

AD-A095 279

INTERNATIONAL CITY MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION WASHINGTON DC
LOCAL GOVERNMENT DISASTER PROTECTION.(U)
FEB 81 L STEVENSON, M HAYMAN


F/6 S/1

DCPA01-78-C-0312

NL

UNCLASSIFIED

1 of 2
2009-2-14



LEVEL ✓

12


AD A095279

LOCAL GOVERNMENT DISASTER PROTECTION
FINAL TECHNICAL REPORT

February 1981

DTIC
ELECTED
FEB 20 1981
S C

Under Grant No. DCPA 01-78-C-0312
Work Unit No. 4511-I
Approved for Public Release: Distribution Limited



International City Management Association
1140 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

DDC FILE COPY

81 2 20 013

X

Local Government Disaster Protection

Final Technical Report

by

Lisa Stevenson
Marie Hayman

February 1981

Prepared for

Federal Emergency Management Agency
Washington, D.C. 20472

Under Grant No. DCPA 01-78-C-0312

Work Unit No. 4511-I

Approved for Public Release: Distribution Limited

FEMA REVIEW NOTICE

"This report has been reviewed in the Federal Emergency Management Agency and approved for publication. Approval does not signify that the contents necessarily reflect the views and policies of the Federal Emergency Management Agency."

International City Management Association
1140 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited



The opinions expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the International City Management Association.

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
	AD-A095279	
4. TITLE (and Subtitle)	5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED	
LOCAL GOVERNMENT DISASTER PROTECTION	Final Technical Report Oct 1978-Feb 1981	
6. AUTHOR(s)	7. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER	
Lisa Stevenson Marie Hayman		
8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS	9. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)	
International City Management Association 1140 Connecticut Ave., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036	Grant No. DCPA 01-78-C-0312	
10. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS	11. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS	
Federal Emergency Management Agency Washington, D.C. 20472	Work Unit No. 4511-I	
12. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)	13. REPORT DATE	
	February 1981	
	14. NUMBER OF PAGES	
	112	
	15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)	
	Unclassified	
	16. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE	
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)		
Approved for Public Release: Distribution Unlimited		
18. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20; if different from Report)		
19. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
20. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)		
local emergency management, organizational arrangements, process, local governments, single, optimal, local government officials, organizational structure, organizational characteristics, effective, risks, planning materials		
21. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)		
This report represents the results of an examination of local emergency management organizational arrangements and the development of a process by which local governments can organize for emergency management. A fundamental conclusion was that a single organizational arrangement which is optimal for all communities does not exist. The project aimed to provide information to local government officials so that they could		

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 68 IS OBSOLETE

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

394674

SW

systematically develop the emergency management organizational structure which is optimal for their particular requirements and environment.

A set of organizational characteristics were identified as contributing to an effective emergency management organizational structure and a process was developed by which local government officials could incorporate these characteristics into their own organizational arrangement.

General Conclusions:

- a. Local government officials need guidance in reviewing current emergency management organizational structures and developing new structures;
- b. Each unit of local government must develop the organization which is appropriate for its particular situation;
- c. In general, local governments are apathetic concerning emergency preparedness;
- d. Local government officials must be motivated to use review and planning materials;
- e. Community officials face financial and political risks if they do not maintain a strong emergency management program;
- f. Emergency management organization planning materials must be especially prepared for use by local government administrators and other municipal personnel.

Section I

This report presents the results of an examination of local emergency management organizational arrangements and the development of a process by which local governments can organize for emergency management.

It is a fundamental conclusion of this project that a single organization arrangement which is optimal for all communities does not exist. The reasons for this conclusion are numerous and include the following factors which account for great variations in local governments across the country:

- legal constraints (state and/or local statutes)
- day-to-day organizational structure
- personalities and leadership skills of local government officials
- regional considerations

Therefore, this project aimed to provide information to local government officials so that they could systematically develop the emergency management organizational structure which is optimal for their particular requirements and environment.

For the purposes of this project, the research team defined the optimal structure to be one which provided the basis for an effective

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	☒
DTIC TAB	☐
Unannounced	☐
Justification	
By _____	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Special
A	

emergency management program. An "effective" program was defined to be one which:

"when applied during a disaster, will provide the levels of protection for life and property, and recovery, which are acceptable to the citizens of the community."

It is, of course, impossible for the research team to determine what levels are acceptable to citizens of any given community--in fact, the citizens themselves probably do not know what is or is not acceptable, until a disaster has occurred. However, the research team has formulated subjective, qualitative conclusions concerning what is and what is not acceptable. For example, it is felt that citizens expect their local governments to:

- 1) Inform the general public concerning the meaning of alerting signals, action to take, availability of flood insurance, etc., in advance of the disaster.
- 2) Quickly and accurately assess the magnitude of the situation, and so report to the general public, and keep the public informed throughout the incident.
- 3) Provide for the rapid restoration of services, even when specific services are not the direct responsibility of the local government, e.g., private utilities.

- 4) Provide for (or access to) recovery services, such as insurance claim preparation, tax counseling, family reunification, etc.
- 5) Provide information on, and specific action steps toward mitigating the impact of future emergencies.

Based on these expectations as well as "good" management principles, a set of organizational characteristics were identified as contributing to an effective emergency management organizational structure. These characteristics are:

1. Roles of elected officials are defined
2. Structure has strong and definitive lines of command
3. Organizational structures for routine and disaster operations are similar
4. Emergency management procedures are as close to routine operational
5. Emergency management organizational structure is based on good interpersonal relationships
6. Emergency management planning is an on-going activity
7. Emergency management organizational structure addresses all hazards
8. Disaster prevention and mitigation included in emergency

management program

9. Motivation provided for involvement in emergency management program
10. Citizens involved in emergency management program
11. Strong coordination maintained among participating agencies
12. Emergency management program includes public/private cooperation
13. Emergency management resources are also used in routine operations
14. Public information function is clearly defined
15. On-going monitoring is conducted for potential disasters
16. Internal alerting procedures are maintained
17. Ability to alert the public is maximized
18. Intergovernmental coordination is active
19. Records are maintained during a disaster
20. Eligibility for state and federal subsidies have been considered

A process was developed by which local government officials could incorporate the characteristics they found desirable into their own organizational arrangement for emergency management services.

Section II

Project Objectives

Municipal administrators (city managers and local officials) are responsible for the efficient and effective operation of their local governments. Their responsibilities include not only the provision of basic municipal services to the community but also the general management of local government including coordination of departments, preparation of the city budget, and hiring and firing of personnel.

Municipal administrators have the authority and responsibility to plan, organize, and establish the linkages for the deployment of resources in times of disaster. In addition, municipal administrators have the responsibility to meet constituency needs in terms of public safety and respond to emergency situations.

In order that municipal administrators may be better able to plan for disaster protection in their own communities, the Defense Civil Preparedness Agency (DCPA) began work with the International City Management Association in October, 1978. The objectives of contract #DCPA01-78-C-0312 awarded to the International City Management Association included the following:

- (A) Analysis of the civil defense and fire legislative and programmatic commonalities as might be found in prior peripheral studies and historical patterns of the civil defense organization at the local level.
- (B) Evaluation of alternative structures to cover the fire and civil defense functions, at the local level to enhance effectiveness of their operational commonality or to enhance the strengths of each including appropriate analyses of the weaknesses suffered by the function whose strength has not been exploited in each such arrangement.
- (C) Synthesis of an optimal structure and placement of these functions within local entities, including rationale for the selected structure and an implementation strategy to field validate such selection.
- (C) Validation with other public interest groups.
(e. g., Conference of Mayors, etc).
- (E) Develop an easy to use systematic, valid process for use by local governments in evaluating their emergency management organization, including

the development of a self-assessment manual
for local government emergency management.

- (F) For each attribute, develop a series of questions which a local government emergency preparedness manager can use to evaluate his/her organization. (The questions shall be as specific as possible, so that the manager will be able to use the answers to judge for himself/herself the relative strength or weakness of that particular attribute in the organization, i.e., questions shall be formulated in such a way that a manager will be able to focus in on various organizational and community factors and develop a conclusion about the particular attribute being evaluated. Upon completing the entire self-assessment process, the manager will have benefitted in two ways: (a) his/her knowledge of the effectiveness of the emergency preparedness organization as a whole will be greatly enhanced, and (b) his/her insight into specific areas will be significantly increased).

- (G) This task shall ensure that the final product is relevant to the concerns and problems of local emergency preparedness management officials. The accomplishment of this task is crucial to the success of the work of Phase III-A of the project.

The project staff will review in person with officials from several local governments the draft questions produced in Task F. Only by reviewing and discussing these questions with actual local government and emergency preparedness managers can both the Contractor and the Government feel confident that the questions are in fact valid and useful for the entire emergency preparedness evaluation process. The places to be visited shall be selected from the original case study sites of Phase I of this project and from the project's user requirements committee members' communities. Managers in these places shall be asked to apply the suggested questions to their own localities, in order to determine whether or not they are relevant, pertinent, and helpful to them in reaching conclusions about their emergency organizations. The emphasis of this task

shall be to validate the questions to be sure that they are not merely theoretically correct, but in fact reflect the realities of local government emergency management. Suggestions shall also be solicited from the communities concerning other aspects of the evaluation guide such as format, references to other documents, and additional contents to be included.

- (H) Submit the text and suggested format of a self assessment manual for local government emergency managers to use in evaluating their emergency organization

to the Govern-

ment. In addition, the Contractor may also disseminate the evaluation tool through its own publications, e.g., as an MIS Report. An issue of Public Management Magazine could be devoted to an analysis of how local government officials are using the manual in their own communities. The self assessment manual may also be used as a component of the Contractor's training program. One appropriate opportunity for such a workshop would be the Contractor's ICMA Annual Conference scheduled for September 1980, in New York state.

Section III

Methods Employed in Research

To achieve the objectives specified in Section II, a variety of means were employed. These included:

- Publicizing to the ICMA membership the intent, scope, and objectives of the initial contract received from the Defense Civil Preparedness Agency. This technique allowed the contract staff to receive the expertise of local public administrators, municipal department heads, and practising public administrators as well as the research community. The advertisement resulted in over 100 expressions of interest, offers of assistance and support, and requests for assistance in various aspects of local emergency management.
- Requesting, through the ICMA membership list, copies of municipal emergency preparedness plans. To ascertain the level of preparedness, sophistication, and concern of municipal officials relative to emergency management, plans were collected from localities throughout the U.S. (Several were also received from Canada).

- Analyzing the emergency preparedness plans which were received.

Over 300 plans were ultimately received which the project staff analyzed and categorized according to population, form of government, type of organizational arrangement and corresponding comments, and proneness to certain types of emergencies.

- Selecting localities for site-visits.

Based on the analysis of the emergency preparedness plans which were received and with the concurrence of DCPA officials, several local governments were chosen for closer study. To maximize the travel budget, several localities were visited while in a particular geographic area. The communities chosen for site visits were:

- Boulder City/County, Colorado
- San Mateo County, California
- Newberg, Oregon
- Washington County, Oregon
- Longboat Key, Florida
- Sarasota County, Florida
- Belle Glade, Florida

- Boca Raton, Florida
- Windsor, Connecticut
- Montgomery County, Ohio
- Metropolitan Washington
Council of Governments

- Conducting Site Visits .

During the summer of 1979, site visits were undertaken to all 11 communities. The purpose of the site visits was to analyze the emergency management operative arrangement and examine the factors which influence the development of the arrangement and placement of the structure. Significant factors which may contribute to the effectiveness of a local civil defense structure were formulated by the project team and consisted of the following:

1. Local commitment to the program (e.g. commitment on the part of elected officials, the civil defense director, the general public, etc.);
2. Support and attitude of state and Federal officials;
3. Level of expertise of local government personnel in disaster preparedness;

4. Personalities involved in the organization;
5. Public education programs;
6. Degree of coordination (among municipal departments, as well as between the municipalities and other public and private organizations);
7. Presence of clearly-defined, understood and accepted lines of authority and responsibility;
8. Operative procedures for determining if a particular situation is a major emergency; and
9. Use of simple procedures (as close as possible to normal operations) for handling an emergency.

- Development of a Uniform Reporting System

In order to record similar kinds of information in each locality visited, a system was developed to capture the required information. The necessary information was recorded in checklist format and consisted of a locality's response to the following questions:

- (A) Where are civil defense/emergency preparedness functions managed:
- under the Fire Department
 - under the Police Department

- by a separate city department
- by a separate county department
- by a separate county department
- by a separate entity outside of the city or
county

(B) Person(s), title, and department responsible for civil defense tasks.

