknesses, best practices, and any other notes on the overall quality of the section.
### Section 4: Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 4.1 Does the plan use the Fact Base to inform Policies?</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Page #</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.1.1 Connection between the Vulnerability Assessment and Policies | | | 2 - Yes, clear description of the connection between the community's vulnerabilities and policies  
1 - Can infer from the plan that there is a connection between the community's vulnerabilities and policies  
0 - No connection |
| 4.1.2 Connection between the Hazard ID and Assessment and Policies | | | 2 - Yes, clear description of the connection between the assessment of hazards, their impacts and policies formulated  
1 - Can infer from the plan that there is a connection between the assessment of hazards, their impacts and policies formulated  
0 - No connection |
| 4.1.3 Connection between the Capability Assessment and Policies | | | 2 - Yes, clear description of the connection between the jurisdiction's capabilities and policies  
1 - Can infer from the plan that there is a connection between the jurisdiction's capabilities and policies  
0 - No connection |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 4.2 Protect the lives and well being of the public</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Page #</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.2.1 Evacuation and Shelter | | | 2 - Detailed policy related to evacuation including pre-event actions and return re-entry) following an event  
1 - General, or brief, description of evacuation policy  
0 - No description |
| 4.2.1.1 Evacuation (General) | | | 2 - Detailed policy related to evacuation including pre-event actions and return re-entry) following an event  
1 - General, or brief, description of evacuation policy  
0 - No description |
| 4.2.1.2 | Sheltering (General) | 2 - Detailed policy related to sheltering before, during, and after an event to include public shelters and sheltering in-place procedures  
1 - General, or brief, description of shelter in-place policy  
0 - No description |
| 4.2.1.3 | Animals and Household pets | 2 - Detailed description of evacuation and sheltering procedures for animals and household pets (including responsible agencies, facilities, and/or plans)  
1 - General, or brief, mention of emergency evacuation and sheltering of animals and household pets  
0 - No description |
| 4.2.1.4 | Inmates | 2 - Detailed description of evacuation and sheltering procedures for inmates  
1 - General, or brief, mention of evacuation and sheltering procedures for inmates  
0 - No description |
| 4.2.2 | Medical Care | |
| 4.2.2.1 | Medical care during an emergency | 2 - Detailed description of medical services provided by the jurisdiction (e.g. patient triage, holding, treatment and transportation area)  
1 - General, or brief, mention of medical services  
0 - No description |
| 4.2.2.2 | Location of Emergency Medical Facilities | 1 - Identifies the location of emergency medical facilities  
0 - Not present |
| 4.2.2.3 | Mass care (feeding, hydration) | 2 - Detailed description of emergency food and water distribution process (including responsible agency, plans, and/or procedures)  
1 - General, or brief, mention of emergency food and water distribution  
0 - No description |
| 4.2.2.4 | Disease Prevention and Control | 2 - Detailed description of policies to prevent and control diseases, including responsible party, testing water supply, controlling disease vectors (e.g. mosquitoes), and other practices  
1 - General, or brief, mention of disease prevention and control during an emergency  
0 - No description |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 4.2.2.5 | Crisis counseling for public | 2 - Detailed description of crisis counseling services provided to the public  
1 - General, or brief, mention of crisis counseling provided to the public  
0 - No mention |
| 4.2.3 | Public Safety and Security |  
| 4.2.3.1 | Public Safety and Security (general) | 2 - Detailed description of public safety and security measures to ensure a safe and secure environment for the public  
1 - General, or brief, mention of public safety and security  
0 - No description |
| 4.2.3.2 | Fire, Police, and Emergency Medical Services | 2 - Detailed description of fire, police, and emergency medical services role in response  
1 - General, or brief, mention of fire, police, and emergency medical services role in response  
0 - No description |
| 4.2.3.3 | Security in Emergency Facilities (e.g. emergency operation centers, assembly/staging areas, shelters) | 2 - Detailed description of security in emergency facilities  
1 - General, or brief, mention of security in emergency facilities  
0 - No description |
| 4.2.3.4 | Search and Rescue Operations | 2 - Detailed description of mass search and rescue operations  
1 - General, or brief, mention of search and rescue operations  
0 - No description |
| 4.2.3.5 | Identifies policies specific to the safety and welfare of socially vulnerable populations | 2 - Detailed description of policies for socially vulnerable populations (including communications and warning, evacuation, sheltering, and medical care) during an emergency  
1 - General, or brief, mention of safety and welfare of socially vulnerable populations  
0 - No description |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 4.3 Protect the lives of first responders</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4.3.1 | Safety provisions for first responders in place | 2 - Detailed description of safety provisions for first responders  
1 - General, or brief, mention of safety provisions for first responders  
0 - No description |
| 4.3.2 | Availability of protective gear for first responders | 2 - Hazard-specific protective gear described (e.g. swift water rescue gear, collapsed structure gear)  
1 - General, or brief, description of protective gear  
0 - No description |
| 4.3.3 | Crisis counseling for first responders | 2 - Detailed description of crisis counseling services provided to first responders  
1 - General, or brief, mention of crisis counseling provided to emergency responders  
0 - No mention |
| **Section 4.4 Communications Systems** |  |  |
| 4.4.1 | Public Warning Systems | 2 - Detailed description of local mechanisms to warn the public that explicitly addresses differing needs of various groups (e.g. non-English speakers, deaf, blind, students, etc.)  
1 - General, or brief, mention of local mechanisms  
0 - No mention |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score 1</th>
<th>Score 2</th>
<th>Score 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broadcast media (commercial radio, television, national weather service radio, newspapers, internet)</td>
<td>0 - No mention</td>
<td>1 - General, or brief, mention of broadcast media</td>
<td>2 - Detailed description of broadcast media to warn the public that explicitly addresses differing needs of various groups (e.g. non-English speakers, deaf, blind, students, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective Action Recommendations (PARs) to citizens (e.g. evacuation, in place protection, or expedient respiratory protection)</td>
<td>0 - No mention</td>
<td>1 - General, or brief, mention of PARs to citizens</td>
<td>2 - Detailed description of providing protection action recommendations to citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socially vulnerable population warning system or communication plan (including populations with limited English proficiency or with disabilities)</td>
<td>0 - No mention</td>
<td>1 - General, or brief, mention of warning socially vulnerable populations</td>
<td>2 - Detailed description of specific policies and actions to warn socially vulnerable populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Alert System</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 - Detailed description of an Emergency Alert System in the jurisdiction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication to emergency personnel</td>
<td>0 - No mention</td>
<td>1 - General, or brief, mention of communication to emergency personnel</td>
<td>2 - Detailed description of voice and data communications between federal, state, and local first responders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish interoperable voice and data communications between federal, state, and local first responders</td>
<td>0 - No description</td>
<td>1 - General, or brief, description of communications between first responders</td>
<td>2 - Detailed description of voice and data communications between first responders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication between the Emergency Management Agency and emergency personnel</td>
<td>0 - No description</td>
<td>1 - General, or brief, description of communications between the emergency management agency and emergency personnel</td>
<td>2 - Detailed description of communications between the emergency management agency and emergency personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4.4.3 Media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Field Operations Guides, Job Aids, Checklists that help emergency personnel perform during response | 2 - Provides examples of job aids and checklists used in response to help persons perform certain job functions  
1 - General, or brief, description of job aids and checklists  
0 - No description or example |
| Identify a Media Center (Joint Information Center or Emergency Communications Center) | 1 - Indicates a specified media center, those responsible and their duties  
0 - No indication |
| Media Management (including rumor control and dispelling disaster myths) | 1 - Describes media management policies  
0 - No description |
| Public Inquiries | 1 - Describes how public inquiries will be addressed  
0 - No description |

### Section 4.5 Internal and external coordination

#### 4.5.1 Command and Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Command System</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Command System | 2 - Detailed description of command systems that the jurisdiction uses in response (including Incident Command System, Unified Command, Area Command)  
1 - General, or brief, description of command systems  
0 - No description |
| Operation Centers | 2 - Detailed description of the operations centers activated in response including Emergency Operation Center and Joint Information Center/Emergency Communication Center  
1 - General, or brief, mention of operations centers  
0 - No description |
| Jurisdictional lead agency | 1 - Indicates a jurisdictional lead agency in response  
0 - No indication |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Jurisdictional lead person</strong></th>
<th>1 - Indicates a jurisdictional lead person (can be defined as a position such as &quot;Emergency Management Coordinator&quot;) 0 - No indication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Division of Responsibilities of Incident Command System (ICS) and Emergency Operations Center (EOC) outlined</strong></td>
<td>1 - Describes division of responsibilities of ICS and EOC 0 - No description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.5.2 Disaster Declaration Policies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Disaster Declaration (State of Emergency)</strong></td>
<td>2 - Detailed description of the process by which the local government declares a disaster 1 - General, or brief, description of the process by which the local government declares a disaster 0 - No description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Disaster Declaration</strong></td>
<td>2 - Detailed description of the process by which the state declares a disaster 1 - General, or brief, description of the process by which the state declares a disaster 0 - No description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Disaster Declaration</strong></td>
<td>2 - Detailed description of the process by which the federal government declares a disaster 1 - General, or brief, description of the process by which the federal government declares a disaster 0 - No description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.5.3 Resource Management Procedures</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.5.3.1 Resource management procedures</strong></td>
<td>2 - Detailed description of resource management procedures (e.g. resource ordering; delivery of equipment, supplies, and services; resource tracking) 1 - General, or brief, description of resources management procedures 0 - No description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.3.2 Financial/Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Fiscal Management                | 2 - Detailed policies describing fiscal management processes during an event  
|                                  | 1 - General, or brief, description of fiscal management  
|                                  | 0 - No description  
| Purchasing                      | 2 - Detailed description of purchasing policies, including policies to pre-position contracts  
|                                  | 1 - General, or brief, description of purchasing policies  
|                                  | 0 - No description  
| 4.5.3.3 Asset and Resource Request |
| Asset and Resource Request to State and Federal Government | 2 - Detailed description of process in which state or federal government resources are requested including the completion of a damage assessment for purposes of requesting resources  
|                                  | 1 - General, or brief, description of request for state or federal government resources  
|                                  | 0 - No description  
| Mutual Aid Agreements            | 2 - Detailed description of coordination of mutual aid agreements with other jurisdictions; should include condition under which agreement is activated or contract begins  
|                                  | 1 - General, or brief, mention of coordination of MAAs  
|                                  | 0 - No description  
| Pre-positioned Agreements or Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) | 2 - Detailed description of pre-positioned agreements/MOUs with private sector agencies, non-profits, community organizations, or educational institutions; should include condition under which agreement is activated or contract begins  
|                                  | 1 - General, or brief, mention of pre-event agreements  
|                                  | 0 - No description  

Section 4: Policies
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.5.4</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.5.4.1</td>
<td>Mass Fatality Management and Mortuary Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - Detailed description of policies regarding fatality management and mortuary services (including responsible agency and procedures) 1 - General, or brief, mention of fatality management and mortuary services 0 - No description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.4.2</td>
<td>Hazardous Material Incident, Fuel/Oil Spill, or Chemical Spill Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - Detailed description of policies for a hazardous material incident, oil/fuel spill, or chemical spill including responsible party, determining exposure of personnel and the public, isolating the incident, decontamination and monitoring support, and other practices 1 - General, or brief, mention of a hazardous material incident, oil/fuel spill, or chemical spill 0 - No description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.4.3</td>
<td>Private Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Services (e.g. grocery stores, home improvement retailers, pharmacies, banks)</td>
<td>2 - Detailed description of private services needed in response 1 - General, or brief, description of private services 0 - No description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractors</td>
<td>2 - Detailed description of contracting procedures with private sector vendors including the development of pre-event agreements to address response activities (e.g. water, food, ice, debris management) 1 - General, or brief, description of contracting procedures 0 - No description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.4.4</td>
<td>Non-Profit Services (e.g. food, clothing, shelter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - Detailed description of non-profit services needed in response; non-profits include American Red Cross, Salvation Army, Voluntary Organizations Active in Disaster 1 - General, or brief, description of non-profit services 0 - No description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.4.5 Volunteer Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Labor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Detailed description of management and care of volunteer labor (including responsible agency and procedures for coordinating volunteers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - General, or brief, description of volunteer management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - No description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donation Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Detailed description of donation management procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - General, or brief, description of donation management procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - No description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Listed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - Not listed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.4.6 Response Teams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Emergency Response Team (CERT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Detailed description of CERT including members and their duties before and after disasters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - General, or brief, description of a Citizen Emergency Response Team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - No description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search and Rescue or Urban Search and Rescue Team (USAR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Detailed description Search and Rescue or USAR Team including members and their duties before and after disasters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - General, or brief, description of an Search and Rescue or USAR Team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - No description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials (HazMat) Response Team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Detailed description of HazMat Team including members and their duties before and after disasters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - General, or brief, description of a HazMat Team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - No description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4.6 Collect information continuously to perform assessments and request resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4.6.1 Emphasize the importance of maintaining and collecting valid information on disaster before taking action | 2 - Detailed description of how information is collected, archived, and used in response-related decision making  
1 - Plan mentions the importance of maintaining and collecting valid information on disasters before taking action  
0 - No mention |
| 4.6.2 The plan emphasizes the jurisdiction's flexibility in response so that operations can adjust to current demands | 2 - Detailed description of jurisdiction's flexibility in responding to current demands during an emergency  
1 - Plan mentions response flexibility so that operations can adjust to current demands  
0 - No mention |
| 4.6.3 Situational Assessments | 2 - Detailed description of developing situational assessments to continuously provide all decision makers with decision-relevant information regarding the nature and extent of the hazard, any cascading effects, and the status of response  
1 - General, or brief, mention of developing situational assessments  
0 - No description |
| 4.6.4 Conduct Health and Safety Assessments | 2 - Detailed description of how health and safety information is collected, archived, and used in response-related decision making  
1 - General, or brief, description of conducting health and safety assessments of the impact of disaster  
0 - No description |
### Section 4: Policies

