

Evacuation and Sheltering Gap Analysis

Citizen Evacuation



Mass Care (Sheltering, Feeding and related Services)

A gap analysis on citizen evacuation, shelter-in-place, and mass care plans and resources in Island, King, Kitsap, Mason, Pierce, Skagit, Snohomish, and Thurston counties, State of Washington EMD, Military (Ft. Lewis/McChord), University of Washington, City of Bellevue, City of Seattle, and the American Red Cross.

This page left intentionally blank

DRAFT

Contents

Executive Summary	4
Overview	6
Site Survey Tool	7
Site Visits	7
Gap Analysis Matrix	8
Citizen Evacuation and Shelter-in-place.....	9
1. Develop and maintain plans, procedures, programs, and systems.....	9
2. Develop and maintain training and exercise programs.....	11
Mass Care (Sheltering, Feeding and Related Services)	12
1. Develop and maintain plans, procedures, programs, and systems.....	12
2. Develop and maintain training and exercise programs.....	14
Appendix 1 Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Program Overview.....	15
Appendix 2 Evacuation and Sheltering Project Survey	17

DRAFT

Executive Summary

The Regional Catastrophic Planning Team's Evacuation and Sheltering Planning Group developed this Evacuation and Sheltering Gap Analysis as a benchmark for where the planning region's (Island, King, Kitsap, Mason, Pierce, Skagit, Snohomish, and Thurston counties) evacuation and sheltering plans were at during the time period of March –June 2009. This is a snapshot in time.

The gap analysis process began with site visits to all of the participating counties in the Combined Statistical Area (CSA) as well as to Ft. Lewis, McChord, University of Washington, and a group of Red Cross representatives from various chapters in the state. Utilizing a survey (see appendix 1) to begin the site visit, questions were asked regarding the planning progress for both evacuation and sheltering for the respective jurisdictions. Documentation was requested (or was researched via the internet) to further expand on the findings.

The planning leads used the Targets Capability Lists for Citizen Evacuation and Mass Care as its measuring stick, as a federal ideal for all programs. This gave a good picture of where the CSA was at based on the recommended model at the FEMA level. We used the "Traffic Light" completion status to identify how complete a measure was – red, yellow, green and N/A.

When looking at the gap analysis matrix, there are several things to point out: one, both the military (Ft. Lewis and McChord) and the University of Washington show many red circles, which would indicate that there may not be as much, if any, planning going on regarding evacuation and sheltering. However, though they may not have actual plans, they are ready with many resources that could be utilized in the event of evacuation and sheltering (i.e. residence halls with beds, kitchens, etc. from the UW, or barracks, tents, other supplies from the military). Second, there are many 'N/A' denotations under the Washington Emergency Management Division column. It must be noted that EMD does not play a role in planning or responding to evacuation and sheltering, relying (based on the concept of home rule in Washington) on each jurisdiction to plan and respond to incidences requiring evacuation and sheltering. EMD does, however, play a major role in the support of such an effort, and will be a major resource when a catastrophic event happens. Third, there are many 'N/A' denotations under Red Cross, particularly under the sections referring to evacuation. It has always been the understanding that the Red Cross plays a role in sheltering, but not in evacuation.

Findings

There were only four jurisdictions that had actual evacuation plans, and those were based on the UASI Evacuation Planning Template (see King County OEM website <http://www.kingcounty.gov/safety/prepare/EmergencyManagementProfessionals/PlansandPrograms/EvacuationTemplate.aspx>). Most all other jurisdictions had an Emergency Support Function (ESF) related to evacuation, although many were related to just the transportation

aspect of evacuation versus the person aspect. For sheltering, many jurisdictions had written documentation (ESF 6) that referred to their local chapter of the American Red Cross as the lead for sheltering.

