1 organize resources

Overview

Phase 1, *Organize Resources*, involves getting started in the hazard mitigation planning process by identifying and pulling together resources such as funding, staff, and political support. These resources will be necessary both to get the process off the ground and to achieve maximum effectiveness in the long term.

This section supplements the guidance provided in the *Getting Started: Building Support for Mitigation Planning* how-to guide (FEMA 386-1). Step 1 involves establishing community support for integrating manmade hazards into the mitigation planning process. Step 2 includes developing a list of stakeholders with expertise in hazardous materials, security issues, and law enforcement, among other disciplines, that you may want to add to your planning team. Step 3 discusses special considerations relevant to public participation activities.

Step 1
Assess Community Support

To be successful, a mitigation planning initiative requires the support of public officials, agency personnel, business owners and operators, citizens, and other community members. *Getting Started* discusses defining the planning area; gauging how much the community knows about mitigation planning; educating public officials on the hazards and risks in your community; using existing plans as a base from which to start; and organizing funding, technical, and human resources.

Inform the Public

One of the fundamental differences in planning for manmade disasters versus natural disasters is that most people have had little or no firsthand exposure to them. Even in light of the alarming increase in terrorist activity directed against the United States, the aging infrastructure, the persistence of security shortfalls in some sectors, and the proximity of industrial hazards to population centers, the public's perception of risk varies widely. This percep-

Planners should recognize that addressing manmade hazards may require that more attention be paid to dealing with a range of potentially strong personal responses, and they should be prepared to address potential concerns that may not have arisen during natural hazards planning such as security, unknown risks, and civil liberties. Thus, it is critical that planners develop a realistic, comprehensive picture of the hazards present in their communities to better educate the public and be prepared to respond to their concerns.

tion is influenced by many factors, such as media portrayal of events, the level of public education available, and an individual's experience with various hazards. Because the United States has a relatively short history of dealing with manmade hazards, discussions on this subject may be characterized by elements of uncertainty and even fear. Therefore, to gain public support, it is important to educate public officials, citizens, and the private sector about the manmade hazards that may affect the community and about the prevention and mitigation actions that can help address them. The planning team must present a realistic assessment of the potential consequences of such disasters while taking care to avoid overstating or inflating the risk.

Promote the Benefits of Mitigation Planning

Summary of the benefits of mitigation planning

- Reduces future losses from disasters
- Builds partnerships
- Facilitates funding priorities
- Contributes to sustainable communities

You can further educate people and build support by emphasizing the value added by mitigation planning and building on planning opportunities that already exist. Although manmade hazards may not be as easy to identify and predict as some natural hazards, the benefits of planning for such events are the same: improved disaster resistance, community involvement in the process, partnerships with sectors you may not have interacted with before, and more sustainable communities. Building on existing opportunities is a good way to create momentum for mitigation planning.

Many people are concerned about manmade hazards since the attacks of 2001, and the media have focused intensely on these disasters. You can use this high visibility to show why your community should plan for such contingencies. *Getting Started* examines ways to implement natural hazard mitigation planning through existing plans; now you can reexamine those plans with a focus on how to integrate planning for manmade disasters into them.

You may want to point out the following benefits as you educate others:

1. Mitigation helps local, tribal, and state governments fulfill their responsibility to protect their citizens, property, and environment by reducing the potential impacts of manmade disasters.
2. Mitigation can enhance a community's ability to recover from the impacts of a manmade disaster.
3. Mitigation can reduce exposure to civil or criminal liability in the event of a terrorist attack or technological accident.

Depending on the nature of the incident, the impacts of a manmade hazard can be localized—even limited to a single building—or they can be widespread, encompassing a metropolitan area, a watershed, or a transportation corridor. Additionally, the extent of the physical damages generated by an incident can be surpassed by its associated economic impacts, as demonstrated by the national-level economic effects of the September 11, 2001 attacks.

4. Mitigation actions may help reduce insurance premiums.

Capitalize on Planning Opportunities

As mentioned previously, manmade hazards can be integrated into existing planning efforts. The following opportunities should be considered:

1. **Planning during post-disaster recovery.** Following the September 2001 attacks, the increased risk of manmade hazards became a topic of conversation in the mainstream media and across the nation. This widespread interest can serve as an impetus to enhance a mitigation plan with actions that can reduce the effects of future attacks.