#### 4.6.5 Resource Assessment

- **2** - Specifically mentions a resource assessment (including manpower, equipment, vehicles, and/or supplies and patterns of usage) to determine its capacity and potential need to use mutual aid agreements or state resources
- **1** - General, or brief, description of a resource assessment
- **0** - No description

#### 4.6.6 Emergency Management Information Tools (e.g. WebEOC, E-Team)

- **2** - Describes process to use Emergency Management Information Tools (e.g. WebEOC, E-Team), including who, when and how these tools are used
- **1** - General, or brief, description of a Emergency Management Information Tools
- **0** - No description

#### Section 4.7 Stabilize the Incident

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.7.1</th>
<th>Stabilize the Incident within a certain timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td>Detailed description on how the jurisdiction will stabilize the incident within a certain timeframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>General, or brief, description of how the jurisdiction will stabilize the incident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td>No description</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Section 4.8 Protect the environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.8.1</th>
<th>Environmental contamination/remediation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td>Detailed description of policies addressing environmental contamination/remediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>General, or brief, description of environmental policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td>No description</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Section 4.9 Ensure Continuity of Government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.9.1</th>
<th>Succession Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td>Detailed description of persons by position to succeed government officials, including members of the emergency management organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>General, or brief, description of a succession plan for government officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td>No description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9.2</td>
<td>Protection of vital records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9.3</td>
<td>Documentation of Emergency Response Activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 4.10 Support Transition to Recovery**

<p>| 4.10.1 | Transitional housing | 2 - Detailed description of transitional housing policies 1 - General, or brief, description of transitional housing policies 0 - No description |
| 4.10.2 | Relocation assistance | 2 - Detailed description of relocation assistance policies 1 - General, or brief, description of relocation assistance policies 0 - No description |
| 4.10.3 | Reentry Policies | 2 - Detailed reentry policy that includes the responsible party for initiating reentry, access points, staging areas for emergency personnel, or other policies. 1 - General, or brief description, of reentry policies 0 - No description |
| 4.10.4 | Restoration of Energy and Utility Services | 2 - Detailed description of energy and utility services that will help restore basic services and community functionality 1 - General, or brief, description of energy and utility services 0 - No description |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.10.5</td>
<td>Restoration of Critical Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - Detailed description of policies regarding the restoration of critical facilities (e.g. hospitals, fire station, police station, public school) including emergency power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - General, or brief, description of policies regarding the restoration of critical facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - No description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10.6</td>
<td>Debris Removal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - Detailed description of debris removal including responsible agency, sites for removal, temporary waiving of road weight limits, and/or plans and procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - General, or brief, mention of debris removal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - No description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10.7</td>
<td>Stabilizing Transportation Corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - Detailed description of stabilizing transportation corridors (e.g. providing alternative routes, road clearing plans, contingencies for road and bridge washouts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - General, or brief, description of stabilizing transportation corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - No description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10.8</td>
<td>Building Inspections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - Detailed description of building inspections post disaster, including re-entry criteria for homes, schools, and businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - General, or brief, description of building inspections post disaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - No description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11.1</td>
<td>Demobilization Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - Detailed description of demobilization policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - General, or brief, description of demobilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - No description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.12.1</td>
<td>In a few sentences or bullet points, characterize the policies-the approach or style used, strengths and weaknesses, best practices, and any other notes on the overall quality of the section.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 4.11 Demobilize Response Operations

Section 4.12 Policies Section Summary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 5: Participation</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Page #</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 5.1 Planning Process</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.1 Planning Process (general)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describes and Documents Planning Process</td>
<td>2 - Detailed description of the process by which the plan was developed, monitored, updated, and approved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - General, or brief, description of the process by which the plan was developed, monitored, updated, and approved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - No description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Team</td>
<td>2 - Detailed description of emergency response planning team that developed the plan, including their roles and responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - General, or brief, mention of emergency response planning team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - No planning team mentioned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Participation</td>
<td>2 - Detailed description of public involvement in the planning process, including public participation at open meetings or workshops, and informing the public through public notices, website updates, and/or targeted outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - General, or brief, description of public involvement in the planning process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - No indication of public involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involves Socially Vulnerable Populations</td>
<td>2 - Detailed description of specific outreach and participation to include socially vulnerable populations in plan development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - General, or brief, description of specific outreach and participation to include socially vulnerable populations in plan development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - No description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Listed as involved in planning process</td>
<td>0 - Not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Listed as involved in planning process</td>
<td>0 - Not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget/Revenue/Finance Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Listed as involved in planning process</td>
<td>0 - Not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Department/Permit Department</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Listed as involved in planning process</td>
<td>0 - Not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Emergency Response Team (CERT)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Listed as involved in planning process</td>
<td>0 - Not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/County Attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Listed as involved in planning process</td>
<td>0 - Not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic/Community based organization or Neighborhood Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Listed as involved in planning process</td>
<td>0 - Not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Listed as involved in planning process</td>
<td>0 - Not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Officials</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Listed as involved in planning process</td>
<td>0 - Not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Management Division</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Listed as involved in planning process</td>
<td>0 - Not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Listed as involved in planning process</td>
<td>0 - Not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy and Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Listed as involved in planning process</td>
<td>0 - Not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Listed as involved in planning process</td>
<td>0 - Not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Listed as involved in planning process</td>
<td>0 - Not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Listed as involved in planning process</td>
<td>0 - Not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Listed as involved in planning process</td>
<td>0 - Not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Agriculture Community</td>
<td>1 - Listed as involved in planning process</td>
<td>0 - Not listed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Business Community</td>
<td>1 - Listed as involved in planning process</td>
<td>0 - Not listed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks/Environmental Department</td>
<td>1 - Listed as involved in planning process</td>
<td>0 - Not listed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department/Community Development Department</td>
<td>1 - Listed as involved in planning process</td>
<td>0 - Not listed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police/Law Enforcement</td>
<td>1 - Listed as involved in planning process</td>
<td>0 - Not listed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>1 - Listed as involved in planning process</td>
<td>0 - Not listed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>1 - Listed as involved in planning process</td>
<td>0 - Not listed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Planning Agency</td>
<td>1 - Listed as involved in planning process</td>
<td>0 - Not listed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District</td>
<td>1 - Listed as involved in planning process</td>
<td>0 - Not listed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services/Childcare/Welfare</td>
<td>1 - Listed as involved in planning process</td>
<td>0 - Not listed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>1 - Listed as involved in planning process</td>
<td>0 - Not listed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water/Sewer District</td>
<td>1 - Listed as involved in planning process</td>
<td>0 - Not listed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.2.2 State</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Emergency Management Agency</td>
<td>1 - Listed as involved in planning process</td>
<td>0 - Not listed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Department of Transportation</td>
<td>1 - Listed as involved in planning process</td>
<td>0 - Not listed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Public Health Department</td>
<td>1 - Listed as involved in planning process</td>
<td>0 - Not listed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Department of Human Services/Social Services</td>
<td>1 - Listed as involved in planning process</td>
<td>0 - Not listed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5.2.3 Federal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Listed as involved in planning process</th>
<th>Not listed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEMA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Guard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Park Service/U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Weather Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Coast Guard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Homeland Security</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Transportation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.2.4 Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Listed as involved in planning process</th>
<th>Not listed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contractors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster Volunteer Groups</td>
<td>E.g. Red Cross, Salvation Army, Voluntary Organizations Active in Disaster (VOAD)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Improvement Retailers</td>
<td>E.g. Home Depot, Target, Walmart, Lowes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Homes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 5.3 Participation Section Summary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.3.1</strong></td>
<td>In a few sentences or bullet points, characterize the participation—the approach or style used, strengths and weaknesses, best practices, and any other notes on the overall quality of the section.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 6: Inter-organizational Coordination</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Page #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 6.1 Coordination of Emergency Management Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.1 Preparedness</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Indicates coordination with the preparedness activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 - No mention of preparedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Indicates coordination with training programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 - Does not mention training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.2 Hazard Mitigation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Indicates coordination with the mitigation activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 - No mention of mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazard Mitigation Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 - Detailed description of integration of local response plan with Hazard Mitigation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - General, or brief, description of Hazard Mitigation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 - No description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.3 Recovery</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Indicates coordination with the recovery activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 - No mention of recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster Recovery Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 - Detailed description of integration of local response plan with Disaster Recovery Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - General, or brief, description of Disaster Recovery Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 - No description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination of response and recovery committees</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Indicates any coordination in response and recovery committees (such as representatives or liaisons of each sector)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 - No indication of coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage Assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 - Detailed description of how the damage assessments will impact disaster recovery process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - General, or brief, description of how the damage assessments will impact the disaster recovery process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 - No description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.4</td>
<td>Prevention and Protection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevention and Protection Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plans, Procedures, or Guidance specific to terrorist attacks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.1</td>
<td>Across Government Entities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency Management Plan Integration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land Use, General, or Comprehensive Plan Integration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training programs with other government departments within the jurisdiction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Describes transition from short term to long term recovery

2 - Detailed description of transition from short term to long term recovery (including temporary accommodations for misplaced households, businesses, government agencies; facilitating repair and reconstruction of property damage, restoring disrupted community social routines and economic activities)

1 - General, or brief, description of transition from short term to long term recovery

0 - No description

### Prevention and Protection Programs

2 - Detailed description of programs and policies with regard to prevention and protection from terrorist attacks

1 - General, or brief, description of terrorist programs

0 - No description

### Plans, Procedures, or Guidance specific to terrorist attacks

2 - Detailed description of plans, procedures, or guidance specific to terrorist attacks

1 - General, or brief, description of plans, procedures, or guidance specific to terrorist attacks

0 - No description

### Section 6.2 Horizontal Integration

#### 6.2.1 Across Government Entities

2 - Detailed description of integration of emergency management plans (e.g. hazard mitigation, disaster recovery, continuity of operations plan)

1 - General, or brief, description of integration of emergency management plans

0 - No plan integration indicated

### Land Use, General, or Comprehensive Plan Integration

2 - Detailed explanation of how land use or comprehensive plans are integrated into response plan

1 - General, or brief, mention of land use or comp plan

0 - No mention

### Training programs with other government departments within the jurisdiction

1 - Existence of training with other government departments within the jurisdiction on the response plan

0 - No training programs indicated
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 6: Inter-organizational Coordination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exercising or testing the plan with other government departments within the jurisdiction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.2.2 Organizations involved in response beyond jurisdiction's government agencies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.2.2.1 Neighboring Jurisdictions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capabilities/Resources</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emergency Management Plans</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mutual aid agreements</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multi-jurisdictional training</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multi-jurisdictional exercises</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.2.2.2 Private Sector</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capabilities/Resources</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 6: Inter-organizational Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emergency Plans</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Indicates coordination between local response plans and private sector emergency plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - Does not indicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-positioned Contractor Agreements or Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Detailed description of pre-positioned contractor agreements or MOUs with private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Information should include: conditions under which the agreement is activated, tasks undertaken, expertise available, condition in which the contract begins, who pays for the resources and bears liability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - General, or brief, description of contractor agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - No description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multi-agency response plan training</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Indicates multi agency training of response plan in coordination with the private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - No indication of multi agency training in coordination with the private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multi-agency response plan exercises</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Indicates exercises that include private sector partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - No indication including private sector in exercises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.2.2.3 Non profit Sector</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Lists non profit partners involved (Red Cross, Salvation Army, Voluntary Organizations Active in Disasters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - Does not list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capabilities/Resources</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Describes how capabilities and resources of the non profit sector support local response efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - No description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emergency Plans</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Indicates coordination between local response plan and non profit sector emergency plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - Does not indicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-positioned Agreements or Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Detailed description of pre-positioned agreements/MOUs with non profits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Information should include: conditions under which the agreement is activated, resources available for loan and their locations, personnel and who they will report to, condition in which the contract begins, who pays for the resources and bears liability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - General, of brief, description of mutual aid agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - No description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 6: Inter-organizational Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Multi-agency response plan training          | 1 - Indicates multi agency training of response plan in coordination with the non profit sector  
0 - No indication of multi agency training in coordination with the non profit sector |
| Multi-agency response plan exercises         | 1 - Indicates exercises that include non profit sector partners  
0 - No indication including non profit sector in exercises |
| 6.2.2.4 Other community organizations       | 1 - Lists community organizations involved in response (faith based organizations, neighborhood groups, etc)  
0 - Does not list |
| Capabilities/Resources                       | 1 - Describes how capabilities and resources of community organizations support local response efforts  
0 - No description |
| Emergency Plans                              | 1 - Indicates coordination of community organizations' emergency plans  
0 - Does not indicate |
| Pre-positioned Agreements or Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) | 2 - Detailed description of pre-positioned agreements/MOUs with community organizations (Information should include: conditions under which the agreement is activated, resources available for loan and their locations, personnel and who they will report to, condition in which the contract begins, who pays for the resources and bears liability)  
1 - General, of brief, description of mutual aid agreements  
0 - No description |
| Multi-agency response plan training          | 1 - Indicates multi agency training of response plan in coordination with community organizations  
0 - No indication of multi agency training in coordination with community organizations |
| Multi-agency response plan exercises         | 1 - Indicates exercises that include community organizations  
0 - No indication including community organizations in exercises |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 6.3 Vertical Integration</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.3.1 State Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.1.1 State Plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Emergency Operations Plan       | 2 - Detailed description of integration of local response plan with State EOP  
1 - General, or brief, description of State EOP  
0 - No description |
| Other State Plans               | 2 - Detailed description of integration of local response plan with other State Plans  
1 - General, or brief, description of other State Plans  
0 - No description |
| 6.3.1.2 State Agencies          |  |
| State Emergency Management Agency | 1 - Indicates coordination with State Emergency Management Agency  
0 - No indication |
| State Department of Transportation | 1 - Indicates coordination with State Department of Transportation  
0 - No indication |
| State Public Health Department  | 1 - Indicates coordination with State Public Health Department  
0 - No indication |
| State Department of Human Services/Social Services | 1 - Indicates coordination with State Department of Human Services/Social Services  
0 - No indication |
| 6.3.1.3 State Resources         | 1 - Describes how capabilities and resources of state government are used during response  
0 - No description |
### 6.3.2 Federal Government