Several findings of note:

- In 11 out of 13 jurisdictions, 'Evacuation and shelter-in-place plans address the dissemination of accurate, timely, and accessible information to public, media, and support agencies.'
- Also, in 11 out of 13 jurisdictions have 'a mass care plan for the general population in place.'
- In 12 out of 13 jurisdictions have three measures in place: 'Shelter agreements for each jurisdiction', 'Mass care plan addresses the safety and security of shelter facilities,' and Mass care plan includes programs for recruiting volunteers.'
- In 10 out of 12 jurisdictions 'local government has a companion animal care/handling plan coordinated with appropriate partners.
- Only one jurisdiction has a memorandum of understanding with another jurisdiction to serve as a host community for evacuees during an incident.
- Only two jurisdictions (out of 12) have a partial evacuation plan (others have none) in place to 'provide transportation and other evacuation assistance, addressing transient populations' and five have partial plans for institutionalized evacuations.
- Only one jurisdiction has provided partial plans for the pre-event exercises of the notification and activation of evacuation and shelter-in-place plans conducted with citizen participation.

Overview

As a lead on one of the eight projects for the overall Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) Seattle Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Plan (RCPP), Pierce County has broken down its project into two pieces – Volunteer and Donations Management, and **Evacuation and Sheltering**. The other seven projects can be found in *Appendix 1, the RCPT Grant Overview*. This two-year grant asks for three central objectives to be met:

1. Address shortcomings in existing plans,
2. Build regional planning processes and communities, and
3. Link operational and capabilities-based planning with resource allocation.

This document is the matrix and gap analysis for the **Evacuation and Sheltering** element of the Pierce County project. The purpose of this gap analysis is to piece together the puzzle of what is already happening in the footprint of the eight-county Combined Statistical Area (CSA) and what needs to be done for the CSA to coordinate **Evacuation and Sheltering** before, during and after large-scale incidents. The eight counties making up the CSA are Island, King, Kitsap, Mason, Pierce, Skagit, Snohomish, and Thurston counties. Also included were the cities of Seattle and Bellevue.

Information was gathered through an initial workgroup meeting, a resulting site survey (See *Appendix 2, Evacuation and Sheltering Project Survey*) and site visits with each of the counties in the CSA and other partnering agencies (i.e. Red Cross, State, Military, and University of Washington). There was also technical assistance training for the Evacuation and Sheltering core team in mid-June this year. (See table 1 below.)

Table 1

Site Visits	Location	Date
Initial Workgroup Meeting	Pierce County EOC	February 24, 2009
Mason County	Mason County EOC	March 25, 2009
Island County	Island County EOC	April 2, 2009
Skagit County	Skagit County EOC	April 3, 2009
Snohomish County	Snohomish County EOC	April 3, 2009
Thurston County	Thurston County EOC	April 7, 2009
Pierce County	Pierce County EOC	April 8, 2009
Kitsap County	Kitsap County EOC	April 13, 2009
King County	Auburn DEM	June 1, 2009
WA EMD	WA EMD	June 10, 2009
Military	Ft. Lewis	June 11, 2009
Technical Assistance Training	Pierce County EOC	June 16, 2009
City of Seattle	City of Seattle EOC	June 17, 2009
University of Washington	University of Washington	June 23, 2009

Site Visits	Location	Date
City of Bellevue	Bellevue City Hall	June 29, 2009
Red Cross	Seattle Red Cross	July 7, 2009

The site survey tool used in the site visits was a starting off point for gathering information. The site visit interviews were based on the outline on the site survey, follow up questions, and other information and documents gathered. All was incorporated in this gap analysis.

Site Survey Tool

The original **Evacuation and Sheltering** survey tool was based on some initial planning assumptions that were either commonly held beliefs, others' experiences with plans, or some that were discovered through research of best practices. As the site visits progressed, some of the assumptions began proving wrong.

1. There will be a mass evacuation of the entire eight-county region as a result of a large earthquake.
2. There will be many evacuation plans in place that we can piece together for the CSA.
3. There will be the need for mass evacuation shelters – mega-shelters – after an earthquake.

Some of the assumptions are not a total fallacy, but may have to be readjusted to better fit the outcomes of the site survey, site visits, and the gap analysis.

Site Visits

The site visits netted very interesting information and observations, enabling the interviewers to more fully grasp the plans, procedures and processes for each jurisdiction. Some of the documents utilized in the analysis of each of the site visits were the CEMPs, specifically ESFs pertaining to Mass Care (ESF 6), Evacuation (varies), and Transportation (ESF 1). In several instances, there were actual evacuation plans, and in most instances, Mass Care referred to the local chapters' American Red Cross plans.