(C) Descriptive analysis of local civil defense structure including:

1. legislated and delegated authority
2. graphic presentation of civil defense organization
3. lead authorities in a local disaster/emergency and any variations which may exist according to type of disaster
4. advantages of operative structure
5. disadvantages of operative structure
6. unique community factors that the local
local organization takes into account

(D) Available resources including:

1. full and part-time personnel
2. personnel from other departments
3. equipment and facilities

(E) Planning operations including:

1. civil defense written plans
2. evaluation mechanisms
3. testing procedures
4. organizational structures' role in developing plan

(F) Training

1. types of training program
2. audience (staff, public, etc.)
3. response of audience

(G) Response

1. process to declare an emergency and implement the plan
2. person authorized to declare an emergency

(H) Coordination

1. internal government organizations active in emergency management
2. external organizations active in emergency management
3. frequency of contact with these organizations

4. involvement of other organizations in an emergency situation
5. who in organization is responsible for coordination.

(I) Budget funding costs

1. budget for this year, last year
2. what's included in budget
3. source of funds (DCPA, local, state)
4. significant budget changes over last ten years
5. costs of maintaining the operation
6. direct costs related to any emergency in last 5 years.

(J) Public Interface and Media Relations

1. mechanism for informing public of an emergency
2. workings of warning system
3. description of any outreach/public education program to explain emergency management
4. use of volunteers
5. involvement of news media in both normal operations and emergency operations

(K) Field operations

1. procedures to be followed during an emergency
2. who has responsibility for overseeing tasks

(L) Recovery

1. procedures and tasks during the recovery process
2. responsibility for accomplishing tasks

(M) Perceptions

1. general feelings concerning the effectiveness of the civil defense organization and functions
2. municipal employees feelings in regard to emergency management
3. support/involvement of news media, the public, etc.
4. level of commitment on part of elected officials
5. role, purpose, and function of civil defense director/coordinator
6. organizational factors most important in emergency preparedness

7. description of the optimal local emergency
preparedness structure/organization

- Analyze results of case study information focussing on
"effectiveness."

Each local government environment possesses characteristic factors and constraints which influence the unique orientation and operation of its organizational structure for emergency preparedness. In the absence of nationally recognized measures of effectiveness for emergency preparedness, the local jurisdiction's objectives and policies became the standards used by the research team for evaluating and comparing the effectiveness of its system.

- Develop list of attributes or characteristics which
are associated with effective local emergency manage-
ment organizations.

Based on the results of the case studies certain attributes or characteristics were identified as contributing to an effective and successful emergency preparedness program.

- Convene a Local Government Advisory Group on October
19, 1979, At the ICMA Annual Conference in Phoenix,
Arizona an Advisory Committee consisting of local
government managers, police chiefs, fire chiefs, and

emergency management personnel met to review and refine the list of organizational attributes.

- Preparation of draft organizational guide

To ensure that the organizational attributes are understood and can be applied by local government officials, a draft guide was prepared to enable the user to evaluate, modify, reorganize or establish an emergency management organizational structure.

- Reality testing of draft guide

During the summer of 1980, the draft guide was reviewed by officials of:

- San Mateo, California
- San Diego, California
- Huntington Beach, California
- Boca Baton, Florida
- Miami Shores, Florida
- Belle Glade, Florida
- Longboat Key, Florida
- Sarasota County, Florida
- Windsor, Conn.
- Metropolitan Washington, Council of Governments

The followed questions served as guidelines to solicit from local officials their comments regarding the draft guide:

A. Suggested Questions: (not all will apply to every interview)

1. Do you understand the purpose of the guide?
2. Do you think such a guide is useful? Why or why not?
 - IF YES, would you use it yourself or pass it on to someone else to use? Who?
3. Any comments about overall usefulness?

B. Evaluation: Are the questions:

1. Naive?
2. Technically correct?
3. Relevant to your community?
4. Interesting/useful to you?
5. Offensive?
6. Politically sensitive?
7. Should any questions be revised? Added?
Eliminated?
8. Is the scenario helpful? Why or why not?
9. Any general comments about using the guide for purposes of evaluation?

C. Modify and/or reorganize: (establish new organization not applicable)

1. After evaluation might you want to modify

or reorganize your disaster organization?

Why or why not?

2. What assistance would you need to accomplish the above changes?

a) Workshops?

b) Special reports?

c) Manual?

d) Peer match?

e) Extensive technical assistance through FEMA regions?

f) Other?

D. Summary

1. If you received the guide in the mail would you be likely to use it? Why or why not?

2. If you knew the guide was available, would you be likely to request it?

3. Would you pay for it? How much?

4. Is Volume I inviting? Does it motivate you to read and use Volume II?

5. What do you like best about Volume II?

6. What do you like least about Volume II?

7. Additional comments/suggestions about any aspects of the guide, project, or emergency preparedness organization--in general, or

specific?

- Revise Guide

Based on the comments of local officials to the preceding questions, the guide underwent substantial revision and led to the production of three separate local emergency management documents.

- Produce Emergency Management Handbooks

Because emergency management is of low priority among local officials, the research team first produced an 8 panel pamphlet which attempts to motivate officials to think about emergency management issues. As the second component in the handbook series, a self-assessment manual enables the local administrator to quickly evaluate the capabilities of his/her local organizational arrangement for emergency management. The third volume in the series, "A Practitioners Workbook" enables local emergency management personnel to modify, revise, strengthen or establish an emergency management organizational structure which best meets the unique requirements of their own communities.

- Validate the self-assessment manual

The ICMA Annual Conference (September 28-October 2, 1980) provided a unique opportunity for validating the self-assessment manual(handbook II in the emergency management handbook series). An announcement in the daily news bulletin issued at the Conference alerted the membership to the validation effort. Those interested were given a briefing on the handbook series and then asked to review the manual and complete an evaluation form. Moreover, a special session on emergency management was held on October 1, 1980 at the Conference and those in attendance were also briefed on the project.

- Analyze validation comments

During the validation process, managers were asked the following questions regarding the self-assessment manual: (please note: not all of the following questions applied to every interview; these questions were used as guidelines).

A. Perception:

1. Do you understand the purpose of Handbook No. 2?
2. Do you think such a Handbook is useful? Why or why not?

3. Regarding format, is the Handbook too long,
too short, just right? Is the text easy
to follow?

B. Evaluation:

1. Are the Questions:
 - a) Naive?
 - b) Technically correct?
 - c) Relevant to your community?
 - d) Interesting/useful to you?
 - e) Offensive?
 - f) Politically Sensitive?
2. Should any questions be revised? Added?
Eliminated?
3. Any general comments about using the Handbook
for purposes of evaluation?

C. General Comments:

1. If you received the Handbook in the mail
would you be likely to use it?
2. If you knew the Handbook was available, would
you be likely to request it?
3. Would you pay for it? How much?
4. What do you like best about the Handbook?
5. What do you like least about the Handbook?

6. Additional comments/suggestions about any aspects of the Handbook, the Handbook Series, or local emergency management concerns--in general, or specific?

- Prepare final handbook series

With minor revisions, the draft handbook series was produced in October and is being reviewed by FEMA officials.

Section IV

Research Accomplished

Introduction

This section discusses the research accomplished in the course of the two-year contract ICMA had initially with the Defense Civil Preparedness Agency (DCPA) and subsequently with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). This section is organized to coincide with the major tasks of the project namely:

- A) to analyze the similarities and differences between the DCPA and the U.S. Fire Administration (USFA);
- B) to examine local emergency management organizational arrangements;
- C) to develop a process (including the preparation of written materials on how to organize for local emergency management) by which local communities can establish an emergency management organizational arrangement; and,
- D) to develop a strategy for validating the organizational planning process.

A. An Analysis of DCPA and USFA

The DCPA evolved from an all-purpose federal emergency office to take command of the needs and requirements of providing the nation with coordinated civilian defense activities. Before its incorporation

into FEMA, the DCPA's major concern was to prepare the nation for nuclear civil defense and the potential threat of an enemy confrontation.

Since its establishment, the DCPA had played a major role in influencing state and local civil defense structures and activities. The DCPA had developed and disseminated manuals on civil defense organizational standards and guidelines for federal, state, and local governments and private industry. In addition, the DCPA made civil defense handbooks available to the public.

It had been the DCPA's function to ensure that nuclear civil defense is a reality and practiced throughout the nation. The DCPA had the authority to assess the status of local governments' emergency preparedness plans and organizational arrangements. This authority had in effect, served as a monitoring system and had prompted local civil defense organizations to seriously consider, and attempt to implement, the DCPA's suggestions and recommendations. Thus, the DCPA had been perceived and accepted as an authoritative figure by state and local authorities.

Such a position was further enhanced by the DCPA's ability to provide financial assistance to state and local governments for civil defense facilities and maintenance costs. To be eligible for such funding, state and local governments had to conform to federal regulations and standards and had to abide by federally-prescribed procedures. This authority gave the DCPA a great

advantage over the control and monitoring of state and local facilities and their operational capabilities.

The DCPA's major concerns and responsibilities were for the Nation's defense capabilities. To advance the federal effort, the DCPA encouraged and financially supported state and local participation in programs and contracts designed to reinforce state and local capability and simultaneously contribute to national defense systems and plans.

At the local level, it was found that the major obstacle for civil defense is not federal support or financial assistance, but rather public apathy and a lack of understanding by local government. Under DCPA, local civil defense facilities and personnel were funded 50 percent by the Federal Government and 50 percent by the local government. However, the size and capability of the local civil defense office was found to be a function of the degree of community support. Without the support of the local constituents, civil defense programs receive low priority and poor funding allowances. This lack of support made it difficult for civil defense officials to acquire equipment and facilities, even on a 50-50 matching fund basis.

The lack of public awareness and understanding of the range of precautionary measures and types of disasters which civil preparedness covers has contributed to the low priority placed on local civil defense organizations. Civil defense does not receive the attention and objective consideration which is necessary to enhance its image because of its low visibility, the infrequency of major local

disasters, and the absence of a direct evaluation mechanism whereby the public can assess the quality of the service received, i.e., civil defense is not a first-line service.

The connotation of civil defense changes from nuclear civil defense at the Federal level to a natural disaster focus at the state and local levels. The consensus is that this transition increases public acceptance and support of, and involvement in, a preparedness program. By identifying disasters that constituents can personally relate to in terms of the potential damage that can be inflicted upon their daily lives, greater concern is generated from the local community.

The DCPA was a disaster preparedness agency; however, its responsibility to natural disasters was secondary. This secondary support for natural disasters became a legislative duty of the DCPA as a result of the fact that assistance to local governments in natural disaster planning already existed. The DCPA provided funding to promote implementation of its plans at state and local levels and to support Federal programs and efforts in nuclear civil defense. The most effective way to financially assist the natural disaster responsibility had been to interest state and local officials in preparing dual-purpose plans and equipment. Financial assistance for natural disaster per se, did not exist in the DCPA's legislation.

Fire Protection

With regard to fire protection, the USFA plays a much less dominant role than did the DCPA vis-a-vis civil defense.

Regardless, in the past four and one-half years, the USFA has become the Federal focus for the fire service and performs those activities which are better managed and controlled from a national level (i.e., the collection, analysis, and subsequent dissemination of fire data; research; the establishment and management of the National Fire Academy; and the development and implementation of educational programs to increase public awareness). The activities and programs of the USFA are concerned with the internal support of local efforts and the future advancement of local fire service effectiveness and performance capability. The drawback, however, is that the success of these Federal efforts relies upon the support and participation of state and local authorities.

The USFA lacks the mechanism to compel state and local governments to respond with greater enthusiasm to its mission. The USFA does not yet have the influence within the fire service that the DCPA had with state and local civil defense officials.

A major reason for this lack of USFA influence may be due to the high regard which each local fire department usually receives within its own jurisdiction. After all, the local fire departments existed long before the USFA was ever considered and have operated with a great amount of autonomy. In addition, the fire service receives virtually 100 percent of its financial support from the local community which it protects, strengthening its local orientation.

The local fire service normally has the complete support of its local community and is considered and recognized as an indispensable force. The fire service provides first-line service to the public, and the results of these firefighting efforts have a direct impact upon constituents. This wide acceptance and support from the public contributes to the de facto autonomy the local fire departments have possessed and maintained, even after the establishment of the USFA.

The USFA has not made great inroads into the operation or the structure of state and local authorities because it has not been the intent of this agency to do so. Legislation demonstrates an intent for the USFA to play a supportive role, not only for the fire service, but rescue medical, civil defense, and other organizations engaged in emergency response activities. This legislative intent is evident in the specifications of the Technology Development Program, the curriculum of the National Fire Academy, and the authority of the Administrator to conduct demonstration projects and to issue contracts.

There has been a limited outreach network between the USFA and its state and local counterparts due to the relative youth of the current Administration and a lack of funding from Congress. However, the lack of financial incentives for state and local governments also hinders the USFA's potential to play a more significant role in the fire service and impedes its development as a more influential authority.

