



MEMC Plans Subcommittee
Mid-America Regional Council
Heartland Room
Monday, October 17, 2011
1:00 p.m.

SUMMARY

Members Present:

Chuck Thacker, Grandview Fire, Co-chair
Bob Evans, Wyandotte County Emergency Management
Nathan McCommon, KCMO Emergency Management
Gene Shepherd, KCMO Emergency Management
Pete Sturner, Platte County Emergency Management

MARC Staff

Erin Lynch, Dan Manley, Justin Sorg, Chris Carroll

Welcome and Introductions

Chuck Thacker opened the meeting and commenced with self-introductions. September's meeting summary was reviewed. Nathan McCommon motioned to accept the summary as written; Pete Sturner seconded the motion. The motion passed with all in favor.

1. Continued Mass Evacuation Planning Discussion

Chuck Thacker first opened the discussion with a funding request to help support Regional Mass Evacuation Planning efforts: MARC Emergency Services Staff has been working with MARC Transportation staff to develop initial recommendations and establish data points needed to complete the planning effort. Since this project will benefit initiatives undertaken by MARC Emergency Services and Transportation departments, Emergency Services staff requested Transportation staff to assist on the project. The Transportation Department will ask the regional Transportation Committee to contribute funding to support this project at their next regular meeting -- as this project was not in their original budgeted work plan. The Transportation Department has asked if homeland security dollars could be available to help support the work. They estimate it will take 3-4 weeks of a Transportation staff member's time and are asking for \$5,000 from homeland security funds to support the work involved. Justin Sorg noted the Plans Subcommittee had previously allocated \$150,000 to support Mass Evacuation Planning efforts. After the discussion, the Plans Subcommittee agreed to the request for \$5,000 to support Transportation staff time working on the evacuation project.

The committee then discussed methodology and deliverables for the Mass Evacuation Plan. Prior to the meeting, committee members were asked to review the Atlanta UASI's Regional Evacuation Plan as a potential model from which to base the Kansas City region's plan. The Atlanta Plan established evacuation zones as a means to manage evacuations and something similar could be set up in the Kansas City region. Chris Carroll presented an initial sketch of 12 evacuation zones that could be established for the region (these were developed in conjunction with Transportation staff). Bob Evans asked if Atlanta used the zones as an alert mechanism for

alerting the public. Justin Sorg responded that Atlanta used zones as a planning tool for developing assumptions rather than pre-identified notification points for the public. Emergency evacuation messages would still have to be tailored to individual jurisdictions with specific directions to the public. The committee agreed to move forward using Atlanta's Plan as a model for the region's plan. Next was discussed how to direct the planning process. The committee agreed a Steering Committee should be established to provide overall direction of the project; then workgroups will be formed to collect or vet specific plan components with subject matter experts. The committee agreed that a Steering Committee of approximately 30 representatives should be established. The Steering Committee should be comprised of two representatives each from the following disciplines: emergency management, law enforcement, hospital, fire, transportation, public works, EMS and ARC. The committee also agreed to submit a request to the RHSCC (at the next RHSCC Co-chairs meeting) to seek assistance in appointing appropriate representatives of the region's various committees to the Steering Committee. MARC staff will work on drafting a letter for the request and will present to the Plans co-chairs for approval.

Next the committee discussed other issues and considerations for the evacuation plan including mass care and pet transportation/sheltering. Chris Carroll noted Atlanta's plan has a large mass care component. However, since the region is currently redrafting ESF#6, there may be no need to include mass care in the scope of work for the evacuation plan. The region will need to determine some important assumptions that will drive the evacuation planning effort, e.g. whether or not evacuees will be sheltered within the region or if there is a need to expand sheltering planning beyond the region, what the triggers for activation are, what role the state(s) should be, etc.

3. Review of Workplan

The committee reviewed its 2011 workplan to discuss remaining project and priorities for the 4th quarter and next year. Originally, the committee wanted to seek technical assistance to help draft ESF#14 – Long-term Community Recover of the RCG, starting in November 2011 and completing the document in 2nd Quarter 2012. With other competing priorities, the committee determined to postpone development of ESF#14 until a later, unspecified date. Justin Sorg noted the committee had budgeted \$50,000 to support development of the ESF#14 using UASI 09 funds. Since UASI 09 closes July 31, 2012, it is unlikely these funds will be expended. The committee will have to determine how these funds should be allocated in the coming months.

Additionally, the committee agreed to shift re-engaging and completing ESF#8 – Health and Medical until 2nd Qtr 2012. Dan Manly noted this will allow for time to pull together existing elements of the document (MCI Plan, Mass Fatality Plan) and create a resource directory that should help to answer some of the outstanding issues surrounding medical surge. Lastly, the committee had scheduled a review of Phase I of the RCG to commence 1st Qtr 2011. The committee agreed to postpone this review until September 2012.

4. Other business

a. Review/approval of ESF#3 – Public Works. Justin Sorg noted the document had been distributed to Public Works directors via Emergency Management Directors. Feedback had only been received from two agencies, and related to language contained within the Public Works Mutual Aid Agreement and the Plan Bulldozer MOU. Since the Plans Subcommittee does not have purview of either of these documents, these comments will be forwarded to the appropriate

entities for review. With no other changes, Nathan McCommon motioned to approve ESF#3; Pete Sturner seconded the motion. The motion passed with all in favor.

b. Review/approval of ESF#11 – Agriculture and Natural Resources. Justin Sorg noted the committee had previously tabled approval of ESF#11 pending additional guidance from applicable Kansas and Missouri state agencies. This guidance is not anticipated soon, therefore it is recommended the committee proceed with approving the document and update as necessary when new guidance is available. Pete Sturner motioned to approve ESF#11; Bob Evans seconded the motion. The motion passed with all in favor.

c. Review/approval of ESF#13 – Law Enforcement and Security. Justin Sorg noted the Law Enforcement subcommittee still needs to approve the document, but that a parallel approval process could be initiated. Bob Evans motioned to approve ESF#13 pending any changes from the Law Enforcement committee; Pete Sturner seconded the motion. The motion passed with all in favor. All approved ESFs will be forwarded to the MEMC for review and approval at their next monthly meeting.

d. Update on HSIN 3 release and review of user policy – site membership permissions. Justin Sorg informed the committee he and John Hwang had sat in on work groups for building out the new release for HSIN. Time tables for launch were still somewhat unclear, but were anticipated by mid-next year. Additionally, Justin had received a question from a member of the KCRHSCC COI as to why they were unable to post comments on the discussion board on the site. Justin informed the member that user permissions were set to read only, which disallowed users to post or alter content. Read only permissions were put in place as a safeguard for the document library until a newer version of the system is release [the newer version promised increased ability to uniquely assign permissions to individual Web parts, rather than one, overarching permission for all Web parts – as is the case with the current version.]The question before the committee was whether or not this policy needed to be revisited. Gene Shepherd asked what the advantages and disadvantages were of altering the current policy. The advantages include allowing users to collaborate real time and upload their own content without having to go through MARC staff. The disadvantages include reduced capability to monitor content and a potential that users could delete content. After discussion, the committee determined to keep the current policy as is.

5. Next meeting -- November 21, 2011 1:00 p.m. in the Heartland Room

Handouts

September Meeting Summary

Agenda

Mass Evacuation Deliverables Timeline (draft)