#### 6.3.2.1 Federal Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Response Framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Detailed description of integration of local response plan with NRF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- General, or brief, description of NRF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Incident Management System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Detailed description of integration of local response plan with NIMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- General, or brief, description of NIMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Preparedness Goal (new Sept 2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Detailed description of integration of local response plan with National Preparedness Goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- General, or brief, description of NPG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Preparedness Guide 101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Detailed description of integration of local response plan with CPG 101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- General, or brief, description of CPG 101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Federal Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Detailed description of integration of local response plan with other relevant federal plan(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- General, or brief, description of other relevant federal plan(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6.3.2.2 Federal Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEMA Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Indicates Coordination with FEMA Regional Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA Headquarters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Indicates Coordination with FEMA Headquarters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Guard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Indicates Coordination with National Guard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Indicates Coordination with NOAA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Weather Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Indicates Coordination with NWS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Federal Government Resources

| 6.3.2.3  | Federal Government Resources | 1 - Describes how capabilities and resources of federal government are used during response  
0 - No description |

#### Section 6.4 Inter-organizational Coordination Section Summary

| 6.4 | In a few sentences or bullet points, characterize inter-organizational coordination—the approach or style used, strengths and weaknesses, best practices, and any other notes on the overall quality of the section. |  

- U.S. Coast Guard: 1 - Indicates Coordination with U.S. Coast Guard  
0 - Not present
- U.S. Department of Homeland Security: 1 - Indicates Coordination with DHS  
0 - Not present
- U.S. Department of Transportation: 1 - Indicates Coordination with US DOT  
0 - Not present
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency: 1 - Indicates Coordination with US EPA  
0 - Not present
**Section 7: Implementation**

### Section 7.1 Roles and Responsibilities of Organizations in Supporting the Jurisdiction’s Plan for Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Page #</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Note:** This section is outlined to address the organization of the local jurisdiction's plan. The plan could be organized by ICS sections, ESFs, Functional Annexes and/or Support Annexes. In some cases, the functions may be within another section (e.g. Transportation may be located within the Logistics Section of the ICS Annex). If this is the case, please code both functions separately.

#### 7.1.1 Incident Command System

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.1.1.1</strong> Operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Responsible Organization or Position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Responsible Organizations or Positions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7.1.2 Planning

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.1.2.1</strong> Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Responsible Organization or Position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Responsible Organizations or Positions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 7.1.1.3 Logistics | 1 - Present  
0 - Not Present |
|-------------------|------------------|
| Lead Responsible Organization or Position | 1 - Listed  
0 - Not Listed |
| Other Responsible Organizations or Positions | 1 - Listed  
0 - Not Listed |
| Responsibilities | 2 - Detailed list of responsibilities by organization or position  
1 - General, or brief, list of responsibilities  
0 - No responsibilities listed |
| 7.1.1.4 Administration/Finance | 1 - Present  
0 - Not Present |
| Lead Responsible Organization or Position | 1 - Listed  
0 - Not Listed |
| Other Responsible Organizations or Positions | 1 - Listed  
0 - Not Listed |
| Responsibilities | 2 - Detailed list of responsibilities by organization or position  
1 - General, or brief, list of responsibilities  
0 - No responsibilities listed |
| 7.1.2 Emergency Support Functions | 1 - Present  
0 - Not Present |
| 7.1.2.1 Transportation (ESF 1) | 1 - Listed  
0 - Not Listed |
| Lead Responsible Organization or Position | 1 - Listed  
0 - Not Listed |
| Other Responsible Organizations or Positions | 1 - Listed  
0 - Not Listed |
| Responsibilities | 2 - Detailed list of responsibilities by organization or position  
1 - General, or brief, list of responsibilities  
0 - No responsibilities listed |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.1.2.2</th>
<th>Communications (ESF 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - Not Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - Not Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - Not Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td>2 - Detailed list of responsibilities by organization or position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - General, or brief, list of responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - No responsibilities listed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.1.2.3</th>
<th>Public Works and Engineering (ESF 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - Not Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - Not Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - Not Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td>2 - Detailed list of responsibilities by organization or position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - General, or brief, list of responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - No responsibilities listed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.1.2.4</th>
<th>Firefighting (ESF 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - Not Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - Not Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - Not Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td>2 - Detailed list of responsibilities by organization or position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - General, or brief, list of responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - No responsibilities listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 7: Implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 7.1.2.5 Emergency Management (ESF 5) | 1 - Present  
0 - Not Present |
| Lead Responsible Organization or Position | 1 - Listed  
0 - Not Listed |
| Other Responsible Organizations or Positions | 1 - Listed  
0 - Not Listed |
| Responsibilities | 2 - Detailed list of responsibilities by organization or position  
1 - General, or brief, list of responsibilities  
0 - No responsibilities listed |
| 7.1.2.6 Mass Care, Emergency Assistance, Housing and Human Services (ESF 6) | 1 - Present  
0 - Not Present |
| Lead Responsible Organization or Position | 1 - Listed  
0 - Not Listed |
| Other Responsible Organizations or Positions | 1 - Listed  
0 - Not Listed |
| Responsibilities | 2 - Detailed list of responsibilities by organization or position  
1 - General, or brief, list of responsibilities  
0 - No responsibilities listed |
| 7.1.2.7 Logistics, Management and Resource Support (ESF 7) | 1 - Present  
0 - Not Present |
| Lead Responsible Organization or Position | 1 - Listed  
0 - Not Listed |
| Other Responsible Organizations or Positions | 1 - Listed  
0 - Not Listed |
| Responsibilities | 2 - Detailed list of responsibilities by organization or position  
1 - General, or brief, list of responsibilities  
0 - No responsibilities listed |
| 7.1.2.8 | Public Health and Medical Services (ESF 8) | 1 - Present  
0 - Not Present | 1 - Listed  
0 - Not Listed | 1 - Listed  
0 - Not Listed | 2 - Detailed list of responsibilities by organization or position  
1 - General, or brief, list of responsibilities  
0 - No responsibilities listed |
| 7.1.2.9 | Search and Rescue (ESF 9) | 1 - Present  
0 - Not Present | 1 - Listed  
0 - Not Listed | 1 - Listed  
0 - Not Listed | 2 - Detailed list of responsibilities by organization or position  
1 - General, or brief, list of responsibilities  
0 - No responsibilities listed |
| 7.1.2.10 | Oil and Hazardous Materials Response (ESF 10) | 1 - Present  
0 - Not Present | 1 - Listed  
0 - Not Listed | 1 - Listed  
0 - Not Listed | 2 - Detailed list of responsibilities by organization or position  
1 - General, or brief, list of responsibilities  
0 - No responsibilities listed |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 7: Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.1.2.11</strong> Agriculture and Natural Resources (ESF 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Responsible Organization or Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Responsible Organizations or Positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.1.2.12</strong> Energy (ESF 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Responsible Organization or Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Responsible Organizations or Positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.1.2.13</strong> Public Safety and Security (ESF 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Responsible Organization or Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Responsible Organizations or Positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 7.1.3 Support Annexes

#### 7.1.3.1 Direction, Control, and Coordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead Responsible Organization or Position</td>
<td>1 - Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Responsible Organizations or Positions</td>
<td>1 - Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td>2 - Detailed list of responsibilities by organization or position</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7.1.3.2 Continuity of Government Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead Responsible Organization or Position</td>
<td>1 - Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Responsible Organizations or Positions</td>
<td>1 - Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td>2 - Detailed list of responsibilities by organization or position</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7.1.3.3 Warning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead Responsible Organization or Position</td>
<td>1 - Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Responsible Organizations or Positions</td>
<td>1 - Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td>2 - Detailed list of responsibilities by organization or position</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Section 7: Implementation**
| 7.1.3.4 Population Protection | 1 - Present  
0 - Not Present  | 1 - Listed  
0 - Not Listed  | 1 - Listed  
0 - Not Listed  | 2 - Detailed list of responsibilities by organization or position  
1 - General, or brief, list of responsibilities  
0 - No responsibilities listed  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead Responsible Organization or Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Responsible Organizations or Positions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 7.1.3.5 Financial Management | 1 - Present  
0 - Not Present  | 1 - Listed  
0 - Not Listed  | 1 - Listed  
0 - Not Listed  | 2 - Detailed list of responsibilities by organization or position  
1 - General, or brief, list of responsibilities  
0 - No responsibilities listed  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead Responsible Organization or Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Responsible Organizations or Positions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 7.1.3.6 Mutual Aid/Multi-Jurisdictional Coordination | 1 - Present  
0 - Not Present  | 1 - Listed  
0 - Not Listed  | 1 - Listed  
0 - Not Listed  | 2 - Detailed list of responsibilities by organization or position  
1 - General, or brief, list of responsibilities  
0 - No responsibilities listed  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead Responsible Organization or Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Responsible Organizations or Positions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 7: Implementation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 7: Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7.1.3.7 Private Sector Coordination | 1 - Present  
0 - Not Present |
| Lead Responsible Organization or Position | 1 - Listed  
0 - Not Listed |
| Other Responsible Organizations or Positions | 1 - Listed  
0 - Not Listed |
| Responsibilities | 2 - Detailed list of responsibilities by organization or position  
1 - General, or brief, list of responsibilities  
0 - No responsibilities listed |
| 7.1.3.8 Volunteer and Donations Management | 1 - Present  
0 - Not Present |
| Lead Responsible Organization or Position | 1 - Listed  
0 - Not Listed |
| Other Responsible Organizations or Positions | 1 - Listed  
0 - Not Listed |
| Responsibilities | 2 - Detailed list of responsibilities by organization or position  
1 - General, or brief, list of responsibilities  
0 - No responsibilities listed |
| 7.1.3.9 Worker Safety and Health | 1 - Present  
0 - Not Present |
| Lead Responsible Organization or Position | 1 - Listed  
0 - Not Listed |
| Other Responsible Organizations or Positions | 1 - Listed  
0 - Not Listed |
| Responsibilities | 2 - Detailed list of responsibilities by organization or position  
1 - General, or brief, list of responsibilities  
0 - No responsibilities listed |
| Section 7.1.3.10 | Prevention and Protection | 1 - Present  
0 - Not Present |
|------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|
|                  | Lead Responsible Organization or Position | 1 - Listed  
0 - Not Listed |
|                  | Other Responsible Organizations or Positions | 1 - Listed  
0 - Not Listed |
|                  | Responsibilities | 2 - Detailed list of responsibilities by organization or position  
1 - General, or brief, list of responsibilities  
0 - No responsibilities listed |
| Section 7.1.3.11 | Damage Assessment | 1 - Present  
0 - Not Present |
|                  | Lead Responsible Organization or Position | 1 - Listed  
0 - Not Listed |
|                  | Other Responsible Organizations or Positions | 1 - Listed  
0 - Not Listed |
|                  | Responsibilities | 2 - Detailed list of responsibilities by organization or position  
1 - General, or brief, list of responsibilities  
0 - No responsibilities listed |
| **Section 7.2 Responsibilities of individuals outlined in the response plan** | | |
| **7.2.1 Public Officials and Employees** | | |
| County Commissioner | 1 - Responsibilities Listed  
0 - Responsibilities Not Listed |
| Town/City Council Member | 1 - Responsibilities Listed  
0 - Responsibilities Not Listed |
| Municipal Mayor(s) | 1 - Responsibilities Listed  
0 - Responsibilities Not Listed |
| City/County Attorney | 1 - Responsibilities Listed  
0 - Responsibilities Not Listed |
| Sheriff/Police Chief | 1 - Responsibilities Listed  
0 - Responsibilities Not Listed |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Responsibilities Listed</th>
<th>Responsibilities Not Listed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County/Town/City Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Management Coordinator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant (or Deputy) Emergency Management Coordinator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Marshal or Fire Chief</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Services Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage Assessment Officer/Tax Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of Schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Red Cross Liaison</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 7: Implementation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.2.2 Incident Command System</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.2.2.1 Incident Commander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Responsibilities             | 1 - Responsibilities Listed  
|                               | 0 - Responsibilities Not Listed  |
| Position appointed as Incident Commander | 1 - Lists position appointed as Incident Commander during response  
|                               | 0 - Person appointed not listed  |
| 7.2.2.2 Finance/Administration Section Officer |  |
| Responsibilities             | 1 - Responsibilities Listed  
|                               | 0 - Responsibilities Not Listed  |
| Position appointed as Finance/Administration Section Officer | 1 - Lists position appointed as Finance/Administration Section Officer during response  
|                               | 0 - Person appointed not listed  |
| 7.2.2.3 Logistics Section Chief |  |
| Responsibilities             | 1 - Responsibilities Listed  
|                               | 0 - Responsibilities Not Listed  |
| Position appointed as Logistics Section Chief | 1 - Lists position appointed as Logistics Section Chief during response  
|                               | 0 - Person appointed not listed  |
| 7.2.2.4 Operations Section Chief |  |
| Responsibilities             | 1 - Responsibilities Listed  
|                               | 0 - Responsibilities Not Listed  |
| Position appointed as Operations Section Chief | 1 - Lists position appointed as Operations Section Chief during response  
|                               | 0 - Person appointed not listed  |
| 7.2.2.5 Planning Section Chief |  |
| Responsibilities             | 1 - Responsibilities Listed  
|                               | 0 - Responsibilities Not Listed  |
| Person appointed in this position | 1 - Lists person appointed as Planning Section Chief during response  
<p>|                               | 0 - Person appointed not listed  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.2.2.6 Public Information Officer</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td>1 - Responsibilities Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - Responsibilities Not Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person appointed in this position</td>
<td>1 - Lists person appointed as Public Information Officer during response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - Person appointed not listed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.2.2.7 Safety Officer</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td>1 - Responsibilities Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - Responsibilities Not Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person appointed in this position</td>
<td>1 - Lists person appointed as Safety Officer during response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - Person appointed not listed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 7.3 Plan Clarity