DCPA and USFA

In terms of interrelated functions and responsibilities with respect to civil defense, both the DCPA and the USFA shared the common cause of protecting life and property, but each developed very distinct roles. The USFA is involved in civil defense because the fire service is one of the primary response forces to all types of disasters and emergencies. Civil defense is dependent upon fire service personnel for rescue and fire protection capabilities.

Both agencies coordinated with state and local authorities. The DCPA provided planning manuals, assessed state and local defense organizations, provided financial assistance, and advised localities in developing dual-purpose preparedness plans against enemy attack and natural disaster. The USFA encourages state and local participation in data collection and analysis, public educational programs, fire service education and training, and reviews and evaluates state and local fire prevention and building codes. The USFA also encourages and supports fire protection master planning and equipment development, involves local officials in technology programs, performs technology dissemination, and operates the National Fire Reference Service.

The Research Division of the DCPA conducted research on all aspects of civil defense, including fire protection. The increased application, implementation, and incorporation of technological results and operational techniques developed by the DCPA would undoubtedly improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the fire service. The USFA has the authority to provide grants and contracts to assist fire service

training, implement data collection and analysis projects, and encourage the development of new technology in fire protection. This authority could be exercised to solidify the USFA's ties with state and local fire service organizations and to strengthen its influence as a Federal focus for fire protection.

Moreover, the USFA orients its academic programs and courses to be versatile enough to accomodate firefighting, rescue, and civil defense forces. The Technological Development Program develops, tests, and evaluates equipment used by fire, rescue, and civil defense services. This program currently coordinates its efforts with the National Bureau of Standards and Fire Research Center.

At the local level, the fire service is usually highly regarded and acknowledged by its constituents. The public's support and acceptance of the fire service gives the local fire department credibility, authority, and frequently, political power. Local civil defense would of course, benefit from a higher public regard. The local civil defense coordinator's major obstacles are the lack of public support and poor political leverage in local government.

Closer association between local civil defense and fire departments may be mutually beneficial to both entities, and, in addition, would increase public welfare. A closer association would undoubtedly enhance the local civil defense office's image and legitimacy as a public safety force.

Fire departments could also benefit from closer association with local civil defense officials. The EOC's could serve not only as the initial meeting place for all public safety officials during times of emergency, but could also operate as the daily communications center for local governments, i.e., daily emergency dispatch center.

Improvement of civil defense plans and operations includes fire service readiness. Since civil defense is dependent upon fire service support, this function can promote and contribute to measures that will improve effectiveness in service and operation.

Conclusively, it would be in the best interest of the public to encourage a closer association between civil defense and fire service agencies at the local level. Greater efficiency and effectiveness in emergency preparedness plans and fire operations would lead to better protection of life and property, and hence, would increase public welfare.

B. Local Emergency Management Organizations

In order to evaluate major organizational patterns and relationships for the delivery of fire and civil defense services at the local level the research team conducted on-site examinations of 11 existing organizational arrangements for the delivery of emergency services. The results of the examination of the 11 existing organizational arrangements are contained in the Task B Report, already submitted to FEMA.

In conducting the site visits, certain findings emerged which were common to nearly all of the organizational arrangements examined. These findings are discussed in the following paragraphs.

Low priority of emergency management

An emergency preparedness organization must be capable of developing and administering plans for the delivery of emergency services and the allocation of resources to implement programs. A fundamental constraint to the viability of a local emergency preparedness program however, is the low priority given to the topic by elected officials as well as by the general public. The absence and/or relative infrequency of an impending danger to life and property fails to keep interest levels high for any length of time beyond the moment of the immediate threat.

Natural disasters were generally the major concern in plans and programs. The more prevalent types of natural disasters experienced by a locality were given the most attention by the organization.

Nuclear defense programs were kept at a minimum and not often emphasized. Local government and public concern over nuclear defense was perceived to be low or insignificant.

Organizational variations

Findings, based upon the case studies, show that the organizational arrangement for the delivery of emergency preparedness services varies significantly with the geographic location, the population make-up and dispersal, the personalities and interrelationships between local government personnel, as well as the degree of local concern and support towards the concept of emergency preparedness.

Two examples of county-wide jurisdictions managed by a separate emergency preparedness entity were studied by the research team. Both receive greater financial support because of pooled resources and support which provide the emergency preparedness organization a more effective basis from which to work.

Local government support is a major factor for determining the degree of job satisfaction on the part of the emergency preparedness coordinators. When support from the city manager, city council or county board is high, the self esteem and sense of accomplishment of the emergency preparedness coordinator is also high. Even without the support or concern of the local constituents, the emergency preparedness coordinator felt satisfied with his own efforts and assumed the public was well taken care of.

The public and government's low concern towards emergency preparedness was a recurring observation. However, the amount of public exposure and attention given a disaster event by the news media proved to be a significant factor contributing to the political strength of, and recognition of the need for emergency preparedness. News accounts emphasizing the lack of and need for improved emergency preparedness contributes support for larger operating budgets and helps to promote emergency preparedness to a higher level of priority within local governments.

Financial support varies widely with the types of organizational arrangement that exists. Financial support ranges from total local support, to total federal support, to no support.

In any case, the financial source had little effect on whether or not there exists an emergency preparedness organization. Where there was little or no local financial support, the Federal Government subsidized personnel and administration costs, and volunteers were used extensively. The degree to which volunteers were used appeared to be inversely related to the size and authority demonstrated by the emergency preparedness organization. The more enthusiastic and numerous the volunteers, the smaller the formal emergency preparedness organization.

Each local emergency management structural arrangement evolved as a response to a need and desire for local emergency preparedness. The actual arrangement and system for emergency preparedness services, however, is a consequence of the local environment in which it must operate. Each and every locality may require a different structure to best accomodate its local constraints and to meet its local needs.

As a direct consequence, the office of emergency preparedness has a difficult task in competing with other local government departments for local funding. Emergency preparedness receives both low priority and poor support from elected officials and local constituents.

Difficulty also occurs in meeting the goals of an on-going emergency preparedness program. This difficulty however, lies more in the fact that emergency preparedness offices are usually limited in power, resources, functional responsibilities, and jurisdiction. In addition, changes in population make-up and density and the rate of turnover further impede the efficient delivery of services.

Each local emergency preparedness structural arrangement has a number of perceived advantages and disadvantages. Frequently the systems do not operate as designed. For example, the quality of leadership generally depends upon the strength of the personalities involved and the perceived responsibilities of other departmental forces rather than the structural arrangement for command.

Final analysis of the characteristic factors underlying any one organizational environment demonstrates that no one optimal model would efficiently and effectively provide emergency preparedness services for every community. However, the following characteristics were identified as contributing to an effective and successful emergency preparedness program:

ABILITY TO ALERT THE PUBLIC MAXIMIZED

A public alerting function should be included within a local government emergency management organizational structure. This alerting function should be operational for all types of natural and man-made disasters faced by a community, not just for foreign attack. Furthermore, provisions should exist to alert all segments of the community, e.g., the handicapped and non-English speaking residents.

ABILITY TO MAINTAIN COMPREHENSIVE RECORDS DURING A DISASTER

The organizational structure should provide for the collecting and recording of disaster-related information, including financial data on governmental expenditures. Information should be maintained in accordance with state and federal requirements for reimbursement in case an official "disaster" is declared.

ACTIVE INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION

The emergency management organization structure should be designed to effectively interface with neighboring communities and state and federal emergency management organizations.

ALL HAZARD APPROACH

A local government emergency management organizational structure (and detailed plans) should be designed to deal with the types of disasters which are most likely to occur (such as natural disasters and industrial accidents; not just foreign attack), so as to have an emergency management capability which both meets anticipated needs and attracts strong participation and support from municipal employees and the general public.

CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT

Residents of the community should be included in the emergency management program. In fact, they have a number of responsibilities, including:

- a. recognizing alerting signals
- b. knowing what to do when an alert occurs
- c. knowing how to personally cope with minor injuries and damage
- d. being generally prepared for possible disasters.

In addition, citizens may serve as volunteers in the emergency management effort--either directly with the city, or indirectly through community volunteer organizations.

DISASTER PREVENTION AND MITIGATION

Advance actions can be taken to either prevent the occurrence of an emergency situation, or to mitigate the consequences of a disaster should one occur. For example, strictly enforced controls on the transport of hazardous materials may prevent a disaster from occurring; an incentive program to discourage construction in a flood plain may not prevent a flood, but could minimize the consequences of the event.

Disaster prevention activities can also be conducted after a disaster has occurred, e.g., prior to reconstruction. For example, houses might be reconstructed in a different area or incorporate storm-resistive features.

ELIGIBILITY FOR STATE AND FEDERAL SUBSIDIES CONSIDERED

A community which is seeking state or federal subsidies for emergency management operations should consider corresponding applicable requirements related to its organizational structure.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PLANNING = ONGOING ACTIVITY

The emergency management planning function should be established within the overall local government organization in such a way as to provide the status and authority necessary to obtain the attention, cooperation and respect of other agency personnel. To the maximum extent possible, the planning function should be integrated into the daily operations of a local government; that is, organizational relationships should be established which require frequent contact between planning personnel and other governmental personnel.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES ARE AS CLOSE TO ROUTINE OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES AS POSSIBLE

The organizational structure should provide for the integration of emergency preparedness functions into the day-to-day operations of the community; that is, emergency planning should be a part of routine activities and not something that is "taken off the shelf" when a disaster occurs. Furthermore, personnel in the organization should be generally acquainted with others with whom they will be working during a disaster.

GOOD INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS -

The organizational structure should recognize the fact that the effectiveness of emergency management operations is dependent upon personalities and interpersonal interdepartmental relationship--and, that these relationships may change as specific individuals are assigned into, and out of, the organization.

INTERNAL ALERTING PROCEDURES

The emergency management organization should provide for the alerting of key officials and personnel in times of disaster, including during non-duty hours, and when the public telephone system is not operational.

MOTIVATION PROVIDED FOR INVOLVEMENT IN THE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

The organization should include motivation for participation in the emergency management program. Such motivation can apply to both individuals and organizations, and can consist of recognition, status, acknowledgement of capability, etc.

MULTIPLE USE OF RESOURCES

The organizational structure should promote the use of

emergency management resources for routine governmental functions. For example, emergency management training resources could be used for general governmental employee training in cardio-pulmonary resuscitation (CPR).

ONGOING MONITORING FOR POTENTIAL DISASTERS

The organizational structure should provide for an emergency management monitoring function staffed on a 24-hour basis. The purpose of this function is to monitor the development of potential disaster situations so that governmental employees, and the general public, can be placed on various stages of alert as appropriate. In addition, this function assists the community in rapidly establishing an accurate and complete understanding of the nature and magnitude of a particular situation.

PUBLIC INFORMATION FUNCTION CLEARLY DEFINED

The organizational structure should include a designated disaster public information function, to provide disaster-related information to the general public and coordination with the news media. The disaster public information function should be the focal point for the release of all information concerning the disaster and should coordinate the activities of all other (i.e., non-disaster) public

information functions. Ideally, the routine overall government public information function (if it exists) should be the same as the disaster public information function.

PUBLIC/PRIVATE COOPERATION

The emergency management organization structure should include the entire community, not just local government employees. Emergency management is a community responsibility and the corresponding organization and planning must include public and private organizations, adjacent cities, the county, the Salvation Army, associations for the handicapped, associations of insurance agents, etc.

In addition,

organizations which are currently providing a given service (e.g., assisting the blind) should be used to provide that service (e.g., alerting the blind) in a disaster situation whenever appropriate. Use of these in-place networks provides three major benefits:

1. A unit of local government does not have to directly provide that service.
2. Cooperation from the public is maximized by utilizing familiar networks.
3. The more community organizations which are

made a part of the emergency management organization, the greater will be the depth and breadth of support for the emergency management in general.

ROLES OF ELECTED OFFICIALS DEFINED

The roles of elected local government officials should be specifically defined in the emergency management organizational structure. These officials will of course, have key roles in representing their respective constituencies during the emergency situation; however, they are frequently assigned additional functions within a disaster operation. Such additional emergency assignments should be clearly represented within the organizational structure.

SIMILAR ROUTINE/DISASTER ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES

The organizational structure which is implemented for disaster situations should be similar to the structure which is used for day-to-day emergencies; that is, as much as possible the disaster organizational structure should be an extension and expansion of the routine emergency structure, --adding special functions (e.g., damage assessment) and lines of coordination (e.g., with volunteer organizations) as needed. To the extend possible, personnel should continue

to work with the supervisor and associates that he/she works with on a day-to-day basis.