In the following gap analysis, the matrix is based on the Target Capabilities as recommended by the National Response Framework. While following this process for our matrix, it did leave some information out, specifically quantifiable assets and resources that may be available during times of disaster. Several of the partners interviewed may not have many of the capabilities listed in the matrix, but do have a contribution to make to Evacuation and Sheltering. Examples of this include the University of Washington, which has thousands of beds and bed spaces for sheltering, and the various military entities which have resources such as tents, vehicles, etc.




Gap Analysis Matrix

The organization of the gap analysis matrix is based on components of the Department of Homeland Security Target Capabilities List (TCL) - searchable document can be found at <https://www.rkb.us/hspd8.cfm>) - for **Citizen Evacuation and Shelter-in-Place** and for **Mass Care (Sheltering, Feeding, and Related Services)**.

Of the four following tables, there are two each pertaining to Evacuation and to Mass Care. The first table assesses the preparedness measures to develop and maintain plans, procedures, programs, and systems for evacuation. The second table assesses the preparedness measures needed to develop and maintain training and exercise programs for evacuation. The third and fourth tables go through the same exercise for mass care.

Based on the site visits and gathered documents, each agency/organization was evaluated on each of the selected target capabilities. There are four designations - listed below in Table 2 - red, yellow, green and NA. This analysis is to give a better overview of the situational readiness in the CSA relating back to Evacuation and Sheltering.

Table 2

The "Traffic Light" Completion Status by Color Designation	
Color	Designation
	The plan element is <25% complete . No relevant documents were located for elements of plan or a responsibility is assigned but no further action is apparent. No plan in place.
	The material is 25%-75% complete . A responsibility is assigned and components of plan are being developed and utilized but not all are complete. Material has been created or collected, but not been assembled or completed into a plan.
	The material is >75% complete . The plan element is basically completed and departments are ready to or are actively training and exercising the capability.
NA	Question is Not Applicable

Citizen Evacuation and Shelter-in-place

1. Develop and maintain plans, procedures, programs, and systems

<u>Preparedness Measures:</u>	<u>Combined Statistical Area and Other Groups</u>														
	Island	King	Kitsap	Mason	Pierce	Skagit	Snohomish	Thurston	WA	Ft. Lewis, McChord	UW	City of Seattle	City of Bellevue	Red Cross	
1. Evacuation and shelter-in-place plans address the dissemination of accurate, timely, accessible information to public, media, and support agencies.	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	NA
2. Are there plans in place addressing authority and decision making for evacuation or sheltering –in-place?	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	NA
3. Were NGOs actively involved in evacuation plan development?	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	NA
4. Are there plans in place for evacuation of hospitals and long term care facilities?	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	NA
5. Plans are in place for the evacuation of special events venues.	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	NA
6. Processes for identifying populations that may need assistance with evacuations are in place.	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	NA
7. Processes for identifying, during an incident, populations that may need assistance with evacuation or shelter-in-place.	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	NA
8. Processes for identifying and addressing the different type of assistance needed (e.g. physical movement, transportation assistance, language translation, etc.) are in place	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	NA

Preparedness Measures:	Combined Statistical Area and Other Groups													
	Island	King	Kitsap	Mason	Pierce	Skagit	Snohomish	Thurston	WA	Ft. Lewis, McChord	UW	City of Seattle	City of Bellevue	Red Cross
9. Evacuation plans are in place to provide transportation and other evacuation assistance to all persons who need evacuation assistance, addressing non-institutionalized populations.	Yellow	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Red	Yellow	NA	Red	Red	Yellow	Green	NA
10. Evacuation plans are in place to provide transportation and other evacuation assistance to all persons who need evacuation assistance, addressing transient populations (e.g. the homeless, tourists, and visitors)	Yellow	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	NA	Red	Red	Red	Yellow	NA
11. Evacuation plans are in place to provide transportation and other evacuation assistance to all persons who need evacuation assistance, addressing institutionalized populations.	Yellow	Red	Red	Yellow	Red	Red	Red	Yellow	NA	Red	Red	Yellow	Yellow	NA
12. Plans to provide for leadership at evacuation staging points and/or temporary evacuation shelters for up to 72 hours are in place.	Green	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	NA	Red	Red	Yellow	Green	Green
13. Plans to coordinate with mass care agencies to provide required services at evacuation staging points and/or temporary evacuation shelters for up to 72 hours are in place.	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	NA	Green	Red	Yellow	Green	Yellow
14. Arrangements with agencies to be involved in evacuation/sheltering, staffing of shelters, logistical supply, security and support of shelters.	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Yellow	Green	NA	Green	Red	Yellow	Green	Yellow