DMA

The Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 provides an impetus for state and local governments to undertake mitigation planning. The Act does not mandate that terrorism or technological disasters be addressed in hazard mitigation planning; however, it does encourage and reward state and local pre-disaster planning and promote sustainability as a strategy for reducing the effects of disasters. Naturally, this objective can only be fully achieved through incorporating not only natural hazards but also the full spectrum of manmade disasters. Interim final regulations on hazard mitigation planning were published in the Federal Register on February 26, 2002 (see 44 CFR Parts 201 and 206).

2. **Comprehensive and other community-oriented planning activities**. If your community has begun developing or updating its comprehensive plan, capital improvement plan, urban design guidelines, land development regulations, growth management or sustainability plans, or other community-oriented guidance, this is a prime opportunity to incorporate planning for manmade disasters. For example, if your community is planning to build a new city hall or hospital, you can incorporate defensive architecture, site planning, and design approaches into the facility planning process to reduce the hazards to the facility from manmade events.

Planners are encouraged to link together as many planning opportunities as possible to maximize coordination, thoroughness, information sharing, and cost-effectiveness. Relevant planning actions may be ongoing or may already have been accomplished in your jurisdiction as part of other emergency management planning initiatives. For example, some jurisdictions completed a community vulnerability assessment as part of the Department of Justice's State Domestic Preparedness Support Program (equipment grant program – now within DHS); this information is directly transferable from first responder planning to mitigation planning.

At the time of this writing, the long-term consequences of the insurance industry's response to the events of September 11, 2001 are not clear. To date, the industry is having difficulty estimating the frequency and magnitude of future terrorism risks and is concerned about ensuring adequate capital to absorb the potential costs of another catastrophic attack. As a result, many insurers are establishing coverage limitations and raising premiums and deductibles for commercial customers. Risk is being shifted from insurers to property owners and business operators, and future attacks may lead to greater direct losses to those impacted—further emphasizing the importance of taking actions to reduce vulnerability and minimize losses.

(Source: General Accounting Office, *Terrorism Insurance: Rising Uninsured Exposure to Attacks Heightens Potential Economic Vulnerabilities*)

The results of the Institute for Business & Home Safety's 2001 study *Are We Planning Safer Communities? Results of a National Survey of Community Planners and Natural Disasters* show that the safest communities are located in states where hazards are a required consideration in comprehensive planning. In many states, however, this "best practice" is not followed. Ideally, hazard considerations are an integral part of state and local comprehensive planning; if they are not, state and local governments should consider requiring that comprehensive planning include all-hazard considerations.

3. **Update of existing mitigation plans or other emergency management plans**. In order to keep plans up-to-date, state and local governments must perform periodic reviews of existing plans. During these reviews, planners should re-evaluate the hazards that can affect their communities and update their plans as appropriate to incorporate manmade hazards.

Step 2
Build the Planning Team

The size and composition of the planning team will depend on the community or state, size of the planning area, planning needs, and resources available. A team approach is optimal because:

a. It encourages participation and gets more people invested in the process

b. It enhances the visibility and stature of the planning process

c. It provides for a broad perspective on the issues

d. It provides the widest possible range of expertise and experience

e. It ensures the use of resources in a coordinated fashion to maximize benefits

Assuming you have already set up your planning team, expanding its scope to incorporate terrorism and technological disasters will require enhancing the team's capabilities by acquiring expertise in a number of disciplines. To ensure that the composition of the mitigation planning team contains the right mix of members, the capabilities of the existing team should be assessed and any gaps filled. To prevent the team from becoming so large as to be unwieldy, a committee/subcommittee approach may be implemented. You may wish to use the categories listed below to define the various subgroup areas of the planning team.

Getting Started: Building Support for Mitigation Planning (FEMA 386-1) outlines methods for identifying stakeholders for a natural hazard mitigation planning process. Existing groups, such as natural hazard mitigation planning teams or emergency planning committees, can serve as ideal bases for manmade hazard mitigation efforts. Such teams should have a broad-based membership that includes, at a minimum, representatives of elected officials, emergency management, first responder agencies, healthcare, local environmental and transportation groups, the media, community groups, and representative owners and operators of private facilities.