STRONG AND DEFINITIVE LINES OF COMMAND

The organizational structure should clearly delineate lines of authority and responsibility for all phases of a disaster operation, specifically:

1. Planning and preparation
2. Monitoring and alerting
3. Operations
4. Recovery

Specific lines of command in emergency preparedness are especially important considering the fact that a number of governmental agencies may be involved in the disaster situation. Furthermore, all individual personnel should know of the established lines of command.

STRONG COORDINATION AMONG PARTICIPATING AGENCIES

Emergency management is a community responsibility, not just a local government responsibility. It is necessary for the organizational structure to clearly identify those individuals (or organizations) which have the responsibility to coordinate (rather than command) resources which are outside of the direct control of the unit of local government, e.g., other public and private organizations such as the American Red Cross.

C.

Develop a process (including the preparation of written materials on how to organize for local emergency management) by which local communities can establish an emergency management organizational arrangement.

This section presents the research findings regarding requirements for
(1) an effective emergency preparedness organizational structure and
(2) the planning process.

Because generally accepted measures of effectiveness for emergency preparedness do not currently exist, the research team has defined an "effective" emergency preparedness program to be one which:

"when applied during a disaster, will provide the levels of protection for life and property, and recovery assistance, which are acceptable to the citizens of the community."

It is, of course, impossible for the research team to determine what levels are acceptable to citizens of any given community -- in fact, the citizens themselves probably do not know what is or is not acceptable, until a disaster has occurred. However, the research team has formulated subjective, qualitative conclusions concerning what is and what is not acceptable.

For example, it is felt that citizens expect their local governments to:

- 1) Inform the general public concerning the meaning of alerting signals, action to take, availability of flood insurance, etc., in advance of the disaster.
- 2) Quickly and accurately assess the magnitude of the situation, and so report to the general public, and keep the public informed throughout the incident.
- 3) Provide for the rapid restoration of services, even when specific services are not the direct responsibility of the local government, e.g., private utilities.
- 4) Provide for (or access to) recovery services, such as insurance claim preparation, tax counseling, family reunification, etc.
- 5) Provide information on, and specific action steps toward mitigating the impact of future emergencies.

A fundamental conclusion of this research project is that a single emergency preparedness organizational structure which is "ideal" for every unit of local government does not exist.

There are significant differences in the ways in which cities, counties, and regional governments are legally established and functionally operate, and these differences have a definite impact on organizing for emergency preparedness. For example:

- The balance of authority between city/county/state governments varies from state to state.

- Responsibility for emergency preparedness in a given city may be specified in the charter or a special ordinance.
- State government legal instruments (e.g., constitutions, statutes, or executive orders) may require specific communication channels with local government (e.g., through the highest elected official) in disaster situations.
- Some cities have council-manager forms of government, while others have mayor-council or commissioner forms.

Also, there are differences in the ways in which local governments currently provide services. For example:

- Certain cities have public safety departments which provide law enforcement, fire protection, emergency medical, and disaster management services, while these services are provided by separate departments in other cities.
- Some communities obtain certain services which are vital to emergency preparedness (such as emergency medical and fire protection services) through contracts with other public or private organizations.

These arrangements, which are already in place, will influence the flexibility of local governments to adopt certain organizational models.

There are also a number of additional factors (such as personalities and traditions) which combine with legal and organizational considerations to create significant differences among communities. These differences preclude the establishment of a single emergency preparedness organization which will be ideal for every community.

Therefore, the findings of this project indicate that a number of alternative models (all of which contain the recommended organizational attributes or characteristics) should be presented so that each community can select the model which is optimal for its own specific situation.

These alternative organizational models formed the basis of the Task C Report which has been submitted to FEMA.

The analysis of emergency preparedness organizational structures (contained in the Task B Report) resulted in the identification of three positions which are considered to be key to effective disaster operations. These positions are represented by:

- 1) The person who is legally responsible for emergency preparedness.
- 2) The person who coordinates the community's preparation for disaster.
- 3) The person who actually directs the operations of the community during a disaster.

These positions must be defined in order to classify and analyze alternative organizational structures:

- The "director" is defined as the person who is assigned legal responsibility for a community's emergency preparedness functions.
- The "emergency preparedness planner" is defined as the person who is responsible for overall community planning for disaster situations.
- The "emergency preparedness incident commander" is defined as the person who has the authority and responsibility to direct local government resources during a disaster situation.

The results of this study identified five basic categories of organizational models.

- 1) An organizational structure wherein the positions of director, incident commander, and planner are all filled by the same person.
- 2) A structure wherein the positions of director and incident commander are combined, with a separate planning position.
- 3) A structure wherein the positions of director and planner are filled by one person and the position of incident commander is filled by another person.

- 4) A structure wherein the positions of planner and incident commander are combined, but the position of director is filled by a different person.
- 5) A structure wherein the positions of director, incident commander, and planner are each filled by a different person.

The chart below offers a visual illustration of the five alternative organizational structures presented above.

Organizational Structure	Director	Incident Commander	Planner	Total Number Responsible Inv.
Model 1	X	X	X	1
Model 2	X	X	Y	2
Model 3	X	Y	X	2
Model 4	Y	X	X	2
Model 5	Y	Y	Y	3

Key: X = Positions which are filled by same individual.

Y = Positions completely separate, filled by separate individual.

Optional organizational arrangements are possible within each of these categories. For example, the position of incident commander could be filled by the municipal chief administrative officer, by a department

director (e.g., the fire chief), or by different individuals, each assuming responsibility for a specific type of disaster in which he/she is especially qualified and/or which he/she normally directs the resources most appropriate to the situation (for example, the Director of the Street Department would become Incident Commander during an ice storm affecting streets).

There are other variations associated with multi-jurisdictional emergency preparedness organizations. For example, a county planning office might serve the county government and associated cities, with each unit of local government responsible for its own disaster operations. Or, a county government could direct disaster operations for individual cities through an appropriate agreement.

Thus, there are an almost infinite number of variations of emergency preparedness organizations -- many of these variations were observed in the course of this study.

The potential advantages and disadvantages associated with a particular organizational structure were identified by the research team based upon the results of the analysis conducted in Tasks A & B of this study. Thus, the advantages/disadvantages are based upon qualitative conclusions resulting from the review of over 300 currently operational local government emergency preparedness organizations and the conduct of 11 on-site case studies. As a result of these analyses, the research team identified traits (i.e., advantages/disadvantages) which appeared to be generally associated with particular organizational structures (see Task C Report).

Of course a particular advantage, or disadvantage, can occur with any type of structure. The actual characteristics (good or bad) of an emergency preparedness organization were found to be significantly influenced by a number of factors which are independent of the organizational structure; for example, local traditions and individual personalities.

General requirements for the planning process

Basic requirements for the development of the organizational planning process are described in this section. These requirements are those which are inherent to the basic planning process, rather than a particular feature of the process.

- a) The planning process should be applicable to all basic types of local government management structures.

Local governments are organized in different ways; some use the council-manager form, while others use the council-mayor or commissioner forms. Planning procedures must be applicable to all of these structures as well as the corresponding forms at the County and Regional levels.

- b) The planning process should be applicable to single and multi-jurisdictional communities of all sizes located in all geographical areas of the nation.

Project results should be applicable to the entire nation.

- c) The planning process should be simple and straightforward.

The planning procedures should be written for use by a variety of local government personnel with different skill levels and background. For example, the process should be understandable and usable for officials of a rural community, as well as by the staff of a complex, sophisticated urban city with specialized planning personnel. Moreover, a multi-jurisdictional emergency preparedness planning effort may include personnel from a large urban city and from several rural communities.

- d) Written procedures associated with the planning process should be clear and concise and must not use jargon of any kind.

The planning procedures will be utilized by city/county management, law enforcement, fire protection, planning, finance, and other personnel; therefore, the language should be equally understandable by all personnel. Jargon, particularly emergency preparedness jargon, should not be used for two primary reasons:

- (1) the terminology may be alien to particular members of a emergency preparedness planning team; and,
- (2) definitions for such terminology may not be unique or precise.

- e) The planning process must not require the use of personnel skills which are not normally available within the staffs of local jurisdictions.

The emergency preparedness organizational planning process is to be primarily accomplished by personnel of the jurisdictions involved.

- f) The planning process should stress that there are benefits associated with the planning process which are independent of the resulting plan.

The completion of individual steps within the planning process may be of significant value to a community, independent of the development of an emergency preparedness organizational structure. For example, the participatory process (involving various governmental personnel) may lead to improved working relationships in addition to a better understanding of, and application for, the need for emergency preparedness.

- g) The planning process should allow compliance with applicable laws and regulations.

The implementation of an emergency preparedness organization may be governed by the regulations, ordinances, and laws of a number of jurisdictions, including the State and Federal government. The planning process

should provide the flexibility necessary to comply with all applicable legal instruments. This requirement should not be construed as restricting the planners in recommending new legislation to permit a desired emergency preparedness organization.

- h) The planning process must not advocate or inhibit the consideration or adoption of any one type of organizational structure.
- i) The planning process must not preclude the consideration or adoption of any one type of organizational structure.

A fundamental conclusion of this project is that there is no single emergency preparedness organizational structure which is optimal for all communities. Therefore, the process must lead officials through the consideration of all applicable alternatives (without prejudice or bias) resulting in the selection of the structure which is best suited to their particular locality.

Requirements associated with the authority for emergency preparedness

This section contains requirements that are critical to the success of an emergency preparedness planning program, especially one in a multi-jurisdictional environment.

- a) The planning process should lead to the establishment of a formal authority for accomplishing emergency preparedness functions.

- b) The planning process should lead to the development of channels for command and coordination.

An emergency preparedness organization should be established upon an authoritative base which is recognized by all participating jurisdictions. This base may be a municipal ordinance or charter amendment; or for multi-jurisdictional structures, a joint powers agreement, a set of individual resolutions, or a county ordinance. Whatever the base, it should be sufficient to support the planning effort and be recognized and accepted by all participating jurisdictions.

- c) To the maximum extent possible, the planning process should utilize planning concepts, procedures, and guides developed by FEMA and other applicable organizations.

The FEMA (and particularly, the DCPA) has prepared a number of emergency preparedness planning materials for local government - the process should encourage planning jurisdictions to use these materials as applicable.

- d) The planning process should include requests to coordinate the planning effort with the FEMA and applicable state, county and regional emergency preparedness organizations.

These organizations may have specific requirements which must be met (e.g., for reimbursement) which may influence the development of an organizational structure. In any case, the structure should be designed to interface with these agencies for coordination purposes.

- e) The planning process should provide for significant participation by all affected individuals and governmental jurisdictions involved in emergency preparedness organizational planning.

A basic conclusion of this study is that for the resulting emergency preparedness organization to be effective the planning process must include participation by concerned or involved parties. This concept is even more important in multi-jurisdictional planning because the parties (or "planning constituency") frequently are other jurisdictions such as cities and districts. Thus, the planning process should include guidelines for the selection of persons to participate in the organizational planning process.

- f) The planning process should encourage the consideration of regional governmental organizations for a role in the emergency preparedness organization.

Regional organizations such as councils of governments, or planning districts, should be considered for participation in the emergency preparedness organizational structure.

- g) The planning process should include procedures for developing a budget and funding program for the implementation of the completed emergency preparedness organization.

This requirement pertains to funding of the adopted organization which is especially important when a number of jurisdictions are involved.

- h) The planning process should include procedures for selecting the specific organizational structure which is most appropriate for a given community.

The planning procedures should include alternative organizational structures for emergency preparedness to assist the user in selecting the form (or modification of a form) that is best for a particular community. A previous requirement stated that the process should be usable to create any organizational structure chosen. This requirement addresses the selection of the appropriate structure.

- i) The planning process should include provisions for forecasting future emergency preparedness requirements, conditions, and constraints.

A fundamental concept of the recommended emergency preparedness planning process is that the planning should be "anticipative" rather than "reactive", that is, future demands and circumstances should be anticipated and planned for, rather than waiting until an event has occurred and then reacting to it.

- j) The planning process should include procedures for the assignment of authority and responsibility for accomplishing emergency preparedness functions reflected in the organization.

The authority required to accomplish each designated function (e.g., emergency preparedness planning) and the corresponding responsibility for getting it accomplished, must be designated within the organizational structure.

- k) The planning process should include procedures for implementing and evaluating the selected organization.

It is not sufficient to just develop and implement an emergency preparedness organization and consider that the planning process is complete. In fact, the planning process should never be considered complete; such an organization is a dynamic entity which will be frequently revised. Revisions will occur because:

(1) specific elements of the organization (which seemed like a good idea at the time) are not proving to be cost-effective; and,

(2) emergency preparedness demands and conditions continuously change.

1) The planning process should provide for the coordination of the adopted emergency preparedness organization with individual city, county, district, state and federal emergency preparedness organizations.

m) The planning process should include procedures for keeping policy leaders and decision-makers informed of planning activities, progress made, and interim results.

