



Homeland
Security

**Preparedness Directorate Information Bulletin
No. 197 November 23, 2005**

TO: All State Homeland Security Directors
All State Administrative Agency Heads
All State Administrative Agency Points of Contact
All Urban Area Core City/Core County Points of Contact

FROM: Robert B. Stephan
Acting Under Secretary for Preparedness

SUBJECT: Nationwide Plan Review

Hurricanes Katrina and Rita left in their wake more than 1,300 dead and forced millions of evacuees from 5 States along the Gulf Coast to seek shelter in 44 States and the District of Columbia. On September 15, 2005, President Bush addressed the Nation, and stated, in part:

“Our cities must have clear and up-to-date plans for responding to natural disasters, disease outbreaks, or terrorist attack... for evacuating large numbers of people in an emergency...and for providing the food, water, and security they would need. In a time of terror threats and weapons of mass destruction, the danger to our citizens reaches much wider than a fault line or a flood plain. I consider detailed emergency planning to be a national security priority. Therefore, I have ordered the Department of Homeland Security to undertake an immediate review, in cooperation with local counterparts, of emergency plans in every major city in America.”

In response, Congress issued H.R. 2360, Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2006, which states, in part:

“It is imperative all States and Urban Area Security Initiative grantees ensure there are sufficient resources devoted to putting in place plans for the complete evacuation of residents, including special needs groups in hospitals and nursing homes, or residents without access to transportation, in advance of and after such an event, as well as plans for sustenance of evacuees. The conferees direct the Secretary [of Homeland Security] to report on the status of catastrophic planning, including mass evacuation planning in all 50 States and the 75 largest urban areas by February 10, 2006. The report should include certifications from each State and urban area as to the exact status of plans for evacuations of entire metropolitan areas in the State and the entire State, the dates such plans were last updated, the date exercises were last conducted using the plans, and plans for sustenance of evacuees.”

Congress also issued H.R. 3, the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), which states in part:

“The Secretary [of Transportation] and the Secretary of Homeland Security, in coordination with Gulf Coast States and contiguous States, shall jointly review and assess Federal and State evacuation plans for catastrophic hurricanes impacting the Gulf Coast Region and report its findings and recommendations to Congress. ...The Secretaries shall consult with appropriate Federal, State, and local transportation and emergency management agencies...and consider, at a minimum, all practical modes of transportation available for evacuations; the extent to which evacuation plans are coordinated with neighboring States; methods of communicating evacuation plans and preparing citizens in advance of evacuations; and methods of coordinating communication with evacuees during plan execution.”

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Preparedness Directorate will lead the nationwide review in coordination with the Department of Transportation. Many States and major cities have already begun to examine their plans, and Federal departments and agencies have been directed to identify lessons learned from Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. Close coordination will be essential in order to complete the review before the start of the 2006 hurricane season.

Participation is a prerequisite for receipt of FY2006 DHS Homeland Security grant funds.

The review will be divided into two phases. The first phase will consist of self-assessment and certification of plan status by each State and urban area/major city, as described in this Information Bulletin. The second phase will consist of peer review by teams of former State and local emergency management and homeland security officials who will visit each State and urban area/major city to validate plan status and determine requirements for planning assistance. Both phases will focus on efforts to identify, prioritize, and correct critical deficiencies (i.e., those that may prevent execution of the plan as written).

In order to support this process, your State / urban area / major city needs to provide the following to the Directorate’s Office of Grants and Training (formerly the Office of State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness) **by Tuesday, January 17, 2006:**

1. A brief narrative self-assessment, as outlined below,
2. A statement of certification (see attached sheet), and
3. Electronic copies of plans or plan components referenced in the narrative, a list of mutual aid agreements supporting those plans (if not listed in the plans themselves), and a list of After Action Reports for recent exercises and operations. These will assist the peer review teams in preparing for their onsite visits.

Additional questions may be directed to the Centralized Scheduling and Information Desk at askcsid@dhs.gov, 1-800-368-6498.

