

MORPC Transportation Needs Evacuation Plan

STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES

March 25, 2010

Date: March 25, 2010 at 2:00 p.m.

Location: MORPC Office, Columbus, Ohio

PARTICIPANTS

Dan Haake	MORPC, 614-233-4149	dhaake@morpc.org
Andy Taylor	MORPC, 614-233-4166	ataylor@morpc.org
Alicia Kehrig	MORPC, 614-233-4169	akehrig@morpc.org
Rudy Blaser	Ohio EMA, 614-799-3825	rblaser@dps.state.oh.us
Sean Miller	Delaware County EMA, 740-833-2180	delcoema@co.delaware.oh.us
Mike Fielding	Columbus Public Health, 614.645.6572	mjfielding@columbus.gov
Jamie Stout	FCEMHS, 614.794.0213	jlstout@franklincounty.ohio.gov
Mike Pompili	OSU (Kettering), 641.864.0723	pompili.4@osu.edu
Ken Zaklukiewicz	Baker, 703.317.6253	KZaklukiewicz@mbakercorp.com
Nancy Lyon Stadler	Baker, 216.776.6814	nlyonstadler@mbakercorp.com
Dhruv Jain	Baker, 703-317-6226	djain@mbakercorp.com
Marty Miller	Miller PR, 614-424-6060	mmiller@mprllc.com

OPENING REMARKS AND INTRODUCTIONS

Dan Haake (MORPC) welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked each person to introduce themselves. The purpose of the meeting was to get an overview of the content and direction of the draft “Planning Guidance for Evacuation of the Transportation Needs Populations of Central Ohio” prepared by the Baker Team.

MEETING OVERVIEW

Ken Zaklukiewicz (Baker) thanked everyone for coming and reviewed the agenda for the meeting:

1. Project Status Report
 - Deliverables
 - Schedule
 - Public Outreach Program
 - Kettering Foundation Research
2. Plan Review
3. Action items/Next Steps

The purpose of the project is to create a seven-county evacuation planning guide for populations with transportation needs. The counties included in the project are: Delaware, Fairfield, Franklin, Licking, Madison, Pickaway, and Union. Ken reminded the group that funding was provided by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and that project will be locally administered while also serving as a national model. Ken stressed that this document is not intended to replace existing emergency evacuation plans but will serve as a supplement that focuses on populations with transportation needs.

PROJECT STATUS REPORT

Phase I – Research and Analysis includes information gathering and gap identification and coordination with Kettering Foundation research. This work is essentially complete. *Phase II – Planning* includes coordination and visioning and intensive outreach to transportation needs populations and emergency and first responders. *Phase III* is in progress, having been initiated on March 19, 2010. *Phase III – Adoption* includes consensus building with the stakeholders and incorporating their input into the final plan. *Phase IV – Implementation* is on schedule for August through September 2010 and will include designing the signage and creating reference materials (training manual with education and marketing materials).

Potential stakeholders for Phase III include representatives from: County fire/police/sheriff, County EMA (Emergency Management Agency), COTA (Central Ohio Transit Authority), CRAA (Columbus Regional Airport Authority), ODOT (Ohio Department of Transportation), Ohio National Guard, OSU (The Ohio State University), COTS (Central Ohio Trauma System), television stations, faith-based organizations, rural metro, FIRSLINK, 211/volunteer, private sector nursing home association, Ohio DODD (Ohio Department of Developmental Disabilities, formerly MRDD) and Ohio Community Service Council. Issues and concerns raised by the stakeholders will form the basis for focus groups that will consider the issue/concern and the result will be fed back to the stakeholders who will make recommendations for the Steering Committee's consideration.