Appropriate officials of participating jurisdictions should receive periodic informal briefings on the planning program. These briefings would serve to keep such individuals generally aware of program activities and results and therefore, would reduce the possibility of major surprises and disagreements.

n) The planning process should include procedures for developing a formal organizational development review and approval process which meets local conditions and requirements.

The basic organizational planning process recommends that certain interim results be reviewed and approved before proceeding with the planning effort. These reviews should occur at major milestones in the planning process.

Approvals should be given to those individuals who have the authority to implement the emergency preparedness organization. In a multi-jurisdictional environment, the approval process may be somewhat complex because of the different types of jurisdictions involved (e.g., cities, districts, etc.). The planning procedures should lead to the development of a review and approval process which is appropriate for a particular organizational development program.

- o) The planning process should include procedures for developing an adoption process which is acceptable to all participating jurisdictions.

It is recommended that the organizational planning process be considered incomplete until the developed organization has been formally adopted by all participating jurisdictions.

- p) The planning process should be developed to be applicable to all types of disaster situations.

Thus, the process should be able to organize for any particular type, or set of disaster situations faced by local governments, including natural disasters, industrial accidents and foreign/nuclear attack.

- q) The planning process should encourage the consideration of the organizational attributes presented in Section II.

These attributes (or characteristics) were found by the project team to be generally associated with "effective" emergency preparedness programs. And therefore, should be considered by those going through the planning process. However, they should not be mandated.

- r) The planning process should encourage the continuous testing of emergency preparedness plans.

The continuous testing of emergency preparedness plans ensures that the plans will be inclusive of the new emergency preparedness needs and constraints of each locality.

Requirements associated with the planning guide and associated materials

- a) The organizational planning guide should include a discussion of the need for a comprehensive local government emergency preparedness program.

It is ironic that a disaster, which has serious life safety and property damage as well as political consequences, currently receives little attention at the local level. Thus, the guide should contain information which will encourage a local government to develop an emergency preparedness organizational structure capable of delivering comprehensive emergency preparedness services to its citizens.

- b) The guide should be designed (from a physical standpoint) and packaged to encourage and facilitate its use.

This requirement addresses two factors:

- (1) The design of the guide should facilitate its use.
- (2) The guide should be designed so that it is attractive and appealing and people want to use it. Specifically, it is recommended that the planning guide NOT look like a traditional civil defense manual.

Recommended physical characteristics are:

- (1) 2 volumes: I Organizing for Emergency Management
II Step-by-Step Guide.
- (2) Less than 8½" x 11" in size (both volumes).
- (3) Contain illustrations (both volumes).

- c) The content of Volume I should include:
- (1) A discussion of the benefits of a comprehensive emergency preparedness program (and the dangers of not having one).
 - (2) An overview of the planning process.
 - (3) Testimonials from local government officials who participated in the validation of the process.
 - (4) A description of the expected result of the process.
- d) The content of Volume II should include:
- (1) A logical flow of material from the general to the specific.
 - (2) The use of an example planning situation which continues throughout the guide.
 - (3) The use of specific case studies to illustrate particular points.
 - (4) An index.
 - (5) Appropriate organizational development techniques (e.g., force field analysis, freakie buttons, the change implementation checklist, etc.).
 - (6) A narrative form which uses personal pronouns.

- (7) Sample forms (reproducible).
 - (8) References to other tools, techniques, documents, and materials which could support the planning process.
 - (9) A list of sources of planning assistance (e.g., ICMA, FEMA, universities, etc.).
- e) Planning procedures should be short in length (i.e., number of pages); using a "checklist" (or similar) format to the extent possible. It is felt that a lengthy guide will discourage use. Furthermore, terminology used in the guide should be familiar to the intended users.
- f) The planning guide should receive wide distribution using such networks as:
- (1) International City Management Association;
 - (2) Federal Emergency Management Agency;
 - (3) State Emergency Preparedness Organizations; and,
 - (4) Public Interest Groups.
- g) The planning guide should be validated prior to general distribution.

Development and preparation of written materials

The review and validation of the planning handbook materials indicated that they were too large in magnitude for general use by municipal officials. Based on these conclusions, the guide was divided into a 3 volume handbook series. Each of the 3 handbooks can stand alone and are designed to (1) motivate, (2) evaluate, and (3) present a "how-to" approach for organizing for disaster protection.

D. Developing a strategy for validating the organizational planning process

This section presents a general description of the project's strategy for validating the organization planning process.

The process must be validated prior to release, for several reasons:

- 1) To ensure that the process is effective;
- 2) To ensure that the procedures correctly implement the process;
- 3) To ensure that the procedures are easy to understand and execute;
- 4) To ensure that the guide and materials generate interest; and
- 5) To generate confidence, on the part of potential users of the guide and materials, that they are accurate, complete and effective.

Furthermore, it is a conclusion of the project team, that the process will not experience general use by local governments unless it is validated. This conclusion is based upon the observation that local governments are frequently hesitant to use any process that is not proven in a similar governmental environment.

Validation program requirements

The organizational planning process should be validated in a set of local government environments which are generally representative of all such governments throughout the nation. Thus, the validation program should include participation by:

- a) cities of various sizes (population and land area);
- b) counties of various sized (population and land area);
- c) multi-jurisdictional regions;
- d) small communities and rural areas;
- e) areas with a dominant large city;
- f) communities which are threatened by various types of disasters (e.g., hurricanes, tornadoes, floods, earthquakes, transportation and industrial accidents, conflagrations, etc.);
- g) communities which have various forms of government (e.g., mayor-council, council-manager, etc.);

- h) communities which currently have various organizational structures for emergency preparedness (e.g., the alternative models described in Section III);
- i) communities which want to reorganize, self-evaluate or modify an existing organizational structure for emergency; and/or
- j) communities in all geographical regions of the nation.

Obviously, it is not feasible to conduct a validation program which includes a separate community for each requirement, and combination of requirements listed above; therefore, a program is proposed which uses communities which individually satisfy several requirements. In this manner, all requirements will be met through the use of a relatively small number of validation sites.

For example, a particular community could satisfy the requirement for: a small city in the Southwest, which is threatened by tornadoes, but does not currently have an emergency preparedness organization.

It is estimated that approximately 12 validation communities will be required to meet the stated requirements using the recommended approach.

Validation procedures

Potential validation sites will be identified by the project team in conjunction with the project Advisory Committee and the Federal Emergency Management Agency. A specific list of sites will then be prepared for

invitation. This list will be submitted to FEMA for review, and when approved, the invitation will be issued to the appropriate local government personnel. Invitations will also be coordinated (through FEMA) with the appropriate state and federal organizations.

If a particular jurisdiction decided not to participate, the next appropriate site will be selected from the candidate list. This process will be followed until the 12 sites have been filled.

The validation communities will be provided with preliminary guides and associated support materials for development of an emergency preparedness organizational structure. Each community will be contacted periodically by telephone and by visits to:

- a) maintain the validation schedule;
- b) monitor interim results;
- c) identify any problems with the process, guide or materials; and
- d) assist as necessary.

Communities will also be asked to provide progress reports and completed products.

Problems identified and assistance provided will be documented for use in revising the process or materials.

Also, problems and corresponding solutions encountered in one community which could affect other validation communities, will be immediately documented and distributed.

Upon completion of the validation effort in the communities, the project team will debrief involved personnel to identify further necessary revisions in the process, guide, or support materials.

The validation program will require 12 months for completion.

SECTION V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This section summarizes project findings and includes discussions of the rationale that led to the design and layout of the handbook series.

Overall conclusions are presented first, then specific conclusions are presented for applicable project tasks.

This section is concluded with a set of recommended actions which should be taken by the Federal Emergency Management Agency as a result of this project.

General Conclusions

Fundamental conclusions of this project are:

- a. Local government officials need guidance in reviewing current emergency management organizational structures and developing new or revised structures.
- b. Each unit of local government must develop the organization which is appropriate for its particular situation-- a corollary is that there is not a single emergency management organizational structure which is appropriate for every city or county.

- c. In general, local governments are apathetic concerning emergency preparedness.
- d. Local government officials must be motivated to use review and planning materials, as well as to give the required attention to an emergency management program.
- e. Community officials face financial and political risks if they do not maintain a strong emergency management program.
- f. Emergency management organization planning materials must be especially prepared for use by local government administrators and other municipal personnel. Specifically, these materials must be of the proper length and format to attract the attention of officials, and must not require a period of time for use which is greater than the expected attention span of the officials for which the materials have been prepared.

These conclusions are discussed in more detail in the following paragraphs.

Need for Planning Guidance

Results of all project tasks indicated a significant need for

planning guidance for local government management officials in organizing for emergency preparedness. This need was emphasized by:

- Members of the Project Advisory Committee
- City Managers and other local government officials who participated in the validation activities associated with the various components of the Handbook Series
- Officials of local governments visited in the data collection activity.

In general, it was concluded that current local government emergency planning materials do not meet this requirement for the following reasons:

- The question of organizing for emergency preparedness was not specifically addressed in any documentation identified in the project literature search.
- General emergency management planning materials which do exist have not been prepared especially for use by city management personnel. The planning guides which were reviewed within this project appeared to have been prepared primarily for use by emergency preparedness staff. For example, the concepts

and concerns which are likely to be of interest to city management have not been stressed in previous planning materials. Also, these materials, and specifically the planning guides, are of such magnitude and complexity that they are not likely to be used by city management personnel. (It should be emphasized that the intent of this project was to provide information specifically for city management personnel; that is, addressing information particularly to those officials who have the overall responsibility for local government emergency preparedness.)

Moreover, it was the opinion of the members of the project team (after reviewing current programs) that in general, emergency management organizational structures appear to have evolved (if they exist at all), rather than having been systematically planned. Each case study official was questioned concerning the basis for the organizational structure that was used, and the response was generally that the structure was developed based upon the professional judgment of one or more individuals or had just evolved over time.

Each emergency management organizational environment is unique.

This study identified a number of basic types of emergency management organizational structures. These basic types were

identified and described in the Task C Report of this project. In addition to these identified organizational structures, there are numerous variations upon these structures which are being used by local governments around the nation. Thus, there are many different ways in which a community can organize for emergency management. However, not any one of these organizational arrangements is appropriate for every community. The reasons for this conclusion are numerous, including:

- Legal constraints - state and/or local statutes and ordinances may dictate certain elements of the organizational structure which is used by a particular community. For example, a state statute might place certain responsibilities and authorities with the highest elected official (e.g., the mayor).
- Day-to-day organization - the day-to-day organizational structure of a community can place certain requirements on the emergency management structure. This is particularly true because, the emergency management structure should be as close to the day-to-day operating structure as practical. In addition, cities vary in the way in which they are organized. For example, in one city, emergency medical services

might be provided by the fire department, while in another city, these services might be provided by the police, the hospital, or a private ambulance company.

- Personalities and leadership skills - it was found that organizational structures frequently develop around individual personalities or particular leadership skills. For example, a city manager might decide to appoint the director of a department as head of Emergency Management Operations because this individual has specialized skills/experience and/or the respect of other government officials. If this individual had been director of a different department, then emergency management would be the responsibility of that department. Thus, emergency management responsibilities are sometimes assigned to individuals, without regard to their governmental positions, or the nature of the departments they direct.
- Regional considerations - a number of emergency management programs involve several different jurisdictions; that is, they are organized and operated on a regional basis by a county, a joint powers agreement, or other organizational structure. A single organizational model would probably not fit the various multijurisdictional

dictional arrangements that are in use around the country.

Therefore, the purpose of this project was to provide information to local government officials so that they can systematically develop the emergency management organizational structure which is optimal for their particular requirements and environment.

Communities are apathetic concerning emergency preparedness

The results of this study indicate that, in general, most local governments in the United States are apathetic concerning emergency preparedness. By "apathetic," it is meant that these communities give minimal attention to emergency preparedness until a disaster situation occurs; that is, only token attention (or none) is given to emergency management organization, planning, training, mitigation, response, and recovery.

This apathy was found to be exhibited by municipal management personnel at all levels. As a result of personal interviews it was concluded that apathy is also exhibited by elected officials, and community leaders, as well as the public at large.

Indicators of such apathy include:

- Lack of an emergency preparedness organizational structure of any type
- An existing, but dormant, emergency management program
- A minimal emergency management program budget
- Emergency management plans which have not been reviewed or updated for a significant period of time
- Absence of training and disaster exercises
- Relative position of emergency management personnel within the overall municipal government structure
- Frequency of contact between emergency management personnel and other municipal officials.