Preparedness Measures:	Combined Statistical Area and Other Groups													
	Island	King	Kitsap	Mason	Pierce	Skagit	Snohomish	Thurston	WA	Ft. Lewis, McChord	UW	City of Seattle	City of Bellevue	Red Cross
15. Plans to coordinate with medical care agencies to provide medical support, supervision and symptom surveillance of evacuees during a prolonged evacuation are in place (e.g. monitoring and caring for people with pre-existing medical conditions or disabilities and those who may become ill during evacuation)	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	NA	●	●	●	●	NA
16. Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) with jurisdictions to serve as host communities for evacuees during an incident have been developed.	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	NA	●	●	●	●	NA
17. Plans to address re-entry of the general population are in place.	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	NA	●	●	●	●	●
18. Plans to address re-entry support for populations requiring assistance to return are in place.	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	NA	●	●	●	●	●

2. Develop and maintain training and exercise programs

Preparedness Measures:	Combined Statistical Area and Other Groups													
	Island	King	Kitsap	Mason	Pierce	Skagit	Snohomish	Thurston	WA	Ft. Lewis, McChord	UW	City of Seattle	City of Bellevue	Red Cross
1. Training and exercise program for mass care personnel is in place and covers sheltering, feeding, and bulk distribution	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	NA	●	●	●	●	●

Preparedness Measures:	Combined Statistical Area and Other Groups													
	Island	King	Kitsap	Mason	Pierce	Skagit	Snohomish	Thurston	WA	Ft. Lewis, McChord	UW	City of Seattle	City of Bellevue	Red Cross
2. Training and exercise program addresses common mass care issues (e.g. culture, language, accommodating people with disabilities in general population shelters, etc.)	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Yellow	NA	Green	Red	Yellow	Green	Green
3. Training and exercises for mass care operations occur on a regular basis	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Green	Yellow	Yellow	NA	Green	Red	Yellow	Green	Green
4. Shelter staff are familiar with ARC/HHS Initial Intake and Assessment Tool that is used for initial screening of clients.	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	NA	Green	Red	Yellow	Green	Green

Mass Care (Sheltering, Feeding and Related Services)

1. Develop and maintain plans, procedures, programs, and systems

Preparedness Measures:	Combined Statistical Area and Other Groups													
	Island	King	Kitsap	Mason	Pierce	Skagit	Snohomish	Thurston	WA	Ft. Lewis, McChord	UW	City of Seattle	City of Bellevue	Red Cross
1. A mass care plan for the general population is in place	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	NA	Green	Red	Green	Green	Green
2. Mass care plan is integrated with our plans for evacuation (e.g. evacuation routes to shelters are identified, exercise evacuation from various locations to local shelters)	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	NA	Yellow	Red	Green	Green	NA

Preparedness Measures:	Combined Statistical Area and Other Groups													
	Island	King	Kitsap	Mason	Pierce	Skagit	Snohomish	Thurston	WA	Ft. Lewis, McChord	UW	City of Seattle	City of Bellevue	Red Cross
3. Mass care plan addresses cultural characteristics and needs of populations to be sheltered (e.g. religious needs, language barriers)	Red	Yellow	Red	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Red	NA	Yellow	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
4. Mass care plan addresses the shelter requirements of special needs populations (e.g. disabled people, people requiring ongoing medical support)	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	NA	Yellow	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
5. Mass care plan addresses the feeding needs of affected populations (e.g. estimate projected need, identify distribution, preparation, feeding sites, establish mobile feeding routes)	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Yellow	Green	Red	Green	Green	Green
6. Plans for the transference of individuals with needs beyond the shelter's capacity to a Functional and Medical Support Shelter or other appropriate care facility with their caregivers/family are in place	Red	Yellow	Red	Red	Yellow	Red	Red	Red	NA	Red	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
7. Plan to utilize ARC/HHS Initial Intake and Assessment Tool to assess individuals arriving at shelters are in place	Green	Green	Green	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	NA	Green	Red	Yellow	Green	Green
8. A mass care plan for companion animals/pets (includes provision of shelter, food and animal welfare inquiry) is in place	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Green	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Red	Yellow	Green	Yellow
9. Shelter agreements for each jurisdiction are in place	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	NA	Green	Red	Green	Green	Green
10. Mass care plan addresses the safety and security of shelter facilities	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	NA	Green	Red	Green	Green	Green

