**STATE OF WASHINGTON**

## MILITARY DEPARTMENT
## EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT DIVISION
*MS: TA-20; Building 20*
*Camp Murray, Washington 98430-5122*
*Phone: (253) 512-7000 ▪ FAX: (253) 512-7200*
*Website: http://www.mil.wa.gov*

February 8, 2024

Debbie Sullivan, Mayor
City of Tumwater
555 Israel Road, SW
Tumwater, Washington 98501

Re:     City of Tumwater Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan

Dear Mayor Sullivan:

Thank you for submitting the City of Tumwater's Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan (CEMP) for our review as required under Title 38.52.070 RCW. Congratulations on completing this significant accomplishment.

The enclosed documents provide a compilation of recommendations for your next planning and review cycle to meet the requirements of RCW 38.52 and WAC 118.30. Addressing the lawful requirements category will ensure your CEMP's continued consistency with the State CEMP and incorporate industry best practices. The Washington Emergency Management Division (EMD) looks forward to receiving the next iteration of the City of Tumwater's CEMP in five years.

To better incorporate the use of core capabilities while also making the CEMP a more operational document, CEMP development in Washington has changed significantly. If you would like additional information or assistance, please contact EMD's Planning Section at emdcempreview@mil.wa.gov.

Sincerely,

Robert Ezelle
Director

Enclosures (2)
EMD CEMP Evaluation Checklist 2023 – City of Tumwater
CEMP Review and Recommendations 2023 – City of Tumwater

| COMPREHENSIVE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PLAN (CEMP) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Section Title | | Tier III - Required | Tier II - Suggestions | Tier I - Optional |
| Basic Plan | | | |
| Introductory Documentation | | 88% | 64% | 0% |
| Purpose, Situation, & Assumptions | | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Concept of Operations | | 100% | 30% | 48% |
| Direction, Control, & Coordination | | 100% | 32% | 47% |
| Organization | | 100% | 50% | 100% |
| Responsibilities | | 100% | 42% | 58% |
| Communications | | 100% | | 19% |
| Administration | | 100% | | 100% |
| Finance | | 100% | 67% | 100% |
| Logistics | | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Development & Maintenance | | 100% | 100% | 24% |
| Annexes | | | |
| Population Protection | | 100% | 79% | |
| ESF 4 | | | 89% | 82% |
| ESF 5 | | | 85% | 88% |
| ESF 6 | | | 73% | 86% |
| ESF 8 | | | 100% | 92% |
| ESF 9 | | | 38% | 61% |
| ESF 10 | | | 67% | 80% |
| ESF 13 | | | 60% | 60% |
| ESF 15 | | | 83% | 87% |
| Resource Management | | 100% | 81% | |
| ESF 7 | | | 100% | 90% |
| ESF 11 | | | 57% | 19% |
| Critical Infrastructure | | 100% | 79% | |
| ESF 1 | | | 60% | 68% |
| ESF 2 | | | 71% | 84% |
| ESF 3 | | | 100% | 89% |
| ESF 12 | | | 100% | 87% |
| TIER TOTALS* | | 99% | 54% | 64% |

*Each Tier Total is the sum of all elements that have been addressed across all sections in the column and displayed in a percentage
Cells that are grayed out do not contain elements that are reviewed for that tier.