#### 7.3.1 Plan Contents

<p>| Table of Contents | 1 - Present  |
|                  | 0 - Not Present  |
| Table of Contents with Page numbers | 1 - Present  |
|                         | 0 - Not Present  |
| Executive Summary      | 1 - Present  |
|                         | 0 - Not Present  |
| Glossary of Terms      | 1 - Present  |
|                         | 0 - Not Present  |
| Written in clear, simple, unambiguous language | 1 - Yes  |
|                         | 0 - No  |
| Plan contains illustrations such as charts, graphs, figures, and maps | 1 - Contains illustrations  |
|                         | 0 - Does not contain illustrations  |
| Record of update or changes | 1 - Present  |
|                            | 0 - Not Present  |
| Introduction               | 1 - Brief explanation of why the plan was developed and how the plan is used  |
|                            | 0 - No explanation  |
| Plan Purpose               | 1 - Present  |
|                            | 0 - Not Present  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References/resources</th>
<th>1 - Describes/lists references and resources used in plan development 0 - No references or resources listed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact List</td>
<td>1 - Includes a list of agencies and personnel not internal to the organization but critical to emergency operations 0 - No list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear alignment of goals and policies</td>
<td>1 - Plan indicates clear alignment of goals and policies 0 - No indication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.3.1.1 Type of Plan/Approach

- **All Hazards Plan**
  - 1 - Describes plan as taking an All-Hazards approach
  - 0 - No description of All-Hazards approach

- **Scenario-Based Plan**
  - 1 - Describes plan as based on a scenario
  - 0 - Not scenario-based

- **Hazard Specific Annexes**
  - 1 - Plan has hazard specific annexes
  - 0 - No hazard specific annexes

- **Capabilities-based**
  - 1 - Plan is described as capabilities-based
  - 0 - No description of plan as capabilities-based

- **Identifies assumptions used in developing the plan**
  - 1 - Plan lists assumptions
  - 0 - No assumptions listed

### 7.3.2 Accessibility/Plan Distribution

- **Plan located on jurisdiction's website**
  - 1 - Indicates location of plan on jurisdiction's website
  - 0 - No indication of website

- **Copies of plan located at public venues**
  - 1 - Indicates plan is located at public venues (e.g. Public library)
  - 0 - No location indicated

- **Identifies publicizing the plan using various media channels**
  - 1 - Identifies media channels used to promote plan
  - 0 - No identification of media channels

- **Distribution list**
  - 1 - List of persons and/or agencies that have received the plan
  - 0 - No list
### Section 7.4 Plan Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.4.1 Training</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration and personnel</td>
<td>1 - Indicates training jurisdiction's administration and personnel on the response plan 0 - No training indicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected officials</td>
<td>1 - Indicates training jurisdiction's elected officials on the response plan 0 - No training indicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>1 - Indicates training jurisdiction's citizens on the response plan 0 - No training indicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Responders</td>
<td>1 - Indicates training jurisdiction's first responders on the response plan 0 - No training indicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Groups (e.g. American Red Cross)</td>
<td>1 - Indicates training volunteer organizations on the response plan 0 - No training indicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-collaboration training with other jurisdictions</td>
<td>1 - Indicates training with other jurisdictions on the response plan 0 - No cross collaboration training indicated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 7.5 Implementation Section Summary

| 7.5.1 | In a few sentences or bullet points, characterize implementation—the approach or style used, strengths and weaknesses, best practices, and any other notes on the overall quality of the section. |  |
## Section 8: Monitoring and Evaluation

### Section 8.1 Exercising or Testing the Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 8.1 Exercising or Testing the Plan</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Page #</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8.1.1 Exercise History                     |       |        | 1 - Describes the types of exercises done in previous years  
|                                            |       |        | 0 - No description |
| Applied Exercise Lessons                   |       |        | 1 - Applies lessons from previous exercises (e.g. results in tangible policy change)  
|                                            |       |        | 0 - No description |
| Frequency of Exercises                     |       |        | 1 - Describes the frequency of exercises  
|                                            |       |        | 0 - No description |
| Drills                                     |       |        | 1 - Mentions drills completed in the past (exercises that test emergency plans, staffing levels, personnel training, procedures, facilities, equipment and materials)  
|                                            |       |        | 0 - No mention |
| Tabletop Exercise                          |       |        | 1 - Mentions tabletop exercises completed in the past  
|                                            |       |        | 0 - No mention |
| Functional Exercise                        |       |        | 1 - Mentions functional exercises completed in the past  
|                                            |       |        | 0 - No mention |
| Full-Scale Exercise                        |       |        | 1 - Mentions full-scale exercises completed in the past  
|                                            |       |        | 0 - No mention |
| 8.1.2 Future Exercises Planned             |       |        | 1 - General, or brief, description of exercises planned in the future  
|                                            |       |        | 0 - No description |
| Future Exercises (General)                 |       |        | 1 - Provides a schedule for future exercises (within 1 to 2 years)  
|                                            |       |        | 0 - No mention of a future exercise |
| Exercise Schedule                          |       |        | 1 - Provides a schedule for future exercises (within 1 to 2 years)  
|                                            |       |        | 0 - No mention of a future exercise |
| Drills                                      | 1 - Mentions future drills (exercises that test emergency plans, staffing levels, personnel training, procedures, facilities, equipment and materials)  
                                              | 0 - No mention |
|---------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Tabletop Exercise                           | 1 - Mentions tabletop exercises planned for the future  
                                              | 0 - No mention |
| Functional Exercise                         | 1 - Mentions functional exercises planned for the future  
                                              | 0 - No mention |
| Full-Scale Exercise                         | 1 - Mentions full-scale exercises planned for the future  
                                              | 0 - No mention |
| 8.1.3 Exercise Development (General)        | 1 - Describes exercise development  
                                              | 0 - No description |
| Procedures for development                  | 1 - Describes process for using feedback from the exercise (e.g. After Action Reports) to update the plan  
                                              | 0 - No description |
| Procedures/process for feedback to update plan | 1 - Indicates persons involved in exercise development  
                                              | 0 - No indication |
| Persons Involved                            | 1 - Indicates how often the plan is evaluated  
                                              | 0 - No indication |
| Frequency of Evaluation                     | 1 - Indicates responsible party for plan evaluation  
                                              | 0 - No indication |
| Responsible Party                           | 1 - Indicates public involvement in plan evaluation  
                                              | 0 - No indication |
| Public Involvement                          | 1 - Indicates public involvement in plan evaluation  
                                              | 0 - No indication |
### 8.2.2 Process for Updating plan

#### 8.2.2.1 Response Plan (as a whole)

| Frequency | 1 - Indicates how often the plan is updated  
|           | 0 - No indication |
| Responsible Party | 1 - Indicates responsible party for updating the plan  
|           | 0 - No indication |
| Process | 1 - Describes process for updating plan  
|          | 0 - No description |

#### 8.2.2.2 Updating Vulnerability Assessment

| Process | 1 - Describes how the vulnerability assessment is updated in the plan  
|         | 0 - No description |
| Frequency | 1 - Indicates how often the vulnerability assessment is updated  
|           | 0 - No indication |
| Responsible Party | 1 - Indicates responsible party for updating the vulnerability assessment  
|             | 0 - No indication |

#### 8.2.2.3 Updating Hazard Assessment

| Process | 1 - Describes how the hazard assessment is updated in the plan  
|         | 0 - No description |
| Frequency | 1 - Indicates how often the hazard assessment is updated  
|           | 0 - No indication |
| Responsible Party | 1 - Indicates responsible party for updating the hazard assessment  
|             | 0 - No indication |
| 8.2.2.4 Updating Capabilities Assessment | | 1 - Describes how the capabilities assessment is updated in the plan  
0 - No description |
| Process | 1 - Indicates how often the capabilities assessment is updated  
0 - No indication |
| Frequency | 1 - Indicates responsible party for updating the capabilities assessment  
0 - No indication |
| Responsible Party | 1 - Describes how the goals and policies are updated in the plan  
0 - No description |
| Process | 1 - Indicates how often the goals and policies are updated  
0 - No indication |
| Frequency | 1 - Indicates responsible party for updating the goals and policies  
0 - No indication |
| Responsible Party | 1 - Describes how the Support Annexes and/or Functional Annexes are updated in the plan  
0 - No description |
| Process | 1 - Indicates how often the Support Annexes and/or Functional Annexes are updated  
0 - No indication |
| Frequency | 1 - Indicates responsible party for updating the Support Annexes and/or Functional Annexes  
0 - No indication |
<p>| Responsible Party | Note: All Annexes in the plan should describe how they will be updated |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8.2.2.7</th>
<th>Post-Disaster Plan Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Process | 1 - Describes how the plan is updated after a disaster  
0 - No description |
| Responsible Party | 1 - Indicates responsible party for updating the plan after a disaster  
0 - No indication |

**Section 8.3 Monitor and Evaluation Section Summary**

8.3.1 In a few sentences or bullet points, characterize monitor and evaluation—the approach or style used, strengths and weaknesses, best practices, and any other notes on the overall quality of the section.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 9.1 Best Practices</th>
<th>Page #</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.1.1 List Best Practices found in the Response Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix A: Definitions**

**Area Command** – The NIMS ICS term to describe the situation in which jurisdictional EOC coordinates operations at multiple scenes or when no single scene exists.¹

**Available Resources** – Resources in which a jurisdiction has available to use in an emergency.

**Best Practice** – A method or technique, based on research or practice, that is considered to be an exemplary practice in emergency management.

**Capabilities-based Planning** – Planning, under uncertainty, to provide capabilities suitable for a wide range of threats and hazards while working within an economic framework that necessitates prioritization and choice. Capabilities-based planning addresses uncertainty by analyzing a wide range of scenarios to identify required capabilities.²

**Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear (CBRN)** – Refers to a situation in which a chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear incident has occurred.

**Community Emergency Response Team (CERT)** – Sponsored volunteers who have been given professional training in disaster response and management.³

**Community Preparedness Guide 101 (CPG 101)** – A FEMA document that provides guidance for developing emergency operations plans.⁴

**Concept of Operations (CONOPS)** – The strategic rules under which emergency response operations are to proceed.⁵

---

³ (Perry and Lindell, 2007).
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Continuity of Government – Measures that ensure that representative government survives during and after an incident.\(^6\)

Continuity of Operations (COOP) – Measures that ensure that government departments can deliver essential services during and after a disaster.

Critical Facilities – Critical facilities include hospitals, fire stations, police stations, storage of critical records, water treatment plants, and other similar facilities. Critical facilities should not be located in a floodplain and should be provided a higher level of protection so that they can continue to function and provide services after a disaster.\(^7\)

Damage Assessment – The process used to appraise or determine the number of injuries and deaths, damage to public and private property, and status of key facilities and services (e.g. hospitals, fire and police stations, water and sanitation systems, utilities) resulting from a human-caused or natural disaster.\(^8\)

Demobilize – Policies that coordinate an efficient return to normal operating procedures after a disaster.

Disaster Declaration (State of Emergency) – A local or state government that does not believe it can respond effectively without outside assistance will ask for a disaster declaration to receive additional resources from higher levels of government.

Emergency Management – The managerial function charged with creating the framework within which communities reduce vulnerability to hazards and cope with disasters.\(^9\)

Emergency Management Accreditation Program (EMAP) – EMAP is an independent non-profit organization which is a standard-based voluntary assessment and peer review accreditation process for government programs responsible for coordinating

---

\(^6\) (Perry and Lindell, 2007).