<u>Preparedness Measures:</u>	<u>Combined Statistical Area and Other Groups</u>													
	Island	King	Kitsap	Mason	Pierce	Skagit	Snohomish	Thurston	WA	Ft. Lewis, McChord	UW	City of Seattle	City of Bellevue	Red Cross
11. The mass care plan includes MOUs with non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to provide personnel and equipment support following an incident	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Red	Green	Green	Yellow
12. Mass care plan includes programs for recruiting volunteers	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	NA	Green	Red	Green	Green	Green
13. Local government has a companion animal/pets care/handling plan coordinated with appropriate partners	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Red	Green	NA	NA	Red	Green	Green	Green

2. Develop and maintain training and exercise programs

<u>Preparedness Measures:</u>	<u>Combined Statistical Area and Other Groups</u>													
	Island	King	Kitsap	Mason	Pierce	Skagit	Snohomish	Thurston	WA	Ft. Lewis, McChord	UW	City of Seattle	City of Bellevue	Red Cross
1. Staff of agencies involved in evacuation/sheltering, staffing of shelters, logistical supply and support of shelters have been trained.	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	NA	Yellow	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
2. Pre-event exercises of the notification and activation of evacuation and shelter-in-place plans are conducted with citizen participation.	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Yellow	NA	Red	Red	Red	Red	Yellow
3. Local emergency response agencies/staff including public safety answering points are trained on local evacuation/shelter in place strategies.	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Red	Yellow	Red	Red	NA	Red	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Red

Appendix 1 Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Program Overview



Puget Sound Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Program (Puget Sound RCPP)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Federal Grant Overview

- The Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Grant Program (RCPPG) provides catastrophic events planning grants to the ten highest risk Urban Areas and surrounding regions:
 - Tier 1 Cities: Chicago, Los Angeles, Houston, New York, San Francisco, Washington, D.C.
 - Tier 2 Cities: Boston, Honolulu, Norfolk, Seattle
- The RCP Program, to date, has received notice of two funding phases:
 - Phase 1 Award: \$3,662,569; Term: September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2010.
 - Phase 2 Award: \$1,420,875; Term: October 2009 – September 2010 (pending negotiations)

Central Objectives:

There are three central objectives of the RCPP:

1. Address shortcomings in existing plans
2. Build regional planning processes and communities
3. Link operational and capabilities-based planning with resource allocation

The Puget Sound Catastrophic Preparedness Planning Region:

The Puget Sound Region is the eight-county region that includes Island, King, Kitsap, Mason, Pierce, Skagit, Snohomish and Thurston counties.

Puget Sound RCP Region	
State of Washington	
Counties Included	Principal Cities Included ¹
Island County	Oak Harbor
King County	Bellevue, Kent, Renton, Seattle
Kitsap County	Bremerton
Mason County	Shelton
Pierce County	Tacoma
Skagit County	Mount Vernon
Snohomish County	Everett
Thurston County	Olympia

¹ With the exception of the Cities in King County, the Principle Cities are represented on the Regional Catastrophic Planning Team (RCPT) by their home county representatives.



Puget Sound Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Program (Puget Sound RCPP)

Regional Catastrophic Planning Team (RCPT):

- Reports to the Seattle UASI Working Group/UASI Core Group
- Includes representatives from the Combined Statistical Area:
 - State, Local, and Tribal governments,
 - Metropolitan Medical Response System (MMRS)
 - Citizen Corp (CC)
 - Private Sector

The Puget Sound RCPT agreed to focus on two planning scenarios:

1. Catastrophic earthquake – likely a shallow-crust earthquake along the Seattle Fault
2. Biological weapons attack in the form of a mass-aerosolized anthrax attack in the Seattle core

Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Program Projects and Lead Agencies:

Planning Project	Project Description	Project Lead
Regional Coordination Plan	Inventory existing Puget Sound region emergency plans; identify gaps in mutual aid pacts, local plans, and policies; develop mechanisms to achieve regional readiness	Seattle OEM
Regional Transportation Recovery Plan	Create a multi-jurisdictional regional transportation system recovery plan; identify likely system disruptions; prioritize route restoration needs.	James Lee Witt Associates
Regional Resource Management and Logistics Plan	Develop a comprehensive region-wide Resource Management and Logistics Plan. Develop a strategy for resource sharing, staging and deployment that considers critical infrastructure limitations and vulnerabilities.	Thurston County OEM
Regional Evacuation & Sheltering Plan and Volunteer & Donations Management Plan	Catalog, coordinate, and plan regional evacuation and sheltering plans, emphasizing high risk populations. Develop a regional volunteer and donation management plan; identify teams to be developed and trained.	Pierce County OEM
Regional Structural Collapse Rescue Plan	Develop a comprehensive strategic plan to facilitate an effective and efficient response to structural collapse incidents.	Bellevue Fire
Regional Pre-Hospital Medical Care (Phase 1); Forward Movement of Patients (Phase 2)	Develop a comprehensive catastrophic Mass Casualty Incident (MCI) plan. Address field triage, treatment, and transportation needs from first alarm through the emergency medical and hospital system.	Seattle Fire
Regional Medical Evacuation and Patient Tracking Plan for Long-Term Care Facilities	Develop a disaster victim patient evacuation and tracking plan for long-term care facilities for the most populated region in the State, King and Pierce Counties to serve as a model for regional partners.	Public Health – Seattle/King; Tacoma/Pierce Health District
Regional Victim Information and Family Assistance Plan	Develop a plan to meet informational and human services needs during and following a mass casualty/fatality event, to include patient/victim status and missing persons information.	Public Health – Seattle & King County
Regional Public Preparedness Campaign	Develop messages and materials for public preparedness for catastrophic events; incorporate messages relevant to the projects being addressed by the RCPGP	Seattle OEM (Phase 2)

Key RCPP Staff:

Diane Bonne RCP Program Manager diane.bonne@seattle.gov (206) 733-9551
 Lise Northey RCP Planning Manager lise.northey@seattle.gov (206) 733-9552

Appendix 2 Evacuation and Sheltering Project Survey



Regional Catastrophic Planning Grant Program **Evacuation and Sheltering Project Survey**

Please take some time to look over this survey. Pierce County will be meeting with various counties and groups to discuss the information below further, but the more information gathered prior to the meeting, the more efficient our time will be spent. Please note that not all questions will be relevant to every group.

Administrative Information	
Name of County/Other (i.e. Fire District, etc.)	
Contact Name	
Agency	
Phone number	
E-mail	
Emergency Management Director/Coordinator	
E-mail	

Evacuation	
Do you have an evacuation plan for your area?	
Do you have an evacuation plan for any part of your area?	
Do your plans account for high risk populations?	
Do your hospitals have evacuation plans?	
Do your long term care facilities have evacuation plans?	
Who is responsible for evacuation planning in your area?	
Who is responsible per your CEMP for evacuation planning?	
Do you have any major transportation agencies/companies in your area?	
Do you have special needs transportation agencies/companies in your area?	
Is your plan linked with any other plan?	



Sheltering	
Do you have any type of sheltering plan for your area?	
Do you have an area-wide sheltering plan?	
Who is responsible for sheltering planning in your area?	
Who is responsible per your CEMP for sheltering planning in your area?	
Do you have medical needs sheltering capabilities (nursing home re-location, etc.)?	
Do you have an active Medical Reserve Corps in your area?	

General	
Do you have an active Citizen Corps Council in your area?	
What are the other active disaster volunteer groups in your area (Red Cross, Salvation Army, etc.)?	

Requested documents

- ESF 6 of your Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan - CEMP
- Any sheltering plans by any agency in your area
- Any evacuation plans by any agency in your area
- Any Memoranda of Understandings/Memoranda of Agreements - MOUs/MOAs - for sheltering or evacuation

For questions or more information, please contact:

Pierce County Planning Leads

Luke Meyers, Overall Lead, luke.meyers@co.pierce.wa.us

Sheri Badger, Evacuation/Sheltering Lead, Sbadger@co.pierce.wa.us

Diane Schurr, Volunteer/Donations Management Lead, dschurr@co.pierce.wa.us