Deliverables: The project deliverables to date are:

- Outreach Plan developed and approved, February 2009
- Project stakeholder website (MPOWR) created, February 2009
- Plan Outline completed, October 2009
- Agreement of definition of "transportation needs", October 2009
- Researched and analyzed local plans, December 2009
- Existing Conditions Report finalized, February 2010
- Draft Plan submitted, March 19, 2010

On-going and future activities and deliverables are:

- Project public website under development
- Continuation of GIS mapping transportation needs within the project definition
- Continuing updates to public website
- Incorporation of stakeholder comments into the plan
- Creation of signage graphics and placement
- Development of educational materials

Schedule: Ken noted that development of the Plan is on schedule, to be completed by September 2010. The project has multiple deliverables beyond the Plan itself, including the Existing Conditions Report, the public web site and educational materials.

Plan Format: Ken briefly reviewed the Plan structure. In 2007, a regional preparedness/evacuation plan was to be developed, containing the following seven components: Decision Making, Planning, Public Communications, Special Needs, Operations, Sheltering and Training. Originally, this evacuation plan for transportation needs populations project was to build on the 2007 regional evacuation plan, likely serving as section in that plan. However, since that plan has not yet been developed, a decision had to be made regarding the best way to proceed. In 2009, the Steering Committee decided to design the evacuation plan for transportation needs populations plan a guide. This format will allow for cross-referencing if it used as a stand-alone document, or the plan can be customized and incorporated into County plans and/or annexes as supplemental information. The maps and checklists would be particularly useful for this purpose. Ken pointed out that many emergency management plans do not follow a common format, with cited examples listed below. The guide format would allow incorporation with a degree of flexibility that would accommodate the differing formats of the various county plans.

- Delaware County and the City of Columbus structured following SLG/CPG 101
- Fairfield and Pickaway Counties follow somewhat structured common format
- Union County & Upper Arlington plans are high level

Existing Conditions Report: The Existing Conditions Report captures the nature, characteristics, key components, and gaps in the existing County emergency management plans. The process followed to develop the Existing Conditions Report:

- Identified planning initiatives and tools required to meet evacuation needs (best practices);
- Compared in-place plans and resources to best practices; and,
- Enables planners to more accurately evaluate the region's capabilities.

Additionally, Ken noted that the Existing Conditions Report matrix:

- Identifies resources and plans needed;
- Notes gaps and lack of information; and,
- Provides recommendations.

Public Involvement Program: Marty Miller (Miller PR) reported that there were no new updates to the Public Outreach Program. The Public Involvement Plan that outlines, defines and documents the Public Outreach Program is a living document in which the schedule identifies review and comment periods. The purpose of the Public Outreach Program is to inform the general public of the plan and is initially intended to reach out to the transportation needs populations. The Program identifies these populations as including those with multi-lingual needs, different physical capabilities and those with transportation limitations.

Kettering Foundation Update: Mike Pompili (OSU/Kettering) provided a brief update on the public forums he has facilitated for the Kettering Foundation project. He noted that Pickaway, Madison and Union Counties are not actively engaged. Mike noted that remaining forums are scheduled for March 30 and 31 and April 5. Reports on the forums will be completed by mid-May, to include a full list of

contacts. Mike also noted that he met with COTA's Mobility Management group and found that experience to be very useful.

PLAN REVIEW

The Plan review consisted of an open discussion of data, other information and their presentation in the draft Plan.

Demographics

Dhruv Jain (Baker) reported that the most complete GIS data set is from Franklin County; data from the other six counties is needed. The maps in the Plan provide information on hospitals, nursing homes, population densities, and prisons. Placeholders have been created for transfer pick up points, day care facilities and shelters. This effort will remain on-going as the information is being collected. Of note, some information was obtained from Community Research Partners.

Dan said that there probably will not be the same level of detail for all seven counties. He requested that one map that incorporates all seven counties be used for the larger scale items that have information in all counties and the smaller scale items should be provided on individual maps for each county with relevant information.

Andy Taylor (MORPC) suggested using the demographic information available from Jobs & Family Services and also suggested reaching out the Ohio Department of Development for additional demographic information.