\(^7\) [http://www.fema.gov/plan/prevent/floodplain/nfipkeywords/critical_facility.shtm](http://www.fema.gov/plan/prevent/floodplain/nfipkeywords/critical_facility.shtm)

\(^8\) Comprehensive Preparedness Guide 101.

prevention, mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery activities for natural and human-caused disasters. Accreditation is based on compliance with collaboratively developed national standards, the Emergency Management Standard by EMAP.10

**Emergency Management Assistance Compact (EMAC)** – Similar to local mutual aid agreement except that it is an agreement for states.11

**Emergency Medical Facilities** – Facilities required to ensure proper medical care for the sick and injured from the time of injury to the time of final disposition (e.g. temporary medical facilities, special care facilities).12

**Emergency Operations Center (EOC)** – The physical location at which the coordination of information and resources to support incident management (on-scene operations) activities normally takes place.13

**EOC Activation Levels** - Levels of activation are used to determine staffing needs for the EOC. It is recommended that adjoining municipalities, neighboring counties, and nearby school districts, hospitals, and businesses use identical or compatible terms to distinguish among activation levels. The use of common terminology can help neighboring jurisdictions understand the severity of the emergency or disaster, assess which level of activation might be appropriate, and determine whether requests for mutual assistance may be forthcoming.14

**Emergency Operations Plan (EOP)** – A document that describes what the community will do in the aftermath of a disaster.15

**Emergency Support Functions (ESFs)** – ESFs group Federal resources and capabilities into functional areas that are most frequently needed in responding to an incident.16 In this context, jurisdictions can use the ESF format to organize its resources and capabilities. The scope of each ESF17:

10 [http://www.emaponline.org/](http://www.emaponline.org/)
11 (McEntire, 2007).
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14 (Waugh and Tierney, 2007)
15 (Perry and Lindell, 2007).
1. **Transportation** – Federal and civil transportation support; transportation safety; restoration and recovery of transportation infrastructure; movement restrictions; damage and impact assessment

2. **Communications** – Coordination with telecommunications industry; restoration and repair of telecommunications infrastructure; protection, restoration, and sustainability or national cyber and information technology resources

3. **Public Works and Engineering** – Infrastructure protection and emergency repair; infrastructure restoration; engineering services, construction management; critical infrastructure liaison

4. **Firefighting** – Firefighting activities; resource support to rural and urban firefighting operations

5. **Emergency Management** – Coordination of incident management efforts; issuance of mission assignments; resource and human capital; incident action planning; financial management

6. **Mass Care, Emergency Assistance, Housing and Human Services** – Mass care; disaster housing; human services

7. **Logistics Management and Resource Support** – Resource support (facility space, office equipment and supplies, contracting services, etc)

8. **Public Health and Medical Services** – Public health; medical; mental health services; mortuary services

9. **Search and Rescue** – Life-saving assistance; urban search and rescue

10. **Oil and Hazardous Materials Response** – Oil and hazardous materials (chemical, biological, radiological, etc) response; environmental safety and short- and long-term cleanup

11. **Agriculture and Natural Resources** – Nutrition assistance; animal and plant disease and pest response; food safety and security; natural and cultural resources and historic properties protection and restoration
12. **Energy** – Energy infrastructure assessment, repair, and restoration; energy industry utilities coordination; energy forecast

13. **Public Safety and Security** – Facility and resource security; security planning and technical resource assistance; public safety and security support; support to access, traffic, and crowd control

14. **Long Term Community Recovery** – Social and economic community impact assessment; long-term community recovery assistance to states, local government, and private sector

15. **External Affairs** – Emergency public information and protective action guidance; media and community relations; congressional and international affairs; tribal and insular affairs

**Environmental contamination** – The depletion or pollution of the earth’s natural resources.\(^{18}\)

**Exercise** – A simulation of a crisis, emergency, or disaster that has the goal of improvising response and recovery operations in an actual event.\(^{19}\)

**Drill** – A small and limited exercise to improve a single function in response operations.\(^{20}\)

**Tabletop Exercise** – Plan test conducted in the classroom or conference room, based on a limited scenario, which allows participants to verbally describe their response to contingencies.

**Functional Exercise** – Exercise that tests one or more functions in an emergency plan in a field setting designed to realistically approximate disaster conditions.

**Full-Scale Exercise** – Exercises that test all aspects and all organizational participants in an Emergency Operations Plan in a realistic field setting.\(^{21}\)

---

\(^{18}\) (McEntire, 2007).


\(^{20}\) (McEntire, 2007).

\(^{21}\) (Perry and Lindell, 2007).
First responders – Public safety personnel such as police, firefighters, and emergency medical technicians. 22

Flexibility – A willingness to depart from widely accepted standards and practices of doing things (thinking creatively and improvising solutions) to react effectively to unforeseen problems. 23

Geographic Extent – The area in which a jurisdiction is affected by hazards.

Hazard Identification and Assessment – Assessment that identifies the hazards to which the jurisdiction is exposed, derives probabilities for impacts, and forecasts consequences. 24

Hazard Mitigation – The capabilities necessary to reduce the loss of life and property be lessening the impact of disasters. 25

Horizontal Integration – Refers to relationships across a horizontal axis and is measured by the strength of local relationships 26; those include government entities, neighboring jurisdictions, private sector, public sector, and community organizations such as faith-based organization or community group.

Incident Command System – A standardized on-scene emergency management construct specifically designed to provide an integrated organizational structure that reflects the complexity and demands of a single or multiple incidents, without being hindered by jurisdictional boundaries. 27

Operations – Coordinates operational support with on-scene incident management efforts.

Planning – Collection, evaluation, dissemination, and use of information regarding the threat or incident and the status of resources. The Planning Section prepares and documents government support actions and develops unified action, contingency, long-term and other plans.

22 (McEntire, 2007).
23 (McEntire, 2007).
24 (Perry and Lindell, 2007).
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Logistics – Coordinates logistics support that includes: control of and accountability for supplies and equipment; resource ordering; delivery of equipment, supplies, and services to field locations; facility location, setup, space management, building services, and general facility operations; transportation coordination and fleet management services; information and technology systems services; administrative services such as mail management and reproduction; and customer assistance. 28

Administration/Finance – Tracks costs, completes and files paperwork, and records expenses or operations and logistics. 29

Incident Management Assistance Teams – IMATs are teams funded by the federal government. They are full-time, rapid-response teams with dedicated staff able to deploy within two hours and arrive at an incident within 12 hours to support the local incident commander. IMATs provide a forward federal presence to facilitate the management of the national response to catastrophic incidents. 30

Interoperable Communications – The ability to communicate and operate across and with various disaster organizations. 31

Joint Information Center/Emergency Communication Center – A facility established to coordinate all incident-related public information activities. 32

Magnitude – The size and extent of a disaster.

Mass care (feeding, hydration) – Providing coordination of sheltering, feeding, hydrating, and emergency first aid following a disaster or other event that is beyond the capacity of local government to adequately meet the needs of the community.

Memorandum of Understanding – A document describing an agreement between parties.

28 National Response Framework
29 (McEntire, 2007).
31 (McEntire, 2007).
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**Metropolitan Medical Response System (MMRS)** – The MMRS Program provides funding to support the integration of emergency management, health, and medical systems into a coordinated response to mass casualty incidents caused by any hazard. *This is a federal program in which only eligible jurisdictions are allowed to apply.*

**Mutual Aid Agreements** – Agreements between local, state, regional, and/or national governmental agencies to reduce duplication and increase the effectiveness of emergency response and other post-disaster activities. Such agreements are often used to provide supplemental staff and other resources in the post-disaster environment.

**National Disaster Medical System** - The National Disaster Medical System (NDMS) is a federally coordinated system that augments the Nation's medical response capability. The overall purpose of the NDMS is to supplement an integrated National medical response capability for assisting State and local authorities in dealing with the medical impacts of major peacetime disasters and to provide support to the military and the Department of Veterans Affairs medical systems in caring for casualties evacuated back to the U.S. from overseas armed conventional conflicts.

**National Fire Protection Association Standard 1600 (NFPA 1600)** – The NFPA 1600, also known as the Standard on Disaster/Emergency Management and Business Continuity Programs, establishes a common set of criteria for all hazards disaster/emergency management and business continuity programs.

**National Incident Management System (NIMS)** – A set of principles that provides a systematic, proactive approach guiding government agencies at all levels, nongovernmental organizations, and the private sector to work seamlessly to prevent, protect against, respond to, recover from, and mitigate the effects of incidents, regardless of cause, size, location, or complexity, in order to reduce the loss of life or property and harm to the environment.

**National Preparedness Goal (NPG)** – NPG is part of the implementation of Presidential Policy Directive 8. The goal is, “to have a secure and resilient Nation with the capabilities required across the whole community to prevent, protect against, mitigation,

---

35 [http://www.phe.gov/preparedness/responders/ndms/Pages/default.aspx](http://www.phe.gov/preparedness/responders/ndms/Pages/default.aspx)
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respond to, and recover from the threats and hazards that pose the greatest risk." NPG identifies the core capabilities and capability targets necessary to advance our national preparedness. Additionally, it emphasizes the responsibility of the entire community in increasing preparedness.  

**National Response Framework (NRF)** – This document establishes a comprehensive, national, all-hazards approach to domestic incident response. It serves as a guide to enable responders at all levels of government and beyond to provide a unified national response to a disaster. It defines the key principles, roles, and structures that organize the way U.S. jurisdictions plan and respond.

**Position** – This refers to a role within government or the community (e.g. Emergency Management Coordinator, Police Chief, or American Red Cross Liaison).

**Pre-positioned Agreement** - Agreements between non-profit, private, community organizations, or educational institutions that help reduce duplication and increase the effectiveness of emergency response and other post-disaster activities.

**Preparedness** – Actions that involve a combination of planning, resources, training, exercising, and organizing to build, sustain, and improve operational capabilities. Preparedness is the process of identifying the personnel, training, and equipment needed for a wide range of potential incidents, and developing jurisdiction-specific plans for delivering capabilities when needed for an incident.

**Prevention** – The capabilities necessary to avoid, prevent, or stop a threatened or actual act of terrorism.

**Protection** – Capabilities to safeguard against acts of terrorism and manmade or natural disasters.

**Purchasing** – A jurisdiction acquiring supplies and equipment for the purposes of disaster response and recovery.

**Recovery** – The differential process of restoring, rebuilding, and reshaping the physical, social, economic, and natural environment through pre-event planning and post-event actions.

---
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Reentry policies – Policies that address when the public and business owners will be allowed to re-enter their communities after a disaster.

Relocation Assistance – Local, state, or federal government provide assistance in relocating after a disaster.

Required Resources – Resources in which a jurisdiction needs during an emergency to respond successfully to the needs of the community.

Resource Management – A system for identifying available resources at all jurisdictional levels to enable timely, efficient, and unimpeded access to resources needed to prepare form respond to, or recover from an incident.  

Response – Activities in the immediate aftermath of a disaster to save lives, protect property and the environment, and meet basic human needs.  

Rumor control – Jurisdictions need to be prepared to manage media inquiries to avoid rumors about the situation to the public.

Scenario-based Planning – A planning approach that uses a hazard vulnerability assessment to assess the hazard’s impact on an organization on the basis of various threats that the organization could encounter. These threats (e.g. hurricane, terrorist attack) become the basis of the scenario.

Search and Rescue (or Urban Search and Rescue) – Involved the location, rescue, and initial medical stabilization of victims during and after a disaster. 

Severity – The harshness or intensity of a disaster.

---
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Sheltering in-place – The public may be asked to stay in their own homes or current location during a disaster rather than evacuate to a designated emergency shelter.

Situational Assessment – An assessment of the nature and extent of the hazard, any cascading effects, and the status of response that will provide all decision makers with relevant information to deploy resources and meet the needs of the community.

Socially Vulnerable Population – Populations that are especially vulnerable to disasters and their impacts; those include minorities, low income, elderly, children or persons with disabilities.

Staging Areas – Location where resources such as vehicles, supplies, and equipment are stored and assembled before deployed to a specific area during and after a disaster.

Standard Operating Procedures – A reference document or operations manual that provides the purpose, authorities, duration, and details for the preferred method of performing a single function or a number of interrelated functions in a uniform manner. 49

Succession Plan – The process for identifying and training personnel to take the role of another, if necessary, during response and recovery.

Support Annexes – Describe essential supporting aspects that are common to all incidents. Those include 50:

Direction, Control and Coordination – Means the jurisdiction will use to direct and control those activities of government that are essential to saving lives, protecting property, and restoring government services during and following emergency situations

Continuity of Government Operations – Process for maintaining essential functions of government

Warning – Actions taken to initiate/disseminate the initial notification that a disaster or threat is imminent or has occurred

Population Protection – Coordinating evacuation and sheltering

49 Comprehensive Preparedness Guide 101
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Financial Management – Actions taken to ensure that funds are provided expeditiously and that financial operations are conducted in accordance with established law, policies, regulations, and standards

Mutual Aid/Multi-jurisdictional Coordination – Processes to establish and execute mutual aid agreements and multijurisdictional coordination in support of incident response

Private Sector Coordination – Processes to ensure effective coordination and integration with the private sector, including non-profit and for-profit, engaged in incident response and recovery activities

Volunteer and Donations Management – Actions taken to manage and coordinate volunteers and donations

Worker Safety and Health – Processes to ensure response and recovery worker safety and health during incident
Prevention and Protection – Methods to conduct prevention and protection activities to reduce the risk of terrorism

Damage Assessment – The operational concepts, organizational arrangements, responsibilities, and procedures to accomplish the tasks required for the local government and its citizens and businesses to initiate the damage assessment process, to assist in recovering from a major emergency or disaster

Swiftwater Rescue – Specially trained and equipped personnel that have the ability to save victims trapped in waterways.