Self-Assessment Narrative Outline

The narrative should summarize the planning coordinated by your State / urban area / major city to manage catastrophic events¹ and identify and prioritize areas for further analysis and improvement. In preparing the narrative, you are required to use State and Local Guide (SLG) 101, *Guide for All-Hazard Emergency Operations Planning* (available online at <http://www.fema.gov/rrr/gaheop.shtm>). Please provide any recommended changes to SLG 101 that you identify during the course of your review. You may supplement that guidance with information from other nationally-accepted reference documents (see references below), provided that you cite those references. The narrative must include the following, at a minimum:

- **Transmittal Letter** – The letter must be signed by a senior elected or appointed official of the State / urban area / major city. Transmittal letters for State / Territory plan reviews should be signed by the State Homeland Security Advisor or Emergency Management Director. For those urban areas / major cities that are not grantees in the FY 2005 UASI program, the State is expected to coordinate input from appropriate jurisdictions and provide the transmittal letter. The letter must certify that the information provided in the plan review is true and accurate.
- **Current Capability for Mass Evacuations** – Describe in specific and measurable terms how a successful mass evacuation could be conducted with current capability in your State / urban area / major city (i.e., how many people in total, including what percentage with what types of special needs, over what time period, using what evacuation and shelter options).
- **Catastrophic Event Planning** – Provide concise answers to the following questions. Describe critical issues or constraints that seriously limit your jurisdiction’s ability to manage a catastrophic event with evacuation and shelter requirements *comparable* to Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. Be sure to highlight where you need Federal assistance to develop a solution.
 - What changes in authorities or regulations are necessary for your plan to meet the demands of a catastrophic event?
 - What actions are being taken to ensure the resiliency of your social services and to ease enrollment processes in the event of a catastrophic event?
 - What actions are being taken to fully address requirements for populations with special needs, particularly persons with disabilities?
 - What actions are being taken to ensure prompt evacuation of patients (ambulatory and non-ambulatory) from health care or other facilities?
 - What actions are being taken to ensure prompt augmentation of response resources (i.e., law enforcement) following a catastrophic event?

¹ The National Response Plan (NRP) defines a catastrophic event as: “...any natural or manmade incident, including terrorism that, results in extraordinary levels of mass casualties, damage, or disruption severely affecting the population, infrastructure, environment, economy, national morale, and/or government functions. A catastrophic event could result in sustained national impacts over a prolonged period of time; almost immediately exceeds resources normally available to State, local, tribal, and private-sector authorities in the impacted area; and significantly interrupts governmental operations and emergency services to such an extent that national security could be threatened.”

- What actions are being taken to strengthen regional planning and ensure requests for assistance, which are typically sequential (local–State–Federal) can meet urgent needs?
- What actions are being taken to ensure delivery networks for critical services and supplies / products are adequate to meet the increased demand in a catastrophic event?
- What actions are being taken to ensure your evacuation planning is mutually supportive among contiguous jurisdictions and States, uses all available transportation modes (ground, rail, air, and sea) and resources, identifies routes of egress / ingress; and identifies destinations and shelter options for displaced populations?
- **Status of the Emergency Operations Plan** – You should review the plan components related to evacuation and shelter options and answer these three questions:
 - Is it *adequate*? A plan is considered adequate if it complies with applicable guidance, the planning assumptions are valid, and the concept of operations identifies and addresses critical tasks effectively.
 - Is it *feasible*? A plan is considered feasible if critical tasks can be accomplished with resources available internally or through mutual aid, immediate needs for additional resources through State and/or Federal assistance are identified in detail and coordinated in advance, and procedures describe how to integrate and employ resources from all these potential sources.
 - Is it *acceptable*? Finally, a plan is considered acceptable if it can meet the requirements of a catastrophic event, it can be implemented within costs and timeframes that senior officials and the public can support, and is consistent with the law.
- **Operational Solutions** – Identify short-term actions to correct the critical issues / constraints identified above. Include “work-arounds” that will be employed as interim measures pending longer-term solutions. For example, if the need to secure transportation funding for a major alternate route constrains your ability to conduct a mass evacuation, identify actions you are taking to compensate, such as an earlier declaration of emergency.
- **Preparedness Solutions** – Describe long-term actions to build capability to address the critical issues / constraints identified above. These actions should be reflected in your State / urban area / major city homeland security strategy.