Senior Citizen and Daycare Facilities

Mike Pompili (OSU/Kettering) noted that he did not see any information in the plan regarding facilities that care for senior citizens. Dan responded that there was an assumption that senior citizen complexes would take care of themselves. However, he added that that may not be a valid assumption. Ken stated that previous project development discussions and industry standards reflect that "hospitals" have their own evacuation plans; in addition to traditional hospitals, senior citizen facilities are included in that definition. Mike said that the senior citizens are a constant presence at the Forums and they should be included in the Plan. Ken added that senior citizen facilities and daycare centers both have populations that fall within the definition of transportation needs populations.

Ken asked if daycare center should be mapped as well as senior centers under the heading, "transportation needs." Alicia Kehrig (MORPC) stated that low-income/federally subsidized housing facilities are supposed to have their own evacuation plans. This population can be identified via low income 202 housing tax credit for the elderly. The Office of Aging and HUD are information resources. Dan stated that areas with insufficient information to provide mapping should be addressed in the plan narrative and could possibly be put into a checklist. Ken responded that items that have a reliable source could be mapped. Jamie Stout (FCEMHS) said that the Ohio Department of Job & Family Services has a database of all the licensed day care centers and Franklin County's Action for Children has a list of most of the after school care locations. Ohio Geographically Referenced Information Program (OGRIP) is another data resource; it is fed by state agencies and is beginning to incorporate local and county data. Dhruv suggested that OGRIP may eventually be the right organization to manage and update the data assembled into by this Plan. The committee discussed that the plan development process should

include OGRIP to facilitate potential future data management. However, OGRIP will not yet have the majority of the information needed for this project.

The issue of potentially providing tables with maps and locations listed was raised. Dhruv indicated that we can handle information electronically and if there are any unique identifiers we should use them. Andy also said that we need to look at capacity issues in nursing homes, etc. and that we can get an aggregate number to give us a sense of the potential need. Jamie added that the Ohio Department of Health has information on the capacity of nursing homes so once we have a list of the maps, we can identify the appropriate agencies for information.

Information on addresses was not provided by some agencies based on the sensitivity of the information. Sensitive information such as this should be included in a separate section of the Plan, identified as “For Official Use Only”.

Shelters

Ken noted that Baker received shelter information for the seven counties. Jamie noted that information for the American Red Cross was mapped by the Franklin County Health Department. The Central Ohio Region for the American Red Cross is the same as the MORPC seven-county region. Dhruv added that the Plan can identify potential shelters. However, during times of emergencies the local EMAs will direct citizens to the actual activated shelters. Ken observed that Franklin County has identified drop-off and pick-up points which are different from shelters. Jamie offered to check with COTA to confirm the information on the Franklin County map.

Shelter information is sensitive. Dan requested that the Plan use generic references to potential shelters and drop-off and pick-up points. For example, use “arenas, stadiums, etc.” rather than referring to Nationwide Arena by name. Counties do not want specific location information to be made public because people would just show up, whether or not that was a location to be used for a particular event. The public sections of the Plan will include general language and the For Official Use Only (FOUO) part of the plan will provide more detailed information with names and locations.

Transit-Related Issues

Sean Miller (Delaware County EMA) noted that Delaware County has not yet identified drop-off points. Ken said the sites could be identified in the “official” document. Rudy Blaser (Ohio EMA) added that counties should be given the opportunity to map certain things along with the option of deciding whether to make items things “public” or FOUO. Dhruv suggested that the Plan provide a matrix identifying the available information and the existing gaps, and allow the counties to decide what information is made public. The matrix will be created as part of the Plan development but will subsequently be maintained and updated by the county agency(ies), as appropriate. The information can be provided in layers, identified by county. Example information could include shelters, pick up and drop off locations, facilities with licensed beds for nursing homes (and numbers of beds), and the like.