Transitional Housing – Housing or financial assistance that enables those that have lost their homes or whose homes have been severely damaged to relocate for a period of time before finding a more permanent residence or rebuilding their previous home.

Unified Command – NIMS term for the collection of representatives from many agencies in an EOC where there is a single scene.\textsuperscript{51}

Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI) - The UASI Program provides funding to address the unique planning, organization, equipment, training, and exercise needs of high-threat, high-density urban areas, and assists them in building an enhanced and sustainable capacity to prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from acts of terrorism. Per the 9/11 Act, states are

\textsuperscript{51} (Perry and Lindell, 2007).
required to ensure that at least 25 percent (25%) of UASI appropriated funds are dedicated towards law enforcement terrorism prevention activities. *This is a federal program in which only eligible jurisdictions are allowed to apply.*

**Vertical Integration** – Refers to relationships to the jurisdiction on vertical scale; those include state or federal organizations.

**Vulnerability** – A physical feature or operational attribute that renders an entity open to exploitation or susceptible to a given hazard.

**WebEOC** – Web-enabled incident management system that is used in Emergency Operations Centers to update real-time information and coordinate the use of resources.

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Location 1</th>
<th>Location 2</th>
<th>Location 3</th>
<th>Location 4</th>
<th>Location 5</th>
<th>Location 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communications plans or procedures</td>
<td>Section 2: Fact Base - Capability Assessment</td>
<td>Section 4: Policies - Communications Systems</td>
<td>Section 7: Implementation - Roles and Responsibilities, ESFs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity of Government Operations</td>
<td>Section 2: Fact Base - Vulnerability Assessment</td>
<td>Section 4: Policies - Ensure Continuity of Government</td>
<td>Section 7: Implementation - Roles and Responsibilities, Support Annexes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis Counseling</td>
<td>Section 4: Policies - Protect the lives and well being of the public</td>
<td>Section 4: Policies - Protect the lives of first responders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Facilities</td>
<td>Section 2: Fact Base - Vulnerability Assessment</td>
<td>Section 4: Policies - Support Transition to Recovery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster Declaration Procedures</td>
<td>Section 2: Fact Base - Capability Assessment</td>
<td>Section 4: Policies - Internal and External Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Operations Center</td>
<td>Section 2: Fact Base - Capability Assessment</td>
<td>Section 4: Policies - Communications Systems</td>
<td>Section 4: Policies - Internal and External Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment/Vehicles/Supplies Resources</td>
<td>Section 2: Fact Base - Capability Assessment</td>
<td>Section 4: Policies - Internal and External Coordination</td>
<td>Section 4: Policies - Collect information Continuously to Perform Assessments</td>
<td>Section 7: Implementation - Roles and Responsibilities, ESFs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evacuation plans or procedures</td>
<td>Section 2: Fact Base - Capability Assessment</td>
<td>Section 4: Policies - Protect the lives and well being of the public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercises</td>
<td>Section 6: Interorganizational Coordination - Horizontal Coordination</td>
<td>Section 8: Monitoring and Evaluating - Exercising or testing the plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities/Operation Centers</td>
<td>Section 2: Fact Base - Capability Assessment</td>
<td>Section 4: Policies - Protect the lives and well being of the public</td>
<td>Section 4: Policies - Communications Systems</td>
<td>Section 4: Policies - Internal and External Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Agencies</td>
<td>Section 5: Participation - Federal</td>
<td>Section 6: Interorganizational Coordination - Vertical Integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>Section 4: Policies - Ensure Continuity of Government</td>
<td>Section 7: Implementation - Roles and Responsibilities, Support Annexes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Responder Units</td>
<td>Section 2: Fact Base - Capability Assessment</td>
<td>Section 4: Policies - Protect the lives and well being of the public</td>
<td>Section 4: Policies - Protect the lives and well being of the public</td>
<td>Section 4: Policies - Protect the lives of first responders</td>
<td>Section 5: Participation - Organizations/Persons involved in response planning process</td>
<td>Section 7: Implementation - Roles and Responsibilities, ESFs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Pets and Service Animals</td>
<td>Section 2: Fact Base - Vulnerability Assessment</td>
<td>Section 4: Policies - Protect the lives and well being of the public</td>
<td>Section 7: Implementation - Roles and Responsibilities, Incident Command System</td>
<td>Section 7: Implementation - Responsibilities of individuals outlined in the response plan, ICS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident Command System</td>
<td>Section 2: Fact Base - Capability Assessment</td>
<td>Section 4: Policies - Internal and External Coordination</td>
<td>Section 7: Implementation - Roles and Responsibilities, Incident Command System</td>
<td>Section 7: Implementation - Responsibilities of individuals outlined in the response plan, ICS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Care</td>
<td>Section 4: Policies - Protect the lives and well being of the public</td>
<td>Section 7: Implementation - Roles and Responsibilities, ESFs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation</td>
<td>Section 2: Fact Base - Vulnerability Assessment</td>
<td>Section 2: Fact Base - Capability Assessment</td>
<td>Section 2: Fact Base - Hazard Identification and Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Section 6: Inter-organizational Coordination - Coordination of Emergency Management Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Section 2: Fact Base - Capability Assessment</td>
<td>Section 4: Policies - Internal and External Coordination</td>
<td>Section 5: Participation - Organizations/Persons involved in response planning process</td>
<td>Section 6: Interorganizational Coordination - Vertical Coordination</td>
<td>Section 6: Interorganizational Coordination - Horizontal Coordination</td>
<td>Section 7: Implementation - Roles and Responsibilities, ESFs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Aid Agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Incident Management System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non profit sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil and Hazardous Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Structure/Command and Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-positioned Agreements or MOUs</td>
<td>Section 2: Fact Base - Capability Assessment</td>
<td>Section 4: Policies - Internal and External Coordination</td>
<td>Section 6: Interorganizational Coordination - Horizontal Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention and Protection</td>
<td>Section 6: Interorganizational Coordination - Coordination of Emergency Management Activities</td>
<td>Section 7: Implementation - Roles and Responsibilities, Support Annexes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>Section 4: Policies - Internal and External Coordination</td>
<td>Section 5: Participation - Organizations/Persons involved in response planning process</td>
<td>Section 6: Interorganizational Coordination - Horizontal Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery</td>
<td>Section 4: Policies - Interorganizational Coordination - Coordination of Emergency Management Activities</td>
<td>Section 6: Interorganizational Coordination - Horizontal Coordination</td>
<td>Section 7: Implementation - Roles and Responsibilities, ESFs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Teams</td>
<td>Section 2: Fact Base - Capability Assessment</td>
<td>Section 4: Policies - Internal and External Coordination</td>
<td>Section 5: Participation - Organizations/Persons involved in response planning process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search and Rescue</th>
<th>Section 2: Fact Base - Capability Assessment</th>
<th>Section 4: Policies - Protect the lives and well being of the public</th>
<th>Section 7: Implementation - Roles and Responsibilities, ESFs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheltering</td>
<td>Section 2: Fact Base - Capability Assessment</td>
<td>Section 4: Policies - Protect the lives and well being of the public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socially Vulnerable population</td>
<td>Section 2: Fact Base - Vulnerability Assessment</td>
<td>Section 4: Policies - Protect the lives and well being of the public</td>
<td>Section 4: Policies - Communications Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Agencies</td>
<td>Section 5: Participation - State</td>
<td>Section 6: Interorganizational Coordination - Vertical Integration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Section 2: Fact Base - Capability Assessment</td>
<td>Section 4: Policies - Support Transition to Recovery</td>
<td>Section 7: Implementation - Roles and Responsibilities, ESFs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Education</td>
<td>Section 2: Fact Base - Capability Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 6: Interorganizational Coordination - Coordination of Emergency Management Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 6: Interorganizational Coordination - Horizontal Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 7: Implementation - Plan Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Management</td>
<td>Section 4: Policies - Internal and External Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 7: Implementation - Roles and Responsibilities, Support Annexes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix B: Evaluation Tool Guide

1. The basic, or reference, level of emergency planning is that of municipal government. The regional, national and international levels are those of co-ordination.

2. The plan should be prepared by, or under the direction of, a qualified emergency planner.

3. There should be only one plan, not several, and it should be cover all likely hazards.

4. The plan should be written in clear, simple, unambiguous language.

5. The plan should conform to the laws on emergency and disaster management that are in force in the country and region it pertains to.

6. The plan must be specific about the extent, limits and limitations of its jurisdiction.

7. The plan should seek to be fully compatible with plans and planning requirements at other levels of government and in neighbouring jurisdictions.

8. The first objective of the plan is to ensure that lives are not lost unnecessarily.

9. The second objective of the plan is to match urgent needs with appropriate resources in the most efficient and timely manner.

10. The plan should be based on a careful and, as far as possible exhaustive, assessment of what is likely to happen when an emergency occurs in its geographical area of jurisdiction. It must be based on adequate basic research.

11. The emergency plan should take account of urban and regional planning provisions in effect in the area under its jurisdiction, especially regarding the hazardousness of place and the siting of critical facilities.

12. The plan should conduct and present the results of a full audit of the resources that will be used during emergency operations.

13. Emergency planning should deal with processes, not merely quantities.

14. The plan should adequately specify the roles and activities of each and every participant in the risk management and emergency operations activities it covers.

15. Whether or not an emergency plan concentrates on the early post-impact phase, it should take account in an integrated manner of all the phases of the “disaster cycle”.
16. Activities described in the plan that are designed to combat disaster should include or at least facilitate sustainable measures for disaster prevention.

17. The plan should seek to integrate and embrace provisions for the private sector, hospitals, industries, airports, etc.

18. The plan should constantly be revised and circulated among its participants, and should be tested regularly.

Alexander (2005) - Applying the Standard Using a Category-Based Evaluation Tool

Legislative and organisational context:
- Disaster mitigation policies . . . adequate and in place?
- Legislative instrument . . . its provisions fully respected?
- Legal and jurisdictional responsibilities of plan participants . . . fully specified?

Clarity of objectives:
- Scope and general objectives . . . clearly set out?
- Conditions for activation . . . fully specified?

Hazard, vulnerability and risk analysis:
- Historical analysis of past hazard impacts in the local area . . . sufficient?
- Hazard probability analysis . . . accomplished?
- Vulnerability and risk analyses . . . adequate?
- Disaster scenarios for the local area . . . constructed and satisfactory?

Logistics:
- Emergency resource audit . . . conducted?
- Structure of the command system and centres . . . fully described?
- Communications equipment, protocols and procedures . . . specified?
- Warning, evacuation and other pre-disaster preparations . . . worked out?
- Search-and-rescue . . . organised and managed?
- Maintenance of public order . . . provisions satisfactory?
- Media and public information arrangements . . . in place, tested and approved?
- Medical and mortuary services, including transportation for the injured . . . OK?
- Mutual assistance pacts . . . are they incorporated into the plan?

Recovery of infrastructure and basic services . . . adequatly described?

Plans for particular sectors (as necessary):
- Hospitals, schools, industry, airports, etc. . . . included?

Arrangements:
- For testing the plan . . . in place?
- For disseminating the plan . . . in place?
- For updating the plan . . . in place?
National Response Framework Criteria

Acceptability – A plan is acceptable if it can meet the requirements of anticipated scenarios, can be implemented within the costs and time frames that senior officials and the public can support, and is consistent with applicable laws.

Adequacy – A plan is adequate if it complies with applicable planning guidance, planning assumptions are valid and relevant, and the concept of operations identifies and addresses critical tasks specific to the plan’s objectives.

Completeness – A plan is complete if it incorporates major actions, objectives, and tasks to be accomplished. The complete plan addresses the personnel and resources required and sound concepts for how those will be deployed, employed, sustained and demobilized. It also addresses timelines and criteria for measuring success in achieving objectives and the desired end state. Including all those who could be affected in the planning process can help ensure that a plan is complete.

Consistency and standardization of products – Standardized planning processes and products foster consistency, interoperability, and collaboration, therefore, emergency operations plans for disasters response should be consistent with all other related planning documents.

Feasibility – A plan is considered feasible if the critical tasks can be accomplished with the resources available internally or through mutual aid, immediate need for additional resources from other sources (in the case of a local plan, from state or federal partners) are identified in detail and coordinated in advance, and procedures are in place to integrate and employ resources effectively from all potential providers.

Flexibility – Flexibility and adaptability are promoted by decentralized decision-making and by accommodating all hazards ranging from smaller-scale incidents to wider national contingencies.

Interoperability and collaboration – A plan is interoperable and collaborative if it identifies other stakeholders in the planning process with similar and complementary plans and objectives, and supports regular collaboration focused on integrating with those stakeholders’ plans to optimize achievement of individual and collective goals and objectives in an incident.
APPENDIX D: EVALUATION TOOL REVIEWER INFORMATION

Dr. David McEntire – Dr. McEntire is an associate professor in the Department of Public Administration at the University of North Texas. He teaches emergency management and his research includes emergency management theory, international disasters, community preparedness, response coordination, homeland security, and vulnerability reduction. He has received grants funded by the Natural Hazards Center at the University of Colorado, the National Science Foundation, and FEMA in Arkansas and Oklahoma. He is the author of five books and numerous articles that have appeared in emergency management journals.

Ellis Stanley – Mr. Stanley has over 30 years of work experience in emergency management. He is currently the Director of Western Emergency Management Services for Dewberry, LLC. Mr. Stanley is known for his work as the General Manager of the City of Los Angeles’ Emergency Preparedness Department, Director of Emergency Management for Brunswick County, North Carolina and later Durham, North Carolina. He was also the Director of the Atlanta-Fulton County Emergency Management Agency during the 1996 Olympics and the Director of Democratic National Convention Planning for the City and County of Denver Colorado in 2008. Mr. Stanley is also an active member in the emergency management community. He sits on multiple boards including the National Science Foundation and has been the President of the International Association of Emergency Managers.