Local Government Officials Must be Motivated

Results of this study indicate that it is necessary to motivate local government officials to organize, implement, and operate an effective emergency management program: The problems of everyday government or other factors apparently force concerns over emergency management to the bottom of the priority list -- at least until an emergency occurs. Local government personnel interviewed during this project indicated this need for motivation, and also unanimously agreed that the only really effective motivation was to experience a disaster. Thus, until a municipal official has been through a disaster, he or she cannot

fully appreciate the need for an effective and comprehensive emergency management program.

A number of these officials felt that a "second best" form of motivation might be visits by city officials to communities which had recently experienced disasters. Under this concept, it is postulated that officials who observe the debris and other physical evidence of a disaster, and talk with their peers immediately after a disaster has occurred, will achieve some level of motivation for emergency management.

In addition to general motivation for emergency management programs, specific motivation is needed to get local government officials to review their current emergency management programs, or develop new programs, and to actively maintain these programs day in and day out, year after year.

Political and Financial Risk

Local governments as well as key officials face political and financial risks associated with inadequate (actual or perceived) emergency management programs. Such risks may result from:

- General public dissatisfaction with a community's responses to a specific disaster

- failure to take steps to mitigate the consequences of known potential hazards

Examples of the consequences of these risks were identified within the course of this study. Specifically:

- a community emergency preparedness director was fired because officials felt that the community's response in a flood situation was not adequate for the incident, and the community should have been better prepared
- one community was reported to have lost Federal Disaster Funds because it had not taken actions to minimize the consequences of flooding, which frequently occurred
- political analysts stated that, in their opinion, a number of local government elected officials were not re-elected primarily because of the public's dissatisfaction with the community's response to specific disasters.

In addition to these risks, recent court decisions indicate that local governments and/or associated officials may be financially liable for certain consequences of a disaster if the community was not prepared, or did not properly response to known hazards.

Design of Handbook Series

The conclusions discussed in the previous paragraphs, as well as other results and conclusions of this project, strongly suggests that emergency management planning materials (for example, pamphlets, documents, guides, films, slides, etc.) must be carefully designed and produced especially for city management personnel. That is, the information must be "packaged" especially for this category of user. The packaging of this information pertains to requirements concerning the magnitude, as well as the form and format, of the material. It was felt that for the results of this project -- components of the handbook series -- to be utilized; an excessive amount of time on the part of management officials must not be required. Based upon ICMA's experience in similar projects, it was concluded that the introductory document to the series (Volume I) should take no more than five minutes of an official's time for reading and using the pamphlet (in this case, "using" is completing the brief checklist). The "Manager's Checklist" (Volume II) was based upon a requirement that it call for no more than 30 minutes of a manager's time, to both read and complete.

It was also concluded that the amount of time that would be available from a management official would vary significantly

with the size of the community. For example, officials of smaller communities would be more likely to personally utilize the materials while officials of larger communities would spend less time using the documents and would transfer the materials to his/her staff at an earlier stage.

Volume III of the Handbook Series, or the "Practitioner's Workbook," is the volume of the series which was not designed for use by the chief administrative officer. While there may be some situations (especially in smaller cities) where the CAO might utilize Volume III, it is felt that in general this volume will be used by staff personnel, such as city management assistants or emergency management planning staff.

Task Conclusions

Task A

"Analysis of the civil defense and fire legislative and programmatic commonalities as might be found in prior peripheral studies in historical pattern of the civil defense organization level."

In summary, this task consisted of an analysis of the relationships between the civil defense and fire protection functions at the local level. The relationships which were considered included, legal (e.g., legislative), functional, and programmatic.

It is not surprising to note that results of this study indicate that the fire protection and civil defense functions are significantly and fundamentally interrelated. In fact, it was concluded that the fire department is fundamental to the local community emergency management program and, in many cases, is the primary agency for many types of disasters. Foreign attack and other types of disasters may lead to the widespread occurrence of fire which would obviously require the services of the fire department. However, there are other disaster-related responsibilities of fire departments, including emergency medical services, rescue, basement pumping, etc.

In some cases, the relationship between fire and civil defense extends to a consolidation of the two departments; that is, the fire department is also responsible for civil defense for the entire community in all types of disasters. A variation of this approach is the situation where the fire department is responsible for certain disasters and other municipal agencies are responsible for other types of disasters.

From a legislative standpoint, there are numerous interrelationships between fire and civil defense. For example, the legislation creating the United States Fire Administration (PL 93-498) specifically references civil defense as a fire service respon-

sibility. In addition, there has historically been a strong interest in fire protection on the part of the Federal Emergency Management Agency and its predecessor civil defense organizations (most recently, the Defense Civil Preparedness Agency). This interest in fire protection on the part of civil defense organizations is exhibited by the number of studies and projects concerning fire protection which have been conducted. The civil defense agencies have devoted a significant portion of their budgets to the role of fire protection in civil defense situations, and national civil defense personnel have been extensively involved in promoting fire protection research on a national level.

This strong relationship between fire protection and civil defense on the local level has been confirmed in a number of other studies; for example, "A Study of Working Relationships Between Fire Departments and Other Municipal Services, " October 1980, Ryland Research, Inc., Santa Barbara, California, and "Disaster Planning Guidelines for Fire Chiefs," prepared by the International Association of Fire Chiefs, July 1980.

The specific results of this task are documented in the Task A report submitted to FEMA in 1979.

Task B

"Evaluation of alternative structures to cover the fire and civil defense functions at the local level to enhance effectiveness of their operational commonality or to enhance the strengths of each including appropriate analyses of the weaknesses suffered by the function whose strength has not been exploited in each such arrangement."

As stated previously in this section, there are numerous alternative structures for local government emergency preparedness. And, all of these structures include fire protection as a component of the emergency preparedness organization. A number of the organizational alternatives involve the fire department as a lead organization in emergency management. The fire department may be responsible for all emergency preparedness operations of the city, or it may be responsible for such functions only for particular types of disasters, such as a conflagration. There are several potential benefits to such an arrangement wherein the strengths of the fire department also benefit civil defense. Examples of such strengths are:

- the fire department frequently has a much higher level of visibility and respect within the community

compared to emergency preparedness; and, the department commands a higher priority for funds within the city government. It is not uncommon for the fire department to have a high percentage of the municipal budget. Also, the general public is much more aware of the fire department on a general basis, especially for those fire departments that provide emergency medical services. This awareness and respect could benefit the emergency preparedness program. Personnel of the fire department are generally familiar with emergency operations and planning for emergency operations, and are, therefore, well qualified for planning and managing an overall emergency preparedness program. This structure could be advantageous considering further the fact that fire departments frequently provide the majority of the services called for in the emergency preparedness plans for many types of incidents.

It was concluded that the benefits of a joint fire department/civil defense relationship would probably be more beneficial to the civil defense function than to the fire function; that is, the strengths are heavily weighted on the side of the fire department, and the civil defense agency would probably benefit more from a close working relationship than would the fire department.

However, there are also benefits to be achieved from the standpoint of fire protection. These benefits include a wider perception and wider range of interests resulting from the fire department's heavy involvement in all aspects of disaster preparedness, rather than just the fire protection and EMS portions of the program. Also, a fire department could benefit from access to additional funding sources and supplies and materials that are available through the FEMA. For example, matching funds could be available to compensate personnel within the fire department who are involved in emergency preparedness activities. Specific results of this task are documented in the Task B Report which has been submitted to FEMA.

Task C

"Synthesis of an optimal structure and placement of these functions within local entities, including rationale for the selected structure and an implementation strategy to field test such selection."

The synthesis of an optimal organizational structure means one which is optimal within a particular environment, and not a single structure for adoption by all local governments. The accomplishment of this task first required that an optimal structure be defined. Therefore, for purposes of this project, the research team defined the optimal structure to be one which provided the basis for an effective emergency management program. An "effective" program was defined to be one which:

"when applied during a disaster, will provide the levels of protection for life and property, and recovery assistance, which are acceptable to the citizens of the community."

Based on this definition, a fundamental set of organizational characteristics was identified utilizing the research conducted in Task B. These fundamental organizational characteristics are listed in the following table:

1. Roles of Elected Officials and Defined
2. Structure has Strong and Definitive lines of Command
3. Organizational Structures for Routine and Disaster Operations are Similar
4. Emergency Management Procedures are as Close to Routine Operational Procedures as Possible
5. Emergency Management Organizational Structure is Based on Good Interpersonal Relationships
6. Emergency Management Planning is an Ongoing Activity
7. Emergency Management Organizational Structure Addresses all Hazards
8. Disaster Prevention and Mitigation Included in Emergency Management Program
9. Motivation Provided for Involvement in the Emergency Management Program
10. Citizens Involved in the Emergency Management Program

AD-A095 279

INTERNATIONAL CITY MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION WASHINGTON DC F/G 5/1
LOCAL GOVERNMENT DISASTER PROTECTION.(U)
FEB 81 L STEVENSON, M HAYMAN

DCPA01-78-C-0312

NL

UNCLASSIFIED

OF 2
95-279



END
DATE
FILMED
3-81
DTIC

11. Strong Coordination Maintained Among Participating Agencies
12. Emergency Management Program Includes Public/Private Cooperation
13. Emergency Management Resources are also used in Routine Operations
14. Public Information Function is Clearly Defined
15. Ongoing Monitoring is Conducted for Potential Disasters
16. Internal Alerting Procedures are Maintained
17. Ability to Alert the Public is Maximized
18. Intergovernmental Coordination is Active
19. Records are Maintained During a Disaster
20. Eligibility for State and Federal Subsidies have been Considered

Within the course of this study, thirteen basic types of organizational structures were identified which are currently in use by one or more communities throughout the nation. These organizational structures were analyzed with respect to characteristics; and the possible advantages and disadvantages of each alternative structure were identified.

Task D

"Validation with other Public Interest Groups"

It was concluded that the handbook series developed within this project would not experience general use by local governments unless

it was validated. This conclusion was based upon the observation that local governments are frequently hesitant to use any process that is not proven in a similar governmental environment. Specifically, it was felt that the process and materials for organizational planning must be validated prior to release for the following reasons:

- 1) To insure that the process is effective
- 2) To insure that the procedures correctly implement the process
- 3) To insure that the procedures are easy to understand and execute
- 4) To insure that the guide and materials generate interest
- 5) To generate confidence that the central guides and materials are accurate, complete, and effective.

Project activities, results, and conclusions were coordinated with other public interest groups throughout the performance period.

Detailed results of this task are presented in the Task C report.

Task E

"Develop an easy to use systematic, valid process for use by local governments in evaluating their emergency management organization, including the development of a self-assessment manual for local government emergency management."

A planning process was established to systematically lead each

municipal government through the process of identifying the emergency preparedness risks that it faces, to consider the characteristics of effective emergency management programs, to examine the alternative structures which are available to the community, and finally to select the structure which best meets its needs.

The planning process is relatively straightforward and was unanimously endorsed by all review parties without modification. However, the development of planning materials which represented this planning process was a more difficult task. This difficulty was concerned with those aspects discussed previously in this report. Initial attempts to document the planning process for use by city management personnel were of course, based upon these general conclusions. However, even with this concern, the review and validation of the planning handbook materials indicated that they were still too large in magnitude for general use by municipal officials. Based upon these conclusions, the guide was divided into a handbook series.

Task F

"Develop self-assessment questions."

"For each attribute, the contractor will develop a series of questions which a local government emergency preparedness manager can use to evaluate his/her organization. The questions shall be as specific as possible, so that the manager will be able to use these

questions to judge for himself/herself the relative strength or weakness of that particular attribute in the organization, i.e., questions should be formulated in such a way that a manager will be able to focus in on various organizational community factors and develop a conclusion about the particular characteristic being evaluated. Upon completing the entire self-assessment process, the manager will have benefited in two ways:

- a) his/her knowledge of the effectiveness of the emergency preparedness organization as a whole will be greatly enhanced, and
- b) his/her insight into specific areas of organizational strengths and weaknesses will be significantly increased."

Self-assessment questions were developed for each of the organizational characteristics identified in Task C. It was determined that the presentation of the self-assessment questions would best be achieved as a "Manager's Checklist" serving as the second volume within the handbook series. Thus, the first volume is a pamphlet requiring no more than 5 minutes for use, and the self-assessment questions in Volume 2 are designed to require no more than 30 minutes of a manager's time. The Manager's Checklist was specifically prepared to be a follow-on activity to the use of the Introductory (Volume I) pamphlet, that is, upon completion of use of the pamphlet, the manager would be encouraged to obtain and use Volume 2 and to

complete the self-assessment questions. It should be emphasized that the Manager's Checklist was prepared exclusively for use by the manager, and not for staff use. Also, the answers to the questions were considered to be confidential, and it is not necessary that they be shared with anyone.

The specific objective of the self-assessment questions was to permit a manager to review a current emergency preparedness organization with respect to the possibility of conducting an indepth reveiw and possibly revising the organizational structure as appropriate to that particular community.