Ken stated that the Plan must document transfer points (pick up and drop off locations). Currently, the Plan focuses on COTA and DATA. Is it possible to leverage both COTA and DATA in reaching the other systems? Will these transit agencies support other communities during emergencies? What assumptions can be built into the Plan? Baker will meet with the transit agencies to research this and other transit-related issues. COTA and DATA cannot be relied upon to support every event. Dan stated

that other counties have smaller transit agencies that provide paratransit services. It is important to incorporate all these agencies into the Plan. Andy stated that Licking County has two smaller transit programs; Pickaway County has paratransit; Fairfield County has a coordinate plan and they were active in the forums. Work will be on-going to determine region-wide transit capabilities. Andy added that the Plan should include types of transit vehicles as well as transit services. Ken noted that the Plan would not contain physical inventories but would provide general reference information including transit service, types of vehicles, and vehicles with lifts. The data sources will be provided to facilitate updates. Jamie suggested a meeting with COTA and DATA for additional input. Andy stated that MORPC holds a Regional Transit Forum. He coordinated with them for this project before Chris Gawronski left and they supported the development of this Plan. They would be an information source. Ken asked that he be included in the next meeting of the group and possible schedule some one-on-one with a few of the members.

Counties without GIS

Jamie stated that the Plan must address the needs of counties without GIS. They may be a one-person operation without the resources to identify all the data (e.g., shelter locations, transfer points) to go into the Plan. Dan responded that part of the plan is to identify needs; the Plan should identify information gaps. In working with the counties, care must be taken to be tactful in identifying gaps. Ken noted that the Plan does not single out particular agencies and that the Plan is not available for review by the public during the plan development process. It will be made accessible to the public upon completion. He also pointed out that the Baker could work with the EMAs to develop transfer pick-up points. In fact, this activity is to occur soon in Delaware County..

County Participation & Schedule

Mike voiced concern that there were county agencies that have not yet seen the plan. The project team should meet with all seven county EMAs and other agencies, as appropriate, to discuss the Plan and its development prior to submitting it to them for their review. It is important to engage the counties now, ask for their available information; if the information is not available, provide criteria and ask for recommendations. They need to know that the Plan is being developed and they need to be asked for their input before they are asked to review the draft Plan. Rudy cautioned that the Plan could be seen as Franklin County wanting to evacuate into surrounding counties and therefore it is important to convey the guidance aspect of the Plan and its relevance to all counties.

Ken noted upcoming steps identified in the project schedule:

- Steering Committee complete plan review, provide comments to Baker
- Baker incorporate comments
- Baker provide disposition of comments and revised Plan to Steering Committee
- Finalize the plan

The dates associated with the above tasks on the project schedule will need to be revisited due to delays related to local match funding. Dan stated the deadlines may be extended depending on the nature and extent of the comments. The project team will schedule a Steering Committee meeting where schedule revisions will be addressed.

Ken said that the Plan could provide detail profiles of what comprises transfer pick-up points. Jamie cautioned that we will need to be careful with the public education aspect of the transfer pick-up points

and that we need to exercise caution when talking about “adoption” of the plan. 30 days is not sufficient to develop, evaluate and establish transfer pick-up points where counties would be comfortable publishing the information in a public document. Use of the word “adoption” should be done with care because of the associated implications. Ken responded that we are asking for comments from EMAs and not final approval. Mike suggested developing a brief summary of the plan and having an EMA representative at the meeting to bridge the gap because EMAs are not currently aware that the project is being developed. Ken said he would work this out; Baker will schedule meetings with the counties, including the EMAs and other appropriate agencies. It would be useful for Mike to be involved in this process because he has established trusted relationships with the counties. Mike said that the Forums would have been good venues to make the introduction, but the schedules did not mesh. All but one Forum will be completed within the next two weeks. Mike requested a project summary to share with the counties at the remaining Forums. Dan suggested Baker attend the Forums and Ken agreed.

Plan Outline

Ken reviewed the Plan’s Table of Contents, along with the purpose and content of each section. The document structure and its contents are based upon the FTA grant requirements and MORPC needs, as identified by the Steering Committee and the stakeholders. Ken noted that the Table of Contents outline was adopted by the Steering Committee in October 2009.