Sandy Sanderson – Mr. Sanderson is the Emergency Management Coordinator for Dare County, North Carolina, who has over 20 years in emergency management and law enforcement in one of the most hurricane at-risk local communities in the country. Mr. Sanderson has served as a consultant to FEMA, presented at numerous regional and national hazards conferences, and is a former Navy Seal.

Scott Wells – During his career at the Department of Homeland Security, Scott Wells served as a Federal Coordinating Officer for approximately 25 disasters, including hurricanes Katrina and Rita in 2005 and the Columbia Space Shuttle recovery operation in 2003. Prior to his career at DHS, Mr. Wells served as an Army officer for more than 20 years, with 10 years’ Pentagon experience at both the Secretariat and Staff level. He provided Department of Defense (DoD) consequence management support to domestic operations such as the 1996 Olympics, the Oklahoma City bombing in 1995, the 1994 Northridge Earthquake, two Presidential inaugurals, numerous floods, fires and smaller hurricanes, and classified terrorist incidents. Throughout his career he has assisted in the development of DHS doctrine and educational courses in response planning.
**REVIEWER FEEDBACK FORMS**

**PURPOSE OF EVALUATION TOOL AND EXPERT FEEDBACK**

The purpose of developing this evaluation tool is to assess the quality of local government emergency response plans. The tool is intended to align scholarly research, federal government guidance documents, and local government response plans to better inform:

- practitioners and local government officials in developing or improving emergency response plans;
- scholars in studying the quality of response plans across jurisdictions;
- state and federal emergency management officials in providing plan development guidance and training for local governments; and
- policymakers at the local, state, and federal level to develop policies in emergency management response planning.

Based on your feedback, I will develop an improved evaluation tool. I ask that you provide honest, constructive feedback and evaluate the tool based on your expertise in the field of emergency management.

**RESEARCH QUESTION AND METHODOLOGY**

My research will answer the question: What constitutes a high quality local government emergency management response plan?

The methodology consists of three parts. First, I developed an evaluation tool that measures plan quality in local government emergency management response plans. The measurement tool is framed using the plan quality principles derived from standards used in planning practice and has been developed through a synthesis of response planning literature, government documents, and local government emergency management response plans. Second, after development of the tool, I tested it on three North Carolina local government response plans and improved it based on that experience. Lastly, I have asked three experts in the field to evaluate the tool and improvements will be made based on their feedback.
REVIEWER FEEDBACK QUESTIONS

The following questions will help guide your comments. Any other recommendations are welcome.

1. Is this evaluation tool a useful and accurate way to measure the quality of local government emergency response plans?

2. Does the alignment of planning principles work for emergency response plans? Are there principles that should be omitted or are there other principles that could be added?

3. Are there indicators that are irrelevant to measuring the quality of emergency response plans? Are there redundancies that could be omitted? Is terminology used appropriately?

4. What is the tool missing? Where are the gaps or weaknesses in the tool?

5. Other comments
David McEntire - Reviewer Feedback Questions

The following questions will help guide your comments. Any other recommendations are welcome.

1. Is this evaluation tool a useful and accurate way to measure the quality of local government emergency response plans?

   It is always very difficult to measure if an EOP is complete, promising, effective, etc. For instance, one city may have a wonderful plan, but no capabilities to implement it (New Orleans in Katrina comes to mind). Another may lack a plan, but have such a strong sense of cooperation that it is better off than another (Perhaps a city in Japan would be an example here). In addition, it is sometimes difficult to fully assess a situation because some cities have mitigation and recovery plans, while others only have a response plan. Therefore, any single assessment should be taken with a grain of salt.

   That being said, I like what you have put together. It is fairly complete and it would give a general overall assessment of the potential disaster goals and operational capabilities of a community.

2. Does the alignment of planning principles work for emergency response plans? Are there principles that should be omitted or are there other principles that could be added?

   Please send me the list of principles (in a single document) so I can comment on them further.

   There are many ways to organize response plans and evaluate their potential effectiveness. However, I like what you have put together. While there are always different ways to organize material, I believe you have a fairly complete document. This is the most important goal in such an evaluation.
3. Are there indicators that are irrelevant to measuring the quality of emergency response plans? Are there redundancies that could be omitted? Is terminology used appropriately?

I tend to be of the mindset that it is better to over analyze and assess, rather than be incomplete. Therefore, I do not think anything you have listed is irrelevant.

Some of the lists of organizations might be a little redundant (as they appear in a few places in the plan).

The terminology you use is appropriate to the profession and is standard.

4. What is the tool missing? Where are the gaps or weaknesses in the tool?

2.1.3 You may want to include a comment about the industry in the area.
2.2.4 and 2.2.8 may overlap a little (e.g., sewage). They could also be placed near one another since they are related.
I wonder if your list of hazards should be consistent? For instance, in some cases you include causes and impacts and magnitude, and in others you do not.
What about including “mass shooting” as a hazard (e.g., Virginia Tech)?
Should a general operating budget be included in the assessment when determining government capabilities?
Should you include related community organizations as participants in 2.4.1.5? (e.g. churches, CERT teams, Ham Radio clubs, etc.)
I wonder if 2.4.1.6 has some items that should belong elsewhere (traffic, evacuation, communications)? (See section 4.2).
Should some of the sections be located together or combined (e.g., evacuation, evacuation of inmates, animal and pet evacuation and sheltering, etc.)?
Should there be mention of redundancies in jurisdictional agency and leader?
4.6 could be labeled as damage and needs assessment.
4.8 could include other environmental issues (debris removal; beach erosion, etc.)
Should faith based orgs be included in 5.2.1?
7.1.1 could have back up redundancy of lead orgs and positions.
7.3.1.1 Some people may also list a functional plan or equate that to an all hazards plan.

5. Other comments

I think you have a great document that is broad and inclusive of all of the issues pertinent to response planning.

Because emergency operations plans are often repetitive, there is difficulty in knowing the best way to organize (and simplify) an evaluation tool. I am curious to know if you thought about different ways to organize the questions. For instance, were there other possible ways to organize this beyond the “principles” approach you took? (I don’t know if there are any other approaches or what the advantages and disadvantages might be. I’m just curious if you thought of any other approaches).
Notes from Scott Wells
- Biggest issue: very comprehensive. Sometimes the strength is the weakness
- Issue: weighting way out of proportion, ex. Public warning system – 0-1-2 versus pandemic threat 0-1. Public warning system 10,000x more important than having pandemic threat
- Focus on key things and leave trivial things out
- Look at the whole approach, this checklist does not allow you to do that. It looks at individual tasks
- More subjectivity
- Things to add: concept of operations – mission essential tasks
- **Think about the scoring and how to define it. And figure out analysis – how to analyze** and look at research question
- Should be focusing on war stopper issues – critical issues – and then another list of other not as important issues
- Essence of planning is determining what you need and then what you going to get that you don’t have.
- Capability assessment – required versus available
- Make decision on land use versus response principles
- Divide it into three categories – what is critical (required capabilities or resources)
- This is what is critical: Good risk assessment – did it include consequences, it is reasonable and comprehensive, did that risk assessment lead to required capabilities, do they have the required capabilities, how do they make up the shortfalls?
REVIEWER FEEDBACK QUESTIONS

The following questions will help guide your comments. Any other recommendations are welcome.

1. Is this evaluation tool a useful and accurate way to measure the quality of local government emergency response plans?

The element that must be referenced here is the EMAP Standards: <https://emap.niehs.nih.gov/emap/index.html>. That provides a tool to assess the "Program," but I wonder which elements in the EMAP elements would be used and what training will be required to use this tool?

2. Does the alignment of planning principles work for emergency response plans? Are there principles that should be omitted or are there other principles that could be added?
Plan Quality Evaluation Tool: Purpose and Issues

The purpose of this document is to evaluate the content of local government emergency management response plans and inform emergency managers about new ideas and best practices.

The plan is divided into nine sections. Each section has subsections and within those subsections are indicators. For example, Section 2: Fact Base has subsections 2.1 to 2.5. Subsection 2.1: Existing Conditions contains indicators such as Geographic Extent, General Population and Economic Characteristics. The plan is evaluated based on the indicators present in the plan.

The absence of an item does not indicate that the plan is of poor quality. Each section needs to be reviewed as a whole because some items relate to one another. For example, in the Vulnerability Assessment section under Section 2: Fact Base, one indicator reads “Plan references mitigation plan or other relevant resource for a detailed vulnerability assessment.” If the plan does reference another resource that has a detailed vulnerability assessment then the vulnerabilities may not be discussed in the plan at all. The fact that the vulnerability assessment is absent from the plan is not important and does not indicate that this plan is of poor quality because they referenced the section in another plan (the same is true for the Hazard Identification and Assessment section.) In addition, the community's assets need to be taken into consideration. For example, a community might not be eligible for an Urban Areas Security Initiative grant from the federal government and therefore would not receive a score for that indicator.
Continuity of Operations (COOP) – Measures that ensure that government departments can deliver essential services during and after a disaster.

Critical Facilities – Critical facilities include hospitals, fire stations, police stations, storage of critical records, water treatment plants, and other similar facilities. Critical facilities should not be located in a floodplain and should be provided a higher level of protection so that they can continue to function and provide services after a disaster.³

Damage Assessment – The process used to appraise or determine the number of injuries and deaths, damage to public and private property, and status of key facilities and services (e.g. hospitals, fire and police stations, water and sanitation systems, utilities) resulting from a human-caused or natural disaster.⁸

Demobilize – Policies that coordinate an efficient return to normal operating procedures after a disaster.

Disaster Declaration (State of Emergency) – A local or state government that does not believe it can respond effectively without outside assistance will ask for a disaster declaration to receive additional resources from higher levels of government.

Emergency Management – The managerial function charged with creating the framework within which communities reduce vulnerability to hazards and cope with disasters.⁹

Emergency Management Accreditation Program (EMAP) – EMPA is an independent non-profit organization which is a standard-based voluntary assessment and peer review accreditation process for government programs responsible for coordinating prevention, mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery activities for natural and human-caused disasters. Accreditation is based on compliance with collaboratively developed national standards, the Emergency Management Standard by EMAP.¹⁰

---

¹⁰ http://www.emaponline.org/
Vulnerability – A physical feature or operational attribute that renders an entity open to exploitation or susceptible to a given hazard.\textsuperscript{55}  

**WebEOC** – Web-enabled incident management system that is used in Emergency Operations Centers to update real-time information and coordinate the use of resources.\textsuperscript{56}

This is a brand name – there are several Emergency Management Information tools on the market (E-Team, ESCom, etc.)

\textsuperscript{55} Comprehensive Preparedness Guide 101  
## Section 1: Identification and Vision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1.1 Evaluator</strong></td>
<td>Name of person coding plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1.2 Dates of Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Fill in date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Fill in date task is completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Fill in date task is completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entered into Database</strong></td>
<td>Fill in date task is completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intercoder Reliability Check</strong></td>
<td>Fill in date task is completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Page #</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1.3 State</strong></td>
<td>E.g. North Carolina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1.4 Jurisdiction</strong></td>
<td>E.g. Dare County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1.5 Title of Plan</strong></td>
<td>Full title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1.6 Date of Plan</strong></td>
<td>E.g. November 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1.7 Author/Preparer of Plan</strong></td>
<td>List primary agency and contractor (if noted in the plan)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1.8 Agency Contact</strong></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address</strong></td>
<td>Address (if provided)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Website</strong></td>
<td>Agency or plan website (if provided)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Handwritten Notes:*

- Hampton Roads Planning District
- Houston-Harris County Regional Planning
- Long Beach, VASCI

*Comment:* Might want a box to address regional identification.