| Five Fundamental Plan Review Criteria: | | Rating: |
|---|---|---|
| *Rating System:*<br>**1** = **Missing All** of the specified characteristics<br>**2** = **Minimally** addresses the specified characteristics<br>**3** = Addresses **Some** of the specified characteristics<br>**4** = Addresses **Most** of the specified characteristics<br>**5** = **Addresses All** of the specified characteristics | | **4** |
| ADEQUACY | A plan is adequate if: | 4 |
| | The scope and concept of planned operations identify and address critical tasks effectively; | 4 |
| | The plan can accomplish the assigned mission while complying with guidance; | 4 |
| | The plan's assumptions are valid, reasonable, and comply with guidance. | 4 |
| FEASIBILITY | A plan is feasible if: | 4 |
| | The organization can accomplish the assigned mission and critical tasks by using available resources whithin the time contemplated by the plan; | 4 |
| | The organization allocates available resources to tasks and tracks the resources by status; | 4 |
| | Available resources include internal assets and those available through mutual aid or through existing state, regional, or Federal assistance agreements. | 5 |
| | Specifically, the jurisdiction should complete a capability estimate that: | 4 |
| | Identifies the current status of resources arrayed to support the plan; | 4 |
| | Analyzes the required resources based on the courses of action in the plan; | 4 |
| | Identifies the most supportable courses of action and ways to reduce the impact of resource deficiencies. | 4 |
| ACCEPTABILITY | A plan is acceptable if: | 4 |
| | It meets the requirements driven by a threat or incident; | 4 |
| | It meets decision maker and public cost and time limitations; | 4 |
| | It is consistent with the law; | 5 |
| | It can be justified in terms of the cost of resources; | 4 |
| | Its scale is proportional to mission requirements. | 4 |
| COMPLETENESS | A plan is complete if it: | 4 |
| | Incorporates all tasks to be accomplished; | 4 |
| | Includes all required capabilities; | 3 |
| | Integrates the needs of the general population, children of all ages, individuals with disabilities and others with access and functional needs, immigrants, individuals with limited English proficiency, and diverse racial and ethnic populations; | 4 |
| | Provides a complete picture of the sequence and scope of the planned response operation; | 3 |
| | Makes time estimates for achieving objectives; | 3 |
| | Identifies success criteria and a desired end-state. | 4 |
| COMPLIANCE | The Plan should align with guidance and doctrine to the maximum extent possible because these provide a baseline that facilitates both planning and execution. | 4 |

# Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan (CEMP) Review & Recommendations

## Jurisdiction: City of Tumwater

The recommendations provided below are separated into three tiers:

**Tier III – Lawful Requirements**; *Tier II – State Suggestions*; and Tier I – Optional

State consistency reviews will follow the recommendations identified in Tier III.  Tier II identifies the next logical step in the planning process and should be considered guidance to assist with state-wide planning coordination; Tier II is not a requirement, but highly suggested to better prepare your jurisdiction.  Tier I identifies entirely optional, accreditation-related elements and remains dependent on individual jurisdictions' preparedness goals, capabilities and resources; Tier I is not a requirement.

| TIER III – Lawful Requirements | | |
|---|---|---|
| **CEMP Location** | **Recommendation to Meet Legal Obligations** | **Reference** |
| Basic Plan – Approval Document | Ensure the approval document is signed by either the Emergency Management Director or the senior elected official. | Chapter 118-30, WA CEMP, CPG 101 |

| TIER II – *State Suggestions* | | |
|---|---|---|
| **CEMP Location** | **Recommendation to Meet Legal Obligations** | **Reference** |
| Basic Plan – Approval Document | Consider discussing authorities and decision-making policies in either your approval document or the delegation of authority if the senior or appointed officials were absent.<br><br>Also, consider adding a statement to your Approval Document that this current CEMP "Supersedes all Previous Plans". | WA CEMP, CPG 101 |
| Basic Plan – Record of Distribution | The Record of Distribution (usually a table consisting of each agency represented within the plan and the date a copy of the plan was delivered) is an important legal document of your CEMP.  It also serves as documentation of your CEMP promulgation process, ensuring each agency identified in the plan was part of the planning process.  Consider adding a column for the name | WA CEMP, CPG 101 |