It is of interest to note that one possible application of the self-assessment questions is to assist a newly-appointed city manager in reviewing the emergency preparedness organization of the community which he/she is entering.

Task G

"Reality Testing"

"This task shall insure that the final product is relevant to the concerns and problems of local emergency preparedness management officials. The accomplishment of this task is crucial to the success of the work of Phase 3-A of this project."

"The contractor shall carry out this task by reviewing in person with officials from several local governments the draft questions produced in Task F."

Since the Manager's Checklist was prepared especially for city management personnel, the reality testing was conducted by reviewing the questionnaire with city managers throughout the United States.

A general unanimous conclusion of this reality testing effort was that the Manager's Checklist is definitely needed by municipal managers, and that an equivalent document does not currently exist. Furthermore, it was concluded that the size of the document (requiring no more than 30 minutes of time) is satisfactory. Also, the city management personnel who utilized the document felt that all of the questions were relevant and appropriate. In some cases, the answers to the questions might be sensitive or embarrassing, but these answers must be known and there was no indication that sensitive material should be excluded. The reality testing produced several minor suggestings for improving the wording of material within the questionnaire; however, no fundamental changes were indicated.

Recommendations

The fundamental recommendation of this project is that the Local Government Emergency Management Handbook Series should be duplicated and disseminated as soon as possible. All results of this project verify the urgent need for the handbook series. The handbook fills a need which is not being addressed by any other materials. Furthermore, validation officials felt that the handbook would be of significant benefit in motivating local government

personnel to become more concerned about emergency management in general, as well as to review current emergency management plans and develop new organizational structures as needed.


A supporting recommendation is that the additional work required to bring the handbook series to the point where it is ready for distribution should be initiated as soon as possible. The original concept and plan for this project were to develop a set of support materials and a delivery system for the handbook series. The support materials might include training aids, terms, visual aids, etc; i.e., items which are needed to publicize and effectively utilize the handbook materials.

It is extremely important that the handbook materials and initially Volume 1, be disseminated as soon and as widely as possible.

The overall project plan included tasks to develop a delivery system which would insure the greatest possible utilization of these materials. Development of the support materials and design of the delivery system were not within the scope of the tasks completed to date but, are included in Phase 3B. It recommended that Phase 3B be initiated as soon as possible, or that the tasks be accomplished through some other channel.

**Local Government
Emergency Management
Handbook Series
No. 2**

**HOW PREPARED IS YOUR COMMUNITY
FOR ITS NEXT EMERGENCY:
A MANAGER'S CHECKLIST**



**International
City
Management
Association**



**federal emergency
management agency**

You, as the Chief Administrative Officer of your community, have the responsibility to provide for the protection of the lives and the property of your community's residents. Are you prepared to meet this responsibility?

Although the potential for some type of disaster exists in most communities, under normal conditions few citizens place a high priority on emergency management. These same citizens, however, do expect their local government leaders to effectively manage a disaster should one occur in their community. In fact, citizens expect their local government to:

- Provide information on alerting signals, action to take, etc., in advance of the disaster.
- Quickly and accurately assess the magnitude of an emergency and keep the public informed throughout the incident.
- Provide for the rapid restoration of services, even when specific services are not the direct responsibility of the local government, e.g., private utilities.
- Provide for (or access to) recovery services, such as family reunification, insurance claim preparation, tax counseling, etc.
- Provide information on, and specific action steps toward mitigating the impact of future emergencies.

To fulfill your responsibility to the citizens of your community, you must ensure that your local government is prepared to respond to disasters.

Effective local emergency management involves the mitigation of, preparedness for, response to, and recovery from all types of disasters: natural

disasters (e.g., floods, hurricanes, and earthquakes); man-made disasters (e.g., hazardous materials spills, power outages, and contaminated water supply problems); radiological incidents (e.g., leaks from nuclear power plants); as well as conventional/nuclear attack.

Is your community prepared to respond to a disaster? Find out by completing the following checklist.

This checklist has been prepared especially for use by the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) of a City, County, or other unit of local government. Answering the questions which follow will enable a Chief Administrative Officer to quickly determine:

1. the capabilities of his/her local emergency management organization; and
2. the areas which have potential for improvement.

The checklist can also be used as a vehicle for a newly appointed Chief Administrative Officer to become familiar with (and review) the emergency management program in his/her new community.

The questions in this checklist are based upon a set of twenty organizational characteristics which have been found to contribute to an effective emergency management organizational structure.

Each characteristic is identified and described, followed by a series of corresponding questions. These questions address the concerns (and level of detail) appropriate for a Chief Administrative Officer.

All questions are phrased so that they can be answered "yes," "no," or "do not know." Thus, the checklist is simple to complete; and your answers can be easily reviewed to determine what follow-up action, if any, is needed.

SELF-ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

ROLES OF ELECTED OFFICIALS DEFINED

The roles of elected local government officials should be specifically defined in the emergency management organizational structure. These officials will of course, have key roles in representing their respective constituencies during the emergency situation; however, they are frequently assigned additional functions within a disaster operation. Such additional emergency assignments should be clearly represented within the organizational structure.

Self Assessment Questions

- a) Have the official and unofficial roles and responsibilities been designated for the community's elected officials (mayor, council members, supervisors, commissioners, sheriff, etc.)?

(Examples of official responsibilities include: Director of Emergency Management, declaration of disaster, request county/ state/federal assistance, etc. Examples of unofficial responsibilities include: policy development, liaison with news media, liaison with constituency, etc.)

Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐

- b) Have specific facilities (e.g. room, desk, etc.) been designated for use by elected officials during a disaster situation?

Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐

STRONG AND DEFINITIVE LINES OF COMMAND

The organizational structure should clearly delineate lines of authority and responsibility for all phases of a disaster operation, specifically:

1. Planning and preparation
2. Monitoring and alerting
3. Operations
4. Recovery

Specific lines of command in emergency management are especially important considering the fact that a number of governmental agencies may be involved in the disaster situation. Furthermore, all individual personnel should know of the established lines of command.

Self Assessment Questions

- a) Do you know the official emergency management responsibilities of the Chief Administrative Officer (i.e., as specified in the city charter, ordinance, etc.)?

Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐

- b) Do you know the unofficial responsibilities of the Chief Administrative Officer?

Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐

- c) Do you know the general responsibilities and authorities of the Incident Commander (e.g., alert the public, rescue, remove debris, control crowds, provide human services, etc.)?

Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐

SIMILAR ROUTINE/DISASTER ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES

The organizational structure which is implemented for disaster situations should be similar to the structure which is used for day-to-day emergencies; that is, as much as possible, the disaster organizational structure should be an extension and expansion of the routine emergency structure, -- adding special functions (e.g., damage assessment) and lines of coordination (e.g., with volunteer organizations) as needed. To the extent possible, personnel should continue to work with the supervisor and associates that he/she works with on a day-to-day basis.

Self Assessment Questions

- a) Do you know who is legally responsible for emergency management?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐
- b) Do you know who is responsible for emergency management planning?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐
- c) Do you know who is responsible for directing municipal resources during a disaster?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐
- d) Is the emergency management organizational structure fundamentally the same as the routine municipal structure?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐
- e) Are personnel assignments and working relationships consistent with day-to-day activities/work, functions/responsibilities?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES ARE AS CLOSE TO ROUTINE OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES AS POSSIBLE.

The organizational structure should provide for the integration of emergency management functions into the day-to-day operations of the community; that is, emergency planning should be a part of routine activities and not something that is "taken off the shelf" when a disaster occurs. Furthermore, personnel in the organization should be generally acquainted with others with whom they will be working during a disaster.

Self Assessment Question

- a) Are emergency management functions and procedures similar to those used in day-to-day operations?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐

GOOD INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

The organizational structure should recognize the fact that the effectiveness of emergency management operations is dependent upon personalities and interpersonal interdepartmental relationships -- and, that these relationships may change as specific individuals are assigned into, and out of, the organization.

Self Assessment Question

- a) Do rivalries or jealousies exist between or among key individuals and departments within the emergency management organization?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PLANNING IS AN ONGOING ACTIVITY

The emergency management planning function should be established within the overall local government organization in such a way as to provide the status and authority necessary to obtain the attention, cooperation and respect of other agency personnel. To the maximum extent possible, the planning function should be integrated into the daily operations of a local government; that is, organizational relationships should be established which require frequent contact between planning personnel and other local government personnel.

Self Assessment Questions

a) Do you know who is responsible for emergency planning?

Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐
 And his/her immediate supervisor?
 Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐

b) Do you know his/her authorities and responsibilities?

Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐

c) Does he/she regularly attend city department head or senior staff meetings?

Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐

d) Does he/she frequently and intensively work with other departments and community groups in performing the planning functions?

Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐

e) Has your Community adopted emergency management goals and objectives?

Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐

ALL HAZARD APPROACH

[natural, man-made, radiological accident/incident, foreign attack]

A local government emergency management organizational structure (and detailed plans) should be designed to deal with the types of disasters which are most likely to occur (such as natural disasters and industrial accidents; not just foreign attack), so as to have an emergency management capability which both meets anticipated needs and attracts strong participation and support from municipal employees and the general public.

Self Assessment Question

a) Does your Community's emergency management plan reflect the potential hazards faced by the community -- natural (e.g. hurricane), manmade (e.g. severe power outage), and war-related (e.g. nuclear bomb)?

Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐

DISASTER PREVENTION AND MITIGATION

Advance actions can be taken to either prevent the occurrence of an emergency situation, or to mitigate the consequences of a disaster should one occur. For example, strictly enforced controls on the transport of hazardous materials may prevent a disaster from occurring; an incentive program to discourage construction in a flood plain may not prevent a flood, but could minimize the consequences of the event.

Disaster prevention activities can also be conducted after a disaster has occurred, i.e. prior to reconstruction. For example, houses might be reconstructed in a different area or incorporate storm-resistant features.

Self Assessment Questions

a) Do you know that recent court decisions indicate that municipalities and officials may be liable for damages if prevention/mitigation steps are not taken for known hazards.

Yes ☐ No ☐

b) Does your community have procedures to prevent a major emergency; or, minimize the consequences should one occur?

For example:

- no homes in flood plain
- special building codes
- restricted use of wood shingle roofs
- public education (to foster a degree of self reliance)
- reduce secondary damage

Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐

MOTIVATION PROVIDED FOR INVOLVEMENT IN THE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

The organization should include motivation for participation in the emergency management program. Such motivation can apply to both individuals and organizations, and can consist of recognition, status, acknowledgement of capability, etc.

Self Assessment Question

a) Do motivations (or incentives) currently exist to encourage active participation in all aspects of emergency management (planning, training, response, recovery)?

For example:

- tax deductions/credits
- additional compensation
- recognition
- feelings of usefulness, personal satisfaction
- status
- acknowledged capability
- private use of municipal equipment during off hours
- paid overtime
- job requirement

Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐

CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT

Residents of the community should be included in the emergency management program. In fact, they have a number of responsibilities, including:

1. recognizing alerting signals
2. knowing what to do when an alert occurs
3. knowing how to personally cope with minor injuries and damage
4. being generally prepared for possible disasters.

In addition, citizens may serve as volunteers in the emergency management effort -- either directly with the city, or indirectly through community volunteer organizations.

Self Assessment Questions

- a) Does your emergency management program include public education components?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐
- b) Are you confident that a significant portion of the population has the knowledge required for a disaster situation?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐

STRONG COORDINATION AMONG PARTICIPATING AGENCIES

Emergency management is a community responsibility, not just a local government responsibility. It is necessary for the organizational structure to clearly identify those individuals (or organizations) which have the responsibility to coordinate (rather than command) resources which are outside of the direct control of the unit of local government, e.g., other public and private organizations such as the American Red Cross.

Self Assessment Questions

- a) Is someone responsible for ensuring that participating organizations are involved in all phases of emergency management?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐
- b) Were representatives of these organizations involved in developing the emergency plan?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐
- c) Do the coordinators and representatives of these organizations meet on a regular basis to review emergency management procedures, update phone numbers, etc.?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐

PUBLIC/PRIVATE COOPERATION

The emergency management organizational structure should include the entire community, not just local government employees. Emergency management is a community responsibility and the corresponding organization and planning must include public and private organizations, adjacent cities, the county, the Salvation Army, associations for the handicapped, associations of insurance agents, etc. In addition, the organization should incorporate organizational resources and networks that already exist within the community; that is, organizations which are currently providing a given service (e.g., assisting the blind) should be used to provide that service (e.g., alerting the blind) in a disaster situation whenever appropriate. Use of these in-place networks provides three major benefits:

1. A unit of local government does not have to directly provide that service.
2. Cooperation from the public is maximized by utilizing familiar networks.
3. The more community organizations which are made a part of the emergency management organization, the greater will be the depth and breadth of support for the emergency management program in general.