Suggested References

1. *Guide for All-Hazard Emergency Operations Planning*, State and Local Guide (SLG) 101.
2. Three related capabilities from the Target Capabilities List (TCL) that accompanies the National Preparedness Goal (Planning, Citizen Protection, and Mass Care).
3. National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 1600, *Standard on Disaster/Emergency Management and Business Continuity Programs* and the Emergency Management Accreditation Program (EMAP).
4. The National Incident Management System (NIMS) and National Response Plan (NRP).
5. *Criteria for Preparation and Evaluation of Radiological Emergency Response Plans and Preparedness in Support of Nuclear Power Plants* (NUREG-0654).
6. *An ADA Guide for Local Governments: Making Community Emergency Preparedness and Response Programs Accessible to People with Disabilities* (available online at <http://www.usdoj.gov/crt/ada/emergencyprep.htm>)

Attachment 1 –Certifications

Answers provided in the table below should be supported by the narrative. Plan components may use titles that are different from those listed below.

Plan Components	Meets Criteria in SLG 101 (Y/N)	Last Exercised (MM/YY)	Last Updated (MM/YY)	Comparison to Recent Catastrophic Events Are You Confident that the Plan is Adequate to Manage Evacuation and Shelter Requirements <i>Comparable</i> to Hurricanes Katrina and Rita? (YES/Qualified YES/NO)
Basic Plan				
Direction and Control Annex				
Communications Annex				
Warning Annex				
Emergency Public Information Annex				
Evacuation Annex: including plans for full evacuation of the population, especially special needs groups in hospitals and nursing homes, or residents without access to transportation				
Mass Care Annex: including plans to provide adequate food, water, and security for evacuees				
Health and Medical Annex				
Resource Management Annex				

Attachment 2 – 75 Urban Areas / Major Cities

The list of urban areas / major cities that meet the requirement in H.R. 2360 includes 55 urban areas participating in the FY 2005 Urban Areas Security Initiative program (designated with an asterisk (*)). DHS identified 20 additional urban areas / major cities on the basis of 2004 population and risk and need.

1. Albany, NY
2. Albuquerque, NM
3. Anaheim, CA*
4. Anchorage, AK
5. Arlington, TX*
6. Atlanta, GA*
7. Aurora, CO
8. Austin, TX
9. Baltimore, MD*
10. Baton Rouge, LA*
11. Boston, MA*
12. Buffalo, NY*
13. Charlotte, NC*
14. Chicago, IL*
15. Cincinnati, OH*
16. Cleveland, OH*
17. Colorado Springs, CO
18. Columbus, OH*
19. Corpus Christi, TX
20. Dallas, TX*
21. Denver, CO*
22. Detroit, MI*
23. El Paso, TX
24. Fort Worth, TX*
25. Fresno, CA
26. Honolulu, HI*
27. Houston, TX*
28. Indianapolis, IN*
29. Jacksonville, FL*
30. Jersey City, NJ*
31. Kansas City, KS & MO*
32. Las Vegas, NV*
33. Lexington-Fayette, KY
34. Lincoln, NE
35. Long Beach, CA*
36. Los Angeles, CA*
37. Louisville, KY*
38. Memphis, TN
39. Mesa, AZ
40. Miami, FL*
41. Milwaukee, WI*
42. Minneapolis, MN*
43. Nashville-Davidson, TN
44. National Capital Region*
45. New Haven, CT
46. New Orleans, LA*
47. New York, NY*
48. Newark, NJ*
49. Oakland, CA*
50. Oklahoma City, OK*
51. Omaha, NE*
52. Orlando, FL
53. Philadelphia, PA*
54. Phoenix, AZ*
55. Pittsburgh, PA*
56. Portland, OR*
57. Raleigh, NC
58. Richmond, VA
59. Riverside, CA
60. Sacramento, CA*
61. San Antonio, TX*
62. San Diego, CA*
63. San Francisco, CA*
64. San Jose, CA*
65. Santa Ana, CA*
66. Seattle, WA*
67. St. Louis, MO*
68. St. Paul, MN
69. St. Petersburg, FL
70. Tampa, FL*
71. Toledo, OH*
72. Tucson, AZ
73. Tulsa, OK
74. Virginia Beach-Norfolk, VA
75. Wichita, KS