| TIER II – *State Suggestions* | | |
|---|---|---|
| **CEMP Location** | **Recommendation to Meet Legal Obligations** | **Reference** |
| | and/or Title of the receiving person and the date of delivery. | |
| Basic Plan – Core Capabilities | While your Annexes show many of the core capabilities, the Basic Plan is meant to describe the relationships between these mission areas/planning efforts/etc. The State CEMP is currently moving in this direction with its own Plan which is the reasoning behind offering this recommendation and the previous one as a suggestion for future updates to your CEMP. [Refer to the Tier II – Suggestion Tab under Concept of Operations and Direction, Control and Coordination for more specific information. ] | The National Planning Frameworks, WA CEMP |
| Basic Plan - Organization | Describe the conflict resolution process that exists or would be used to resolve issues which present themselves amongst local departments. | WA CEMP, CPG 101 |
| Basic Plan – Responsibilities | There are many tasks and abilities that Departments/Agencies (at all levels of government), the private sector, community organizations, and individuals should be participating in and accomplishing based on the guidance offered by the National Planning Frameworks. The Responsibilities section is an opportunity to not only address what capabilities are, but what they should be. This section should also be considered a place to set expectations. For more information on stakeholder responsibilities, consult the CEMP Evaluation Checklist – Tier II Suggestions tab.

Overall, this section was well-written, there were just a few pieces missing. | The National Planning Frameworks, WA CEMP, CPG 101 |
| Basic Plan - Finance | Consider briefly discussing the impact and role of insurance for recovering from the impacts of emergencies and/or disasters. | National Disaster Recovery Framework, WA CEMP |

| TIER II – *State Suggestions* | | |
|---|---|---|
| **CEMP Location** | **Recommendation to Meet Legal Obligations** | **Reference** |
| Population Protection Annexes – Fire: Firefighting Assistance Agreements | The ESF 4 Annex made frequent references to Firefighting Agreements but did not detail how those agreements would be implemented (or the process to implement them). Please detail what these agreements entail and how they are implemented. | National Response Framework, WA CEMP, CPG 101 |
| Population Protection Annexes – Emergency Management: Deactivation/Transition Process of EOC/ECC | Consider discussing the process for deactivation of the EOC/ECC and/or transitioning to recovery. | WA CEMP, CPG 101 |
| Population Protection Annexes – Mass Care: Shelter Communications & Operations | Consider discussing more information regarding what communications are established and maintained for sheltering operations. Important areas to consider are what information collection and dissemination efforts will be conducted between the various stakeholders, such as between shelters and the media or shelters and evacuees. Another consideration to discuss is the process and procedures to address unaccompanied children, registered offenders, or household pets when they arrive at shelters. [Recommendation can be found on the CEMP Evaluation Checklist Tier II – Suggestions tab under ESF 6] | National Response Framework, National Disaster Recovery Framework, WA CEMP, CPG 101 |
| Population Protection Annexes – Search and Rescue | Consider discussing the capabilities for aeronautical and wilderness Search and Rescue efforts. If these capabilities do not exist in your jurisdiction, consider noting neighboring jurisdiction through MOA/MOU or other formal request process that can assist.<br><br>Consider discussing the following topics to completely round it out:<br>• Methods for monitoring distress levels;<br>• Tracking locations of distressed individuals;<br>• The potential for evacuation. | National Response Framework, WA CEMP, CPG 101 |

| TIER II – *State Suggestions* | | |
|---|---|---|
| **CEMP Location** | **Recommendation to Meet Legal Obligations** | **Reference** |
| Population Protection Annexes – Hazardous Materials | Consider discussing the following:<br>• Environmental cleanup<br>• Implementing treatment options.<br>Even if your jurisdiction does not participate in the process (i.e. Department of Ecology takes care of the waste), your CEMP should briefly describe/highlight who is participating in these activities and if any coordination is involved. | National Mitigation Framework, National Response Framework, National Disaster Recovery Framework, WA CEMP, CPG 101 |
| Population Protection Annexes – Police: Public Safety and Security | Consider discussing how coordination of situational information is shared with/from the EOC/ECC to create a Common Operating Picture. | National Response Framework, National Disaster Recovery Framework, WA CEMP, CPG 101 |
| Population Protection Annexes – Public Information: Notices | Discuss how information pertaining to the potential impacts of secondary hazards is relayed to the public. | National Response Framework, National Disaster Recovery Framework, WA CEMP |
| Resource Management – Animal and Plant Diseases | Discuss how the jurisdictional will respond in the event of animal and plant disease. Additionally, consider the potential economic impact of devastating animal/zoonotic/plant diseases. | WA CEMP, CPG 101 |
| Resource Management – Natural, Cultural, and Historical Resources | A commonly unaddressed area of planning involves the consideration of natural, cultural, and historic resources. Consider identifying how your jurisdiction will preserve, rehabilitate, recover, and restore these resources. | National Mitigation Framework, National Recovery Framework, National Disaster Recovery Framework, WA CEMP, CPG 101 |
| Critical Infrastructure – Transportation: Incident Management | Building off the described incident management measures implemented for roadways, consider describing what incident management practices will be implemented for those involving Aviation, Maritime, Pipelines, and Railroads. Even if your jurisdiction has no capabilities to perform | WA CEMP |