A community's hazard mitigation planners are its primary resource for leading and coordinating efforts to reduce vulnerabilities in the built environment. In any given community, however, there may be a variety of other entities operating to the same end, either in concert with mitigation planning or independently. These may comprise public, private, or partnered initiatives; they may cut across local, state, and/or federal jurisdictions; and they may address planning, security, safety, engineering, and other aspects of hazard reduction. While projects such as these are often undertaken in a vacuum—that is, without relation to the community as a whole—their key personnel may possess or have access to expertise and resources that will enhance the ability of the hazard mitigation planning team to meet the state's or community's goals. The importance of thinking inclusively and holistically when recruiting team members becomes especially clear when planners are confronted with new and generally unfamiliar challenges such as integrating manmade hazards into mitigation planning.

Expertise that will be helpful in addressing manmade hazards may be lacking from a purely natural-hazards oriented team. Such expertise includes the following:

- Chemical emergency planning
- Counter- and antiterrorism (law enforcement and military)
- Crime prevention planning, including situational crime prevention and Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)
- Electrical engineering
- Emergency management
- Explosives/blast characteristics
- Fire protection engineering
- Force protection (protection of military personnel and facilities)
- Industrial security
- Mechanical engineering, including heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC)
- Protective/defensive architecture
- Site planning, urban design, and landscape design
- Structural engineering, design, and construction

Although situational crime prevention and Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) are closely related, the two are not synonymous. Situational crime prevention encompasses many CPTED principles but focuses more on managerial and user behavior factors that affect opportunities for criminal behavior in the specific setting for the specific crime(s) being addressed. CPTED, on the other hand, focuses more on changing the physical design aspects of environments to deter criminal activity.

Specialized expertise in these fields can be found at a number of sources, even in communities with modest resources. Additionally, technical assistance from the federal government may be available to communities. Among the many federal organizations offering relevant support are the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the Department of Justice (DOJ). See Appendix C for Web links to these agencies' programs.

See **Worksheet #1: Build the Planning Team** at the end of this section (also included in Appendix D) to help you identify additional team members.

The planning team should work with elected officials to formalize the community's commitment to planning and to promote an atmosphere of cooperation by "authorizing" the planning team to take the steps necessary to develop a mitigation plan for terrorism and technological hazards. At a minimum, this authority can be established through a resolution or proclamation recognizing the team as an authorized agent of the community.

Step 3
Engage the Public

Given the dramatic nature of terrorism and technological hazards, the community will expect to be involved in and informed about the mitigation planning process. *Getting Started* discusses developing a schedule or program for involving the public throughout the mitigation planning process. Adding a manmade hazard element to your public participation program will simply be another step. Keep in mind, however, that care must be taken when presenting certain types of information.

Because citizens may be fearful or upset about recent events and apprehensive about publicized threats, they may want to engage public officials in talking about such issues. The planning team should encourage the public to focus on what they can realistically do to protect their community and limit the time spent discussing issues that are outside the scope of their influence. For example, they may be concerned about travel safety and would like to see changes in airport security, but federal government agencies control these issues—not the local planning team. To alleviate concerns about issues the community has no authority over, the planning team should be informed enough to provide an overview of who the various authorities are and what their responsibilities are for addressing manmade hazards. Including as many stakeholders as possible in the planning process can help turn these concerns into productive considerations and enhance rather than hinder the process.

Planners should note that some issues involved with technological hazards, such as industrial siting, hazardous materials transportation, or chemical storage and processing techniques, may be contentious and can cause friction among citizens, industry leaders, emergency planners, and other decision makers. Local Emergency Planning Committees (LEPCs) will likely already be involved with these issues and should be able to provide insight into how they can be addressed.

There are several stages in the mitigation planning process at which you can inform the public about your efforts to bring manmade hazards into your program. These stages are:

Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment. The planning team should inform the community of the complete spectrum of natural and manmade hazards it identifies and the risks they present, emphasizing that terrorism and technological disasters can strike not just in large cities, but in any community of any size. Although in some cases it will be necessary to limit the kinds of information shared, it is nevertheless important to provide the community with a realistic picture of the hazards and risks and to understand what the community considers to be an acceptable level of risk. It should be emphasized that while no amount of planning and mitigation can remove 100% of the risk from terrorism or technological emergencies, a thorough hazard identification process will help in

prioritizing the community's needs and allocating its resources effectively.

Mitigation Strategy Development. When developing a strategy for the hazard mitigation process, you should hold public meetings or workshops to discuss mitigation actions. The planning team should obtain public input into non-sensitive mitigation decisions, especially if the actions will have a long-term effect such as a change in traffic patterns or an increase in the surveillance of public places. The community should also have input into how to fund some mitigation actions, such as through taxes, bonds, loans, or grant programs. While citizens may be willing to pay for some actions, they may not be willing to support others.

