



CONTINUITY COUNCIL

Wednesday, April 11, 2018

Continuity Council Agenda

Wednesday, April 11, 2018

- What's new with the CGC?
- Understanding interconnectedness of disaster management components
- New Policy Letter development strategy
- Continuity Council Charter development strategy
- Special interest working groups
 - Institutes of higher education and other instructional/residential organizations
 - Legislative entities
- Training ideas for upcoming meetings
- Metrics for plan measurement
- Grant money to help with COOP program development

Notes from Previous Meeting

February 8, 2018

1. New FEMA Continuity Guidance Circular

2. New policy letter goals

- Drive understanding, and broaden acceptance of continuity as a part of operations
- Emphasize executive buy-in
- Describe the benefits, protections, and responsibilities of having a program
- Drive team-building across communities
- Develop additional planning tools and templates that:
 - Use plain language
 - Make planning easier, faster, and more concise
 - Accommodate adaptations for various organizational needs
 - Build and test robust exercise programs that go beyond basic compliance
 - Integrate COOP with other disaster management programs
 - Build a more robust exercise program

3. Texas Continuity Council and its charter

Bring Texas continuity professionals together more often to leverage knowledge and experience and develop partnerships

- Include all sectors of community
 - All levels of government
 - Private-sector business
 - Public, non-profit, and volunteer organizations
- Schedule periodic check-ins to:
 - Ensure we are on-track
 - Determine where entities need help and how to provide the best solutions
- Foster relaxed, open sharing without losing the urgency of the mission
- Develop work groups for entities that share mission, geographic location, size, or other factors that would create common problems and solutions

4. Evolution of the metrics SORM uses to evaluates plans

5. Training & exercise ideas

- Provide more opportunities for face-to-face training, discussion forums, problem solving, hot-topics, workshops, conferences, etc.
 - Continue to train basics for new coordinators and as refresher
 - Discuss how to set up in-house training for an organization's personnel
 - Provide forum for sharing of best practices, problem-solving strategies, and lessons learned
 - Discuss/analyze real events
- Foster robust exercise development
 - Develop better planning tools to allow coordinators to focus on entity specific components
 - Devote one council meeting each year to exercise development strategies
 - Describe what it takes for an exercise to be effective and successful
 - Encourage joint exercises between entities that share geographic location, mission, or common issues and concerns

6. Integration of disaster management plan components

Hurricane Harvey Survey Results Summary

Opened 10/20/2017 | Closed 11/3/2017

Entities	Information		
61	Responded to the survey		
16	Were not able to keep working as normal		
	75%	Reported that they suffered damage	
	69%	Indicated they had applied for insurance payouts, FEMA assistance, or both	
		Reparations are being sought for damages to buildings and property, cost of temporary housing, regular wages, overtime and temporary staffing	
13	Declared a continuity event and reduced work – focused on pre-identified essential functions		
1	Declared a continuity event and reduced work – focused on functions other than those they’d identified as essential in their COOP		
2	Relocated to a place other than the designated continuity facility		
3	Reported damage to, or loss of records		
	1	Had no backup copies	
2	Reported continuity personnel who had not been trained or prepared for their roles (1 mentioned not having backup with required qualifications)		
1	Prepared their building and equipment ahead of disaster onset, but because the storm was worse than predicted, their efforts were in vain		
1	Said no action was taken to prepare		
1	Forwarded their list of continuity team members to Emergency Management to forward emergency response personnel so they would know who was there if they needed to conduct rescue work		
>50%	Either waited to buy supplies or relied on landlords to protect properties		
Most	Maintain a good system for alert notification and ongoing communication updates		
	Felt that the time and money spent to prepare before the storm significantly reduced the time and money required to recover after		
	Felt that cancelling work and providing weather updates was adequate protection for staff		
Some	Posted messages on media broadcasts		
	Were under-prepared to provide food, water and supervision through the event due to unexpected occupancy (refugees, or resident students who couldn’t return to damaged homes through the weekend)		
	Scheduled work in other geographic areas to remove workers from harm’s way.		
	Mobilized and staged response teams		
	Maintained pre-positioned emergency prep kits (sheet plastic, duct tape, bubble wrap, etc.) to shield equipment		
More reported using recovery and cleanup supplies after the storm, than they did protective supplies before			
There was significant variation in the time required to verify the location and welfare of personnel (from “immediately” to “several days” to “unknown”)			
In support of others	Universities opened their doors to receive and distribute resources		
	State parks provided camping, allowing 5,000 evacuees to stay for free during the storm		
	Some entities manned and/or supplied the State Operations Center with		
		Aid crews, ice, water, vehicles	
		FEMA/EPA cleanup assistance	
		Assistance monitoring price gouging, conducting background checks at shelters, and supporting local law enforcement	