| TIER II – *State Suggestions* | | |
|---|---|---|
| **CEMP Location** | **Recommendation to Meet Legal Obligations** | **Reference** |
| | either of these a discussion should still occur concerning who manages those specific incident types and how your jurisdiction assists or coordinates (e.g. provides traffic control in affected areas, provides specific transportation resources, etc.). | |
| Critical Infrastructure – Communications: Interoperable Communications Plan | Identify a communications plan which outlines how interoperable communications are established in your jurisdiction. | The National Planning Frameworks, WA CEMP, CPG 101 |
| Critical Infrastructure – Communications: AFN Communication Systems | Identify existing communication systems that will be used to communicate with Access and Functional Needs populations. These systems might include:<br>• Text Telephone (TTY)<br>• Telecommunication Device for the Deaf (TDD)<br>• Telecommunications Relay Service (TRS)<br>• Video Relay Service (VRS), etc. | WA CEMP, CPG 101 |
| Critical Infrastructure – Communications: – Frequencies | Considering adding a table in this ESF which identifies the various frequencies that response organizations operate on. | WA CEMP, CPG 101 |
| Critical Infrastructure – Communications: – Alternate 9-1-1 | Consider discussing alternative methods for essential communications if 9-1-1 or other dispatch centers are out of operation. | WA CEMP, CPG 101 |

| TIER I – <u>Optional</u> | | |
|---|---|---|
| **CEMP Location** | **Recommendation to Meet Legal Obligations** | **Reference** |
| Basic Plan | Develop and/or reference a multi-year strategic plan complete with goals, objectives, milestones, and implementation methods. | EMAP 3.1.1 |
| Basic Plan - Communications | There are a lot of elements to try and provide methods and processes regarding crisis communication, public information, and education. | EMAP 4.11.1 - 4.11.4 |
| Basic Plan - Development and Maintenance | A training and exercise program contains numerous components.  Accreditation is primarily concerned with the methods used to train, exercise, and track all this data. | EMAP 4.9 - 4.10 |

| Additional Considerations | |
|---|---|
| **CEMP Location** | **Recommendation** |
| Overall CEMP | Your CEMP was very well written and will meet all of the legal requirements once it has been formally approved, adopted and signed by your City Council. As a reminder, do not forget to include a copy of the Promulgation Letter in the Introductory Section of the plan. |
| ESF 6: Mass Care - ARC | While it is fairly common to rely on the support and capabilities of the American Red Cross, your own capabilities should not be discounted. Consider investing in planning efforts focused on what the capabilities of the County and its Cities are capable of in comparison of those of the ARC. If a significant or widespread disaster were to occur, then the capabilities and resources of the ARC would be severely diminished and prove to be insufficient. Therefore, it is advised that you work closely with them to develop your own plans based on your capabilities which can be instituted in a worst-case scenario. At the very least (as the former is no small task), consider reviewing the ARC's procedural manuals so that you can describe how the ARC accomplishes certain capabilities. For example, examine what methodology the ARC uses in shelter site selection, qualification, and operations. This can be incorporated into your ESF 6 annex in the case that the ARC is not able to assist you immediately following a disaster or emergency. |