Self Assessment Questions

- a) Are private and voluntary organizations and individuals involved in the emergency management planning effort?
- Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐

- b) Do they have specific roles (advisory, technical assistance, approval, decision making, etc.)?
- Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐
- c) Do they have any influence in the decision making process?
- Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐
- d) Is their involvement welcomed, encouraged and returned?
- Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐
- e) Do private and voluntary organizations have assigned responsibilities in incident operations and recovery?
- Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐

USE OF RESOURCES

The organizational structure should promote the use of emergency management resources for routine governmental functions. For example, emergency management training resources could be used for general governmental employee training in cardio-pulmonary resuscitation (CPR).

Self Assessment Question

- a) Are your emergency management resources being used to the fullest extent for other functions (when not needed for disasters)?

Examples:

- day-to-day communication/dispatching
 - general training
 - general public information service
 - emergency management staff office space
- Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐

PUBLIC INFORMATION FUNCTION CLEARLY DEFINED

The organizational structure should include a designated disaster public information function, to provide disaster-related information to the general public and coordination with the news media. The disaster public information function should be the focal point for the release of all information concerning the disaster and should coordinate the activities of all other (i.e., nondisaster) public information functions. Ideally, the routine overall government public information function (if it exists) should be the same as the disaster public information function.

Self Assessment Questions

- a) Do the news media have an official role in each aspect of emergency management (Planning, Training, Response, Recovery)?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐
- b) Is someone responsible for coordinating with the media during each aspect of emergency management?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐
- c) Are elected officials involved in the public information program?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐
- d) Have facilities been designated for use by the news media during a disaster?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐

ON-GOING MONITORING FOR POTENTIAL DISASTERS

The organizational structure should provide for an emergency management monitoring function staffed on a 24-hour per day basis. The purpose of this function is to monitor the development of potential disaster situations so that governmental employees, and the general public, can be placed on various stages of alert as appropriate. In addition, this function assists the community in rapidly establishing an accurate and complete understanding of the nature and magnitude of a particular situation.

Self Assessment Questions

- a) Are weather and other indicators of potential emergencies continually monitored?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐
- b) If a disaster occurred in your community would it be immediately detected no matter when and where it occurred?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐

INTERNAL ALERTING PROCEDURES

The emergency management organization should provide for the alerting of key officials and personnel in times of disaster, including during non-duty hours, and when the public telephone system is not operational.

Self Assessment Questions

- a) Would your key emergency personnel (in municipal and community organizations) be rapidly notified of a disaster, or potential disaster, situation?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐
- b) Is the notification network dependent upon the public telephone system?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐
- c) Do you have procedures to follow if a key individual is out of town?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐

ABILITY TO ALERT THE PUBLIC MAXIMIZED

A public alerting function should be included within a local government emergency management organizational structure. This alerting function should be operational for all types of natural and manmade disasters faced by a community, not just for foreign attack. Furthermore, provisions should exist to alert all segments of the community, e.g., the handicapped and non-English speaking residents.

Self Assessment Questions

- a) Is someone responsible for alerting the general public concerning an actual or potential emergency situation?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐
- b) Has the role of the news media in alerting the public been coordinated with media representatives?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐
- c) Has the general public been educated as to the meaning of alerting signals, and corresponding actions to take?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐
- d) Do you have special provisions for alerting particular population groups such as the handicapped, institutionalized, non-English speaking, etc.
Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐

ACTIVE INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION

The emergency management organizational structure should be designed to effectively interface with neighboring communities and state and federal emergency management organizations.

Self Assessment Questions

- a) Do formal and/or informal cooperative agreements (such as mutual aid) exist between community and other units of government (municipal, county, state, Federal) for assistance?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐
- b) Does your community routinely alert neighboring communities concerning potential or actual disasters?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐
- c) Do you know who has the authority to request assistance for your community from other levels or units of government?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐
- d) Do you know how your community can formally declare a "disaster" and request a corresponding declaration from the state and Federal governments?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐
- e) Do you know who has the legal authority to make this declaration for your community?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐

ABILITY TO MAINTAIN COMPREHENSIVE RECORDS DURING A DISASTER

The organizational structure should provide for the collecting and recording of disaster-related information, including financial data on governmental expenditures. Information should be maintained in accordance with state and federal requirements for reimbursement in case an official "disaster" is declared.

Self Assessment Questions

- a) Have procedures been developed and implemented to capture and record disaster-related information?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐
- b) Have person(s) or position(s) been assigned the responsibility for obtaining and recording necessary information.
Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐

ELIGIBILITY FOR STATE AND FEDERAL SUBSIDIES CONSIDERED

A community which is seeking state or federal subsidies for emergency management operations should consider corresponding applicable requirements related to its organizational structure.

Self Assessment Questions

- a) Are you generally familiar with requirements and procedures for receiving state and Federal reimbursement and other disaster related aid?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐
- b) Do you know who has the authority (and responsibility) to apply for this assistance?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐
- c) Do you have procedures to ensure that the required information is captured and maintained, to support the request for assistance?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Do Not Know ☐

UNDERSTANDING YOUR ANSWERS

Your Score At A Glance

"No" may mean that there is a deficiency within your current emergency management organization

"Do Not Know" may be a signal of a potential problem.

"Yes" may mean that your community is capable of providing effective emergency management services.

The characteristics and questions included in the checklist are based upon research conducted by the International City Management Association. Case studies of numerous local government emergency management programs lead to the identification of organizational characteristics which contribute to "effective" emergency management programs. Because each community has unique requirements, certain characteristics may not apply to your situation. Therefore a "no" answer does not always signal a deficiency.

Of course, effectiveness is in the eye of the beholder; therefore, a particular program was considered effective if there was a feeling shared by citizens and officials, that adequate emergency management services were being provided.

The checklist questions were phrased so that a "no" answer always indicates the absence of a particular characteristic. The absence of a characteristic is not always a deficiency; however, it might represent an area for improvement and should at least be reviewed.

A "do not know" answer may mean that:

1. the characteristic is not present;
2. the characteristic is present, but you are not aware of it; or
3. the presence/absence of the characteristic (and related information) are not within your area of concern.

Count the number of answers you checked in each category and list below:

Yes _____
No _____
Do Not Know _____

If you checked a significant number of "no" answers, it may mean that you (or your staff) need to conduct a more detailed review of your local emergency management organization. The results of this detailed review will indicate if changes in the emergency management organizational structure are needed.

A number of "do not know" answers indicates that you may wish to obtain additional information concerning your program.

When the information is obtained, the answers can then be changed to "yes" or "no," and a determination of the need for a detailed review can be made.

If you checked a significant number of "yes" answers you probably have an effective emergency management organization. However, if you want to ensure that this level of capability is maintained, and possibly even strengthened, you may still want to conduct a more detailed review.

If you decide that an overall detailed review is not necessary, you may wish to pursue the need for improvements associated with any individual "no" answers.

The third volume in this handbook series will assist you and/or your staff in performing an overall detailed review of your community's emergency management organizational structure, or, it can be used to simply review individual characteristics.

DESCRIPTION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT
EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT HANDBOOK SERIES

ICMA's Local Government Emergency Management Handbook Series provides you and your staff with the tools to evaluate your current organizational arrangement for emergency management and/or establish an effective emergency management organizational structure based on the unique requirements of your own community.

The Local Government Emergency Management Handbook Series is composed of the following publications:

- No. 1 You Are at Risk
- No. 2 How Prepared is Your Community for its Next Emergency: A Manager's Checklist
- No. 3 Organizing for Comprehensive Local Emergency Management: A Practitioner's Workbook

To obtain one or more volumes in The Local Government Emergency Management Handbook

Series contact:

Financial support for this project was provided under contract No. DCPA01-78-C-0312,
Federal Emergency Management Agency.

DISTRIBUTION LIST

Federal Emergency Management Agency
Mitigation and Research
ATTN: Administrative Officer
Washington, D.C. 20472

Assistant Secretary of the Army (R&D)
ATTN: Assistant for Research
Washington, D.C. 20301

Chief of Naval Research
Washington, D.C. 20360

Defense Technical Information Center
Cameron Station
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Oak Ridge National Laboratory
ATTN: Librarian
P. O. Box X
Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830

Mr. Phillip M. Smith
Associate Director
Natural Resources & Commercial Services
Office of Science and Technology Policy
Executive Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20500

Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory
ATTN: Document Library
Los Alamos, N.M. 87544

The RAND Corporation
ATTN: Document Library
1700 Main Street
Santa Monica, CA 90401

Dr. William W. Chenualt
Human Sciences Research, Inc.
Westgate Research Park
7710 Old Springhouse Road
McLean, VA 22101

Dr. Jiri Nehnevajsa
Professor of Sociology
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Conrad Chester
ERDA, Holifield Nat'l Laboratory
P. O. Box X
Oak Ridge, TN 37830

Mr. Walmer E. Strobe
Center for Planning and Research
5600 Columbia Pike
Bailey Cross Roads, VA

Mr. Don Johnston
Research Triangle Institute
P. O. Box 12194
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

Mr. Richard K. Laurino
Center for Planning and Research, Inc.
2483 East Bayshore Road
Palo Alto, CA 94303

The Dikewood Corporation
1613 University Blvd., N.E.
Albuquerque, NM 87102

Ohio State University
Disaster Research Center
128 Derby 154 North Oval Mall
Columbus, OH 43210

Dr. Gerald Klonglan
Dept. of Sociology & Anthropology
Iowa State University
Ames, IA 50010

General Leslie Bray
Suite 1200
8301 Greensboro Drive
McLean, VA 22102

Mr. Howard McClennon, President
Int'l Assn. of Fire Fighters
1750 New York Avenue, N.W., 3rd Fl.
Washington, D.C. 20006

General Manager
Int'l Assn. of Fire Chiefs
1329 - 18th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Mr. Bjorn Pedersen
Int'l Assn. of Chiefs of Police
11 Firstfield Road
Gaithersburg, MD 20760

Mr. Ferris Lucas
National Sheriff's Association
1250 Connecticut Ave., N.W. #320
Washington, D.C. 20036

Mr. Gerald W. Collins, Exec. V.P.
National Defense Transportation Assn.
1612 K Street, N.W., Suite 706
Washington, D.C. 20006

National Fire Protection Association
Attn: Library
470 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, MA 02210

National Bureau of Standards
Disaster Research Coordinator
Attn: Mr. C.G. Culver
Office of Federal Building Technology
Center for Building Technology
Washington, D.C. 20234

Command and Control Technical Center
The Pentagon - BE 685
Washington, D.C. 20301

Mr. Louis V. Spencer
Radiation Theory Section
National Bureau of Standards
Building 245, Room C-313
Washington, D.C. 20418

National Academy of Sciences (HH-312)
Commission on Sociotechnical Systems
CUSEP
2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20418

Governor Leo A. Hoegh
Timpa Road
Chipita Park, CO 80811

The Council of State Governments
Attn: Mr. Hubert A. Gallagher
Disaster Assistance Project
1225 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., #300
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dr. Joseph E. Minor
Texas Tech University
Department of Civil Engineering
P. O. Box 4089
Lubbock, TX 79409

Dr. John W. Billheimer
SYSTAN, Inc.
343 Second Street
P. O. Box U
Los Altos, CA 94022

Mr. Robert Harker
SYSTAN, Inc.
343 Second Street
P. O. Box U
Los Altos, CA 94022

Mr. Gerard Hoetmer
International City Management Assn.
1140 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Ms. Claire Rubin
Academy for Contemporary Problems
400 North Capitol Street
Washington, D.C. 20001

Mr. Cliff McLain
System Planning Corporation
1500 Wilson Boulevard
Suite 1500
Arlington, VA 22209

Local Government Disaster Protection
Unclassified
International City Management Association
February 1981
pp. 112
Grant No. DCPA 01-78-C-0312
Work Unit No. 4511-I

Presents the results of an examination of local
emergency management organizational arrangements and
the development of a process by which local
governments can organize for emergency management.

Local Government Disaster Protection
Unclassified
International City Management Association
February 1981
pp. 112
Grant No. DCPA 01-78-C-0312
Work Unit No. 4511-I

Presents the results of an examination of local
emergency management organizational arrangements and
the development of a process by which local
governments can organize for emergency management.

Local Government Disaster Protection
Unclassified
International City Management Association
February 1981
pp. 112
Grant No. DCPA 01-78-C-0312
Work Unit No. 4511-I

Presents the results of an examination of local
emergency management organizational arrangements and
the development of a process by which local
governments can organize for emergency management.

Local Government Disaster Protection
Unclassified
International City Management Association
February 1981
pp. 112
Grant No. DCPA 01-78-C-0312
Work Unit No. 4511-I

Presents the results of an examination of local
emergency management organizational arrangements and
the development of a process by which local
governments can organize for emergency management.