1. Introduction
 - Project is funded by FTA grant and contents of Plan are based on grant requirements.
2. General Guidance
 - Part of the plan is guidance and part of the plan is fairly specific, uniquely tailored to the MORPC region.
 - Care was taken to avoid replicating what is contained in other plans.
 - Plan sections are based upon Steering Committee and stakeholder input.
 - Designed for Counties to take the information and build it into their individual plans.
3. Overarching Common Operating Picture
 - Contains technical information and flow charts (narrative format).
4. Operational Information
 - Contains checklists and quick reference information to be used during an event.
 - Identifies items that are unique to transportation needs populations.
 - Follows a logical flow of events.

Plan Outline Comments

Dan said that Sections 2 & 3 had parts that were somewhat “jumbled” and that he would e-mail the details of what he would prefer to see to Ken. For example, the notification methods appeared to be directed at driving populations, particularly with the CMS and VMS sections. This needs to be re-addressed with a focus on transportation needs. Dan directed Baker to remove the Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) architecture section from the Plan. However, the Plan must address Automatic Vehicle Location (AVL) systems and other systems critical to the plan. However, no additions or modifications of the ITS architecture will be needed. Dan also noted that the Plan needs to provide

more checklists for the target populations and operational examples. For example, if there is an explosion, how do we notify people and how do we deal with “obvious” groups. As a minimum, create checklist for the low-income, African, and Latino populations. Mike Pompili said that the demographic and Kettering information needs to be more thoroughly incorporated into the Plan and that we need to more clearly define the populations needing transportation. How to communicate with each population group should be included. The “lessons learned” from the Forums should be effectively incorporated into this Plan. Dhruv stated that this is information that can be included in the matrix as well as described within the Plan text. Dan responded that it would be helpful to set up scenarios for the counties that outline specific steps to take in case of an emergency evacuation. Nancy Lyon Stadler (Baker) affirmed Dan’s suggestion by stating that the fact sheets take a “Real World Events & Lessons Learned” approach which will be appropriately incorporated into the Plan. The fundamental information will be provided within the body of the Plan and the Forum reports, as prepared by Mike, will be provided as an appendix. Dan requested adding the Kettering Foundation outcomes to Chapter 3.

Dhruv stated that the public and FOUO sections would be separated as follows: Chapters 1-3 and the Appendices will be public information. Chapter 4 will be FOUO. This separation will be explained in the introduction of the Plan. The data will be obtained from the counties then a decision will be made as to what is FOUO and what can be made available to the public.

Dan requested the removal of “MORPC” throughout the document. It is sufficient to identify MORPC in the beginning of the document. The term “Central Ohio region” should be used instead of MORPC. This Plan will be implemented and executed by the County EMAs, not MORPC. Removal of the term “MORPC” should eliminate potential confusion on that matter.

Dan said that some areas need more explanation to avoid misinterpretation, or the term should be removed. For example, more completely define “multi-modal transportation” or remove it from the document.

Dan requested that more information on the existing conditions be provided in narrative form in the public sections of the report (Sections 1 and 2); a one-page summary would be sufficient. More complete information should be provided in Section 4 (FOUO).

Andy stated that he needs the approved copy of the Table of Contents; Ken agreed to provide it.

Andy requested that the terms be defined in the introduction rather than later in the Plan.

Rudy said that his written comments would be forthcoming and suggested that most of the issues from an EMA perspective would probably be in Section 4. Rudy stated that he would pass the plan around to their planners for comments, but prior to doing that, he will flag any potential hot button issues that might inhibit county coordination.

Rudy expressed concern with the identification of specific agencies within the Plan. He thought that the use of agency names could be construed as having their roles and responsibilities dictated in someone else’s plan. Nancy suggested using the phrase, “transit agencies” to replace some of the names. Baker will revise the Plan to use more generic terms.

Jamie stated that terminology needs to be consistent throughout the document. For example, EMA is used in a number of different manners. She suggested using the generic phrase “local emergency management agency” throughout the Plan.