Implementation and Monitoring of the Mitigation Plan. The planning team should keep the community informed of the implementation schedule and progress, although once again, it may be necessary to limit the kinds of information released to the public. The public should also be notified when the mitigation plan is reviewed and updated.

Once you have established community support, expanded the planning team to include manmade hazard experts, and engaged the public in the planning process, you will be ready to perform a hazard identification and risk assessment for your jurisdiction. Phase 2 will guide you through this process.

When addressing antiterrorism and other manmade hazard mitigation actions, you should recognize that many of these are sensitive and that information about them should be restricted to a very limited number of people. You must carefully consider whether each part of the process will be open to the public or whether for security reasons you will have only the planning team and perhaps a limited number of outside stakeholders (such as key public officials not on the planning team) discuss the best actions for certain critical facilities. See Phase 4 for sensitive information issues to consider.

Step 2 of Getting Started *(FEMA 386-1) discusses establishing a planning team with a broad range of backgrounds and experience represented. This worksheet suggests additional individuals, agencies, and organizations that should be included on a team to plan for manmade hazards. State organizations can be included on local teams when appropriate to serve as a source of information and to provide guidance and coordination.*

You should use the checklist as a starting point for expanding your team.

	ON TEAM	ADD TO TEAM
Specialists for Manmade Hazards		
Bomb and Arson Squads	☐	☐
Community Emergency Response Teams	☐	☐
Hazardous Materials Experts	☐	☐
Infrastructure Owners/Operators	☐	☐
National Guard Units	☐	☐
Representatives from facilities identified in Worksheet #2: Asset Identification Checklist	☐	☐
Local/Tribal		
Administrator/Manager's Office	☐	☐
Budget/Finance Office	☐	☐
Building Code Enforcement Office	☐	☐
City/County Attorney's Office	☐	☐
Economic Development Office	☐	☐
Emergency Preparedness Office	☐	☐
Fire and Rescue Department	☐	☐
Hospital Management	☐	☐
Local Emergency Planning Committee	☐	☐
Planning and Zoning Office	☐	☐
Police/Sheriff's Department	☐	☐
Public Works Department	☐	☐
Sanitation Department	☐	☐
School Board	☐	☐
Transportation Department	☐	☐
Tribal Leaders	☐	☐

	ON TEAM	ADD TO TEAM
Special Districts and Authorities		
Airport and Seaport Authorities	☐	☐
Business Improvement District(s)	☐	☐
Fire Control District	☐	☐
Flood Control District	☐	☐
Redevelopment Agencies	☐	☐
Regional/Metropolitan Planning Organization(s)	☐	☐
School Districts	☐	☐
Transit/Transportation Agencies	☐	☐
Others		
Architectural/Engineering/Planning Firms	☐	☐
Citizen Corps	☐	☐
Colleges/Universities	☐	☐
Land Developers	☐	☐
Major Employers/Businesses	☐	☐
Professional Associations	☐	☐
Retired Professionals	☐	☐
State		
Adjutant General's Office (National Guard)	☐	☐
Board of Education	☐	☐
Building Code Office	☐	☐
Climatologist	☐	☐
Earthquake Program Manager	☐	☐
Economic Development Office	☐	☐

	ON TEAM	ADD TO TEAM
Emergency Management Office/ State Hazard Mitigation Officer	☐	☐
Environmental Protection Office	☐	☐
Fire Marshal's Office	☐	☐
Geologist	☐	☐
Homeland Security Coordinator's Office	☐	☐
Housing Office	☐	☐
Hurricane Program Manager	☐	☐
Insurance Commissioner's Office	☐	☐
National Flood Insurance Program Coordinator	☐	☐
Natural Resources Office	☐	☐
Planning Agencies	☐	☐
Police	☐	☐
Public Health Office	☐	☐
Public Information Office	☐	☐
Tourism Department	☐	☐

	ON TEAM	ADD TO TEAM
Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs)		
American Red Cross	☐	☐
Chamber of Commerce	☐	☐
Community/Faith-Based Organizations	☐	☐
Environmental Organizations	☐	☐
Homeowners Associations	☐	☐
Neighborhood Organizations	☐	☐
Private Development Agencies	☐	☐
Utility Companies	☐	☐
Other Appropriate NGOs	☐	☐

phase 2

organize resources
assess risks
develop a mitigation plan
implement the plan and monitor progress