*Comment:* ESF USICS or Hybrid form might be important to ID that early.
## Section 2: Fact Base

### Section 2.1 Existing Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Page #</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2.1.1 Geographic Extent

- 2 - Detailed description of the specific geographic areas that are affected by hazards within the jurisdiction; should include maps of geographic extent of identified hazards
- 1 - General, or brief, description of the geographic areas that are affected by hazards within the jurisdiction
- 0 - No description

#### 2.1.2 General Population

- 2 - Detailed assessment of the population; applies to the general population not to especially vulnerable populations (e.g. minorities, low income, elderly, children or people with disabilities), which is covered in another coding item (2.2.2); should include maps of population at risk
- 1 - General, or brief, assessment of the population
- 0 - No description

#### 2.1.3 Economic Characteristics

- 2 - Detailed narrative description of the economic characteristics of the jurisdiction; should include maps of economic characteristics at risk
- 1 - General, or brief, description of the jurisdiction’s economy
- 0 - No description

#### 2.1.4 Land Use Trends

- 2 - Detailed description of land use and development trends and their risks; includes transportation, population density, location of new development; should include maps of land use trends at risk
- 1 - General, or brief, description of land use and development trends
- 0 - No description

### Section 2.2 Vulnerability Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Page #</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2.2.1 Plan References Mitigation Plan or other relevant resource for a detailed Vulnerability Assessment

- 1 - Plan refers to mitigation plan or other relevant resource for a detailed vulnerability assessment
- 0 - No reference to mitigation plan or other relevant resource for vulnerability assessment
| 2.2.7 | Environmental Assets | 2 - Detailed assessment of the vulnerability of environmental assets (e.g. dunes, wetlands, forests, water supplies, ecosystems, species) to hazard events; should include maps of environmental assets
1 - General, or brief, assessment of environmental assets
0 - No description |
| 2.2.8 | Infrastructure | 2 - Detailed description of the vulnerability of infrastructure systems (fuel, electric power, water sewer, telecommunications, transportation); should include maps of infrastructure at risk
1 - General, or brief, description of infrastructure systems
0 - No Description |
| 2.2.9 | Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear (CBRN) | 2 - Detailed description of risks of chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear including location and number of facilities in region; should include maps
1 - General, or brief, description of CBRN (includes if plan indicates the jurisdiction does not have any risks)
0 - No description |

**Section 2.3 Hazard Identification and Assessment**

Note: The Earthquakes, Floods, and Hurricanes/Coastal Storms categories were chosen to include indicators for characteristics, location, magnitude and severity, and previous events. These three hazards were chosen as examples in this tool, but these indicators can be used for each hazard listed.

| 2.3.1 | Plan References Mitigation Plan or other relevant resource for a detailed Hazard Identification and Assessment | 1 - Plan refers to mitigation plan or other relevant resource for a detailed hazard identification and assessment
0 - No reference to mitigation plan or other relevant resource for hazard identification and assessment |
| 2.3.2 | Prioritize Hazards | 1 - Hazards are ranked in terms of their potential impacts in the jurisdiction based on likelihood/frequency, geographical distribution, potential magnitude/severity, and past losses of specific hazards
0 - No prioritization |
| 2.3.3 | Drought | 1 - Plan indicates whether jurisdiction is at risk or not at risk of drought
0 - No indication of risk of drought |
| 2.3.19       | Pandemic Influenza | 1 - Plan indicates whether jurisdiction is at risk or not at risk of pandemic influenza  
0 - No indication of risk of pandemic influenza |
|--------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2.3.20       | Medical Counter Measures/Bio-terrorism | 1 - Plan indicates whether jurisdiction is at risk or not at risk of MCM/Bio-terrorism  
0 - No indication of risk of MCM/Bio-terrorism |
| 2.3.21       | Technological Accidents (Hazardous Materials Incident, Chemical Spill, Dam Failure, Power Grid Failure, Traffic Accident, Train Derailment) | 1 - Plan indicates whether jurisdiction is at risk or not at risk of technological accidents  
0 - No indication of risk of technological and accidental hazards |
| 2.3.22       | Animal Disease | 1 - Plan indicates whether jurisdiction is at risk or not at risk of animal disease  
0 - No indication of risk of animal disease |
| 2.3.23       | Coastal Erosion | 2 - Plan indicates whether jurisdiction is at risk or not at risk of coastal erosion  
0 - No indication of risk of coastal erosion |
| 2.3.24       | Other | 1 - Plan indicates whether jurisdiction is at risk or not at risk of other hazards  
0 - No indication of risk of other hazards |

### Section 2.4 Capability Assessment

#### 2.4.1 Local Government

Describes capability of local government

---

#### 2.4.1.1 Legal Framework

- **Jurisdiction's Emergency Management Ordinance**: 1 - Description of jurisdiction's applicable emergency management ordinance  
0 - No description of jurisdiction's ordinance

- **Statement of Approval or Evidence of the Adoption of Response Plan**: 1 - Statement of approval or evidence of the adoption of response plan by jurisdiction's governing body  
0 - No evidence of response plan's adoption by governing body

#### 2.4.1.2 Organization

- **Organizational Structure of Emergency Management During Response**: 2 - Detailed description of the organizational structure during response  
1 - General, or brief, description of the organizational structure during response  
0 - No description
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.4.1.3 Emergency Operations Center (EOC)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EOC Activation Levels</td>
<td>2 - Detailed description of the different EOC activation levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - General, or brief, description of the EOC activation levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - No description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of EOC</td>
<td>1 - Indicates the location of the EOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - No location indicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate location of EOC</td>
<td>1 - Indicates the location of an alternate EOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - No location indicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person or group responsible for activating EOC</td>
<td>1 - Lists person or group responsible for activating EOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - Does not list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of participants that will be located at the EOC</td>
<td>1 - Lists participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - Does not list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of agencies represented in the EOC</td>
<td>1 - Lists agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - Does not list</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.4.1.4 Resources</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Resources</td>
<td>2 - Detailed description of the financial resources of the jurisdiction that could be used in an emergency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - General, or brief, description of the financial resources of the jurisdiction that could be used in an emergency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - No description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Aid Agreements</td>
<td>2 - Detailed description of mutual aid agreements with other jurisdictions; should include resources available for loan and their locations, who pays for the resources and bears liability, and condition in which contract begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - General, or brief, mention of mutual aid agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - No description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-positioned Agreements or Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)</td>
<td>2 - Detailed description of pre-positioned agreements/MOUs with private sector agencies, non-profits, or community organizations; should include resources available for loan and their locations, who pays for the resources and bears liability, and condition in which contract begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 - General, or brief, mention of pre-event agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - No description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Equipment/Vehicles/Supplies            | 2 - Detailed description of equipment, vehicles, and supplies used in disaster events including any back-up capabilities (e.g., communications equipment, sandbags, respirators, traffic barricades, toxic gas monitoring equipment)  
1 - General, or brief, description of equipment, vehicles, and supplies  
0 - No description                                                                 |
| Facilities                             | 2 - Detailed description of facilities used in disaster events, including emergency operation centers, assembly/staging areas, shelters and/or "safe havens" from extreme environmental conditions  
1 - General, or brief, description of facilities  
0 - No description                                                                 |
| First Responder Units (Police, Fire, EMS) | 2 - Detailed description of first responder unit capabilities, including vehicles, equipment, departments, personnel, fire districts, dispatching  
1 - General, or brief, description of first responder unit capabilities  
0 - No description                                                                 |
| Sheltering                             | 2 - Detailed assessment of local capability related to sheltering (plans, maps, studies, measures or investments related to sheltering population in hazard event)  
1 - General, or brief, description of sheltering capability  
0 - No description                                                                 |
| 2.4.1.5 Response Committees and Teams  | 1 - Indicates that a Local Emergency Response Committee exists  
0 - No indication                                                                 |
| Local Emergency Response Committee      | 1 - Indicates that the jurisdiction has response teams (such as Citizen Emergency Response Team, Search and Rescue, Rapid Response Team, HazMat Response Team)  
0 - No indication                                                                 |
| Response Teams                         | 1 - Indicates that a Local Emergency Response Committee exists  
0 - No indication                                                                 |

Section 2: Fact Base

More important than how much do you have is what's available. Plan might include...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.4.2.2 State Programs, Policies, and Laws</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| State legal framework                    | 1 - Description of state regulations and laws applicable  
                                        | 0 - No description of state regulations and laws |
| State Mutual Aid and Assistance Agreements  
(e.g. Emergency Management Assistance Compact) | 1 - Describes any state mutual aid and assistance agreements  
                                        | 0 - No description |
| State Hazard Mitigation Planning         | 1 - Describes State Hazard Mitigation Planning programs or policies  
                                        | 0 - No description |
| State Disaster Recovery Assistance       | 1 - Describes State Disaster Recovery Assistance programs or policies  
                                        | 0 - No description |
| State Emergency Response Agency          | 1 - Lists State Emergency Management Agency  
                                        | 0 - No mention |
| State Emergency Response Team (SERT)     | 1 - Brief description, or mention, of State Emergency Response Team (SERT)  
                                        | 0 - No description |
| 2.4.3 National Policies and Standards    |  |
| Incident Command Structure (ICS)         | 1 - Plan describes the use of ICS  
                                        | 0 - No description of ICS |
| Presidential Directives                  | 1 - Plan indicates compliance with a Presidential Directive  
                                        | 0 - No indication |
| National Incident Management System (NIMS)| 1 - Plan indicates compliance with NIMS  
                                        | 0 - No indication |
| Universal Task List                      | 1 - Plan indicates compliance with Universal Task List  
                                        | 0 - No indication |
| Target Capabilities List                 | 1 - Plan indicates compliance with Target Capabilities List  
                                        | 0 - No indication |
| National Fire Protection Association Standard  
1600                                      | 1 - Plan indicates the jurisdiction's compliance with the National Fire Protection Association Standard 1600  
                                        | 0 - No indication of compliance |
| Emergency Management Accreditation Program (EMAP) | 1 - Plan indicates the jurisdiction's compliance with EMAP  
                                        | 0 - No indication of compliance |

This area may fall into appendix etc. Is this the intent?
PURPOSE OF EVALUATION TOOL AND EXPERT FEEDBACK

The purpose of developing this evaluation tool is to assess the quality of local government emergency response plans. The tool is intended to align scholarly research, federal government guidance documents, and local government response plans to better inform:

- practitioners and local government officials in developing or improving emergency response plans;
- scholars in studying the quality of response plans across jurisdictions;
- state and federal emergency management officials in providing plan development guidance and training for local governments; and
- policymakers at the local, state, and federal level to develop policies in emergency management response planning.

Based on your feedback, I will develop an improved evaluation tool. I ask that you provide honest, constructive feedback and evaluate the tool based on your expertise in the field of emergency management.

RESEARCH QUESTION AND METHODOLOGY

My research will answer the question: What constitutes a high quality local government emergency management response plan?

The methodology consists of three parts. First, I developed an evaluation tool that measures plan quality in local government emergency management response plans. The measurement tool is framed using the plan quality principles derived from standards used in planning practice and has been developed through a synthesis of response planning literature, government documents, and local government emergency management response plans. Second, after development of the tool, I tested it on three North Carolina local government response plans and improved it based on that experience. Lastly, I have asked three experts in the field to evaluate the tool and improvements will be made based on their feedback.

* Plans assessment for existing plans not new plans
* Very broad scope is difficult because of the varying differences between local, state and federal plans
* Stick with response planning at local level or state planning they are different in roles + responsibilities
REVIEWER FEEDBACK QUESTIONS

The following questions will help guide your comments. Any other recommendations are welcome.

1. Is this evaluation tool a useful and accurate way to measure the quality of local government emergency response plans?

   The overall vision wants to create a tool that can look into an existing plan and determine its worthiness. You can do this utilizing the document you have created. I would caution that local plans, state plans, and federal plans have varied levels. If, as you stated in your purpose this is for local plan evaluation, then this tool would provide a useful evaluation.

2. Does the alignment of planning principles work for emergency response plans? Are there principles that should be omitted or are there other principles that could be added?

   The tool has a shotgun approach — in that it attempts to address every possible facet of EM. MAN. I give it a value and come away with yes it's good or no not complete. A response plan can be very broad, almost to the point of generic —
3. Are there indicators that are irrelevant to measuring the quality of emergency response plans? Are there redundancies that could be omitted? Is terminology used appropriately?

If you go back to the "Carolina Plan" that 90% of the local plans in NC were developed from a definite similarity is obvious — each plan has its own focus, but utilizes the local threats as the basis — what may be irrelevant in one local plan may be the central theme for another — the focus for a response plan is to ID threats and develop measures to combat them — redundancy is not bad.

4. What is the tool missing? Where are the gaps or weaknesses in the tool?

I seem to run into a black hole here because I want to see a cross walk of identified problems and solutions with options — but that isn't what you are attempting to do with this tool — so the tool, as is, does what you set out to do.

5. Other comments

The overall concept has accomplished the desired result of assessment for local plan. Arguments could be made that it is too detailed and wonders into haz mitigation and may be too detailed for a small county plan, however it would be a good building block for the smaller county
Evaluating Plan Quality of Local Government Emergency Management Response Plans

1. Is this evaluation tool a useful and accurate way to measure the quality of local government emergency response plans?

In my opinion, I believe this would be a great tool to use as a guide in updating not only local response plans, but also at the state and federal levels. As far as the local level it may be too detailed for some smaller jurisdictions compared to more complex jurisdictions, i.e. Mecklenburg / Charlotte, NC area.

2. Does the alignment of planning principles work for emergency response plans?

I noticed that this tool outline worked for the response plan, but also had some of the elements and principles that have been or could be used in updating Hazard Mitigation Plans, Recovery Plans and COOP Plans.

Are there principles that should be omitted or are there other principles that could be added?

I felt that sections 2.2 and 2.3 were more geared to Hazard Mitigation planning. Section 2.4 looked to be more policy driven then response planning. However, those topics can be referenced in the response plan.

3. Are there indicators that are irrelevant to measuring the quality of emergency response plans?

I did notice a couple of the sections that were more Hazard Mitigation planning or policy development/update then response planning; there again can still be referenced in the response plan but not so detailed oriented.

Are there redundancies that could be omitted?

N/A

4. What is the tool missing?

I felt that this tool covered all aspects of the planning process.

Where are the gaps or weaknesses in the tool?

N/A

5. Other comments

I feel that this Evaluation Tool could benefit the emergency management community in assisting with plan updates. I would be willing to sit down with you some time and discuss the process that was undertaken in the development of this tool.
APPENDIX E: ATLAS TI

Figure 1: Atlas Ti with example plan and evaluation tool's principles

Figures 2 and 3: Evaluation tool with expanded Fact Base section
Figure 4: Example indicator with description

Figure 5: Drag-and-click to code the plan (Example using Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment code “Plan References Mitigation Plan”)

IV. SITUATION AND ASSUMPTIONS
Figure 6: Memos in the evaluation tool for plan evaluators to reference while coding