Jaime recommended using only data good enough that it could be mapped. The information on the sizes of the populations should be eliminated from the Plan because they are under debate and determination of the specific numbers is a political issue that would be best to avoid. The Plan needs to tie in transportation needs populations to non-English speaking populations. The researched numbers can be provided, with sources documented and any appropriate disclaimers. However, the locations of these populations should not be mapped. Andy stated that the Plan needs to map the “no car” population and that the 2000 Census data should be used. He also noted that we need numbers to connect minority populations to transportation needs. Jamie felt there was no value added to locations of minority populations and suggested that this was a “charged” issue with jurisdictions in Franklin County. She said that if the numbers of minorities is used there should be language stating that the numbers are disputed. The Plan will include available data, with sources noted and appropriate qualifying statements, as needed.

Jamie requested that more generic terms be used throughout the Plan. For example, Emergency Support Functions (ESF) is used only in the largest jurisdictions and that Incident Command System (ICS) is used by some others such as Delaware County. As such, the plan will take an approach that is more generic such as “local law enforcement”, “fire”, and so forth .

Ken said that there would be a more generic reference to ITS in the checklist. Nancy asked whether ITS should be included in the plan, since its use is to direct the driving population. After some discussion regarding the FTA grant requirements and the merits and drawbacks of including ITS in the Plan, Dan stated that the ITS section should be retained but not emphasized in order to maintain the credibility of the plan and its application to transportation needs populations. As such, the Plan will not cover modifications to ITS architecture but it will address AVL.

ACTION ITEMS

Comments on the draft Plan to be addressed by Baker:

1. Modify GIS mapping. Provide one map that incorporates all seven counties be used for the larger scale items that have information in all counties and the smaller scale items should be provided on individual maps for each county with relevant information.
2. Obtain additional demographic information from Jobs & Family Services (2008 data) and the Ohio Department of Development.
3. Incorporate senior citizen facilities and daycare centers into the plan, through mapping, checklists or narrative text, as appropriate given the available information.
4. Reference OGRIP for potential future management and maintenance of the MORPC Plan data.
5. Modify Plan to include a chapter designated as “For Official Use Only”. The information in this chapter will not be released in the public plan and it will not be posted on the public web site. It will only appear in Plans to be used by County EMAs and other appropriate agencies. Information to be included in the FOUO chapter includes: shelters, pick up and drop off locations.

6. Develop a matrix identifying the available information and the existing gaps (shelters, pick up and drop off locations, licensed beds for nursing homes, etc.). Allow the counties to decide what information is made public.
7. Coordinate with all transit agencies in the seven county region to assess their capabilities with respect to serving transportation needs populations during emergency events.
8. Provide transit information for all seven counties with general reference information including transit service, types of vehicles, and vehicles with lifts. The data sources will be provided to facilitate updates.
9. Refer to Plan Outline Comments section (page 7) for specific comments.

Plan development action items to be addressed by the identified agencies and organizations:

10. Gather GIS data. (Baker)
11. Work with counties to identify Transfer Pick-Up Points. (Franklin County's have been developed.)
12. Plan review (30-day period), comments due to Baker by April 19, 2010. (Focus Group members)
13. Incorporate information and lessons learned from Kettering Foundation Forums into Plan. (Baker)
14. Reach out to MORPC's Regional Transit Forum to include Baker in next meeting. (MORPC)
15. Submit updated Plan with Disposition of Comments to Focus Group members by May 3, 2010. (Baker)
16. Review updated Plan and return to Baker by May 10, 2010. (Focus Group members)
17. Meet with transit providers: COTA, DATA, LCTB and others. Incorporate appropriate information into the Plan. (Baker)
18. Meet with County agencies to review Plan concepts. (Baker and Kettering)
19. Modify Plan based upon information received from County meetings, as appropriate. (Baker)
20. Finalize and publish the Plan. (Baker) (Note: May 31st was discussed as the deliverable date but this will likely be delayed.)

WRAP UP

Dan asked that comments on the plan be sent to him by Friday, April 2. He will keep the comments separated by person and Ken stated he will maintain the comments on the MPOWR site.

The meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.