

Committee on Public Safety & Military Affairs
Information Briefing
Tuesday, February 17, 2009
Conference Room 229 – State Capitol
1:00 p.m.

LINDA LINGLE
GOVERNOR

MAJOR GENERAL ROBERT G. F. LEE
DIRECTOR OF CIVIL DEFENSE

EDWARD T. TEIXEIRA
VICE DIRECTOR OF CIVIL DEFENSE



PHONE (808) 733-4300
FAX (808) 733-4287

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF CIVIL DEFENSE
3949 DIAMOND HEAD ROAD
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96816-4495

January 17, 2006

Ms. Tracy A. Henke
Executive Director of Grants and Training
Preparedness Directorate
Washington, D. C. 20531

Dear Ms. Henke:

Nationwide Plan Review

Emergency preparedness and response planning for catastrophic incidents occurring in the State of Hawaii is a work in progress. Like many other states that are vulnerable to potential impacts of hurricanes, earthquake, tsunami, and man-made hazards to include terrorist attacks, Hawaii State Civil Defense and County Civil Defense Agencies continue to collaborate with federal, State, county, Hawaii National Guard, and with non-government organizations to improve upon emergency preparedness plans.

To satisfy the requirements of Preparedness Directorate Information Bulletin No. 197 November 23, 2005, subject as above, a brief narrative self-assessment is attached at Enclosure 1. A statement of certification is attached as Enclosure 2. Narrative and supporting documents from the City and County of Honolulu, an Urban Area Security Initiative jurisdiction are attached at Enclosure 3. Electronic copies of plans, mutual aid agreements, to include a list of after action reports for recent exercises and operations will be forwarded to the Office of Grants and Training as soon as possible.

As the State of Hawaii Director of Civil Defense and Governor's Homeland Security Advisor, I certify that the information provided at the enclosures is true and accurate.

If you have any questions concerning the provided information, please contact me directly at (808) 733-4246 or you may contact Mr. Ed Teixeira, Vice Director of Civil Defense, (808) 733-4301 ext. 501.

Sincerely,

ROBERT G. F. LEE
Major General, HING
Director of Civil Defense

Enclosures

STATE OF HAWAII

NATIONWIDE PLAN REVIEW

BRIEF SELF-ASSESSMENT NARRATIVE

A. Overview

As an insular State, Hawaii is extremely vulnerable to the potential impacts of hurricanes, earthquake, tsunami, flooding, and man-made hazards. Short-term and long-term logistical requirements in terms of food, water, medical, and sanitation and the recovery of critical infrastructure capabilities i.e. transportation nodes, power, and utilities are critical considerations in emergency preparedness and response planning. Given the logistical challenges (time and distance) involved in providing disaster relief and assistance from a less impacted island or from the continental United States, a Category 1 (Saffir-Simpson Scale) hurricane striking any of the four counties would result in a widespread damage, the need for food, water, ice, and sanitation, medical assistance, business interruption, economic losses, significant disaster debris problems, and temporary housing needs for affected communities.

For the purpose of the Nationwide Plan Review self-assessment, the impact of a Category 4 (Saffir-Simpson Scale, sustained winds from 131-155 mph) hurricane on the island of Oahu and two neighboring counties should satisfy the definition of a catastrophic event as outlined in the National Response Plan. The self-assessment narrative, therefore, focuses on the a Category 4 hurricane scenario striking Oahu, portions of Kauai and Maui County with Category 4 hurricane force winds.

B. Current Capability for Mass Evacuations

- 1. Evacuation of Tourists.** The State lacks the capability to successfully conduct emergency evacuations and sheltering in the event of a Category 4 hurricane that impacts Oahu and the neighboring counties of Kauai and Maui. The State will need Federal assistance through a Presidential Emergency Declaration in the pre-landfall stage (within 72 hours of landfall) to evacuate about 120,000 tourists from affected islands. On the average, approximately 140,000 tourists or visitors are in the State, the majority of which will be vacationing on Oahu, Kauai, and in Maui County.

There will not be sufficient aircraft from industry, active military, Hawaii National Guard, and cruise ship vessels available to evacuate visitors to the mainland or to other points along the Pacific Rim within a 72 hour pre-landfall period. It is important to also note that the National Weather Service National Hurricane Center and Central Pacific Hurricane Center (Honolulu) issue hurricane watches when hurricane force winds impact within 36 hours, and hurricane warnings when hurricane force winds impact within 24 hours. The evacuation of tourists,

therefore, at 72 hours before hurricane landfall will be accomplished with a great deal of certainty that a Category 4 hurricane will impact the islands.

- 2. Evacuation of Resident Population.** The State will need Federal assistance through a Presidential Emergency Declaration or Disaster Declaration in the pre-landfall and post-impact stages to support the mass evacuation of about 200,000 Oahu and neighbor island residents to safer island destinations or to mainland evacuation centers. This estimate should include about 100,000 people with special needs (see **Note** below).

In October 2005, Civil Defense in conjunction with the State Department of Health, State Department of Human Services, American Red Cross, and the Healthcare Association of Hawaii assembled a state wide interagency working group to address and improve evacuation and emergency shelter planning for Special Needs groups. To assist in planning, the interagency working group described Special Needs groups in the following categories:

Level I: Those with disabilities who are independent and capable of self-care or care by those who are their daily caregivers (exclusive of the need for electrical power, generator, etc.). This includes the following persons, as a non-exhaustive list: those who use wheelchairs but are capable of transfer; those with stable, controlled conditions such as arthritis; those with mild to moderate muscular conditions with a stable or assisted gait; colostomy patients; patients on special diets; those with artificial limbs or prosthesis; those with mechanical devices, such as pacemakers, implanted defibrillators, insulin pumps; those with visual, speech, or hearing impairments; those with managed, non-acute behavioral, cognitive or mental health illnesses; and those with tuberculosis controlled by medication.

Level II: Those individuals who have ongoing 'enhanced medical needs' and who, by the nature of their condition, need a heightened level of attention. This includes the following persons as a non-exhaustive list: those with attendant medical care and continuous health care support; those with special bed care and/or special toileting arrangements; those with life support equipment; those requiring significant supportive nursing care such as kidney dialysis; those with physician-ordered observation, assistance or maintenance or custodial care; those requiring skilled nursing care due to recent medical treatment; those whose disability prevents them from sleeping on a cot; those who require equipment normally found in a hospital or skilled nursing facility; and those who require assistance in performing activities of daily living or have health conditions whereby they cannot manage for themselves in an evacuation shelter.

Level III: Those individuals who have additional acute medical needs which include women giving birth, individuals having a heart attack, individuals experiencing trauma or injury, who seek the services of an acute hospital, as a situation arises but who would otherwise simply be a part of the general population. In the case of a medical outbreak, a significant portion of the population may immediately be thrown into this category.

Note: "Individuals with special needs" will refer only to Level II individuals who have enhanced medical needs during an emergency or evacuation.

The U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census of Population and Housing reflected a Hawaii population base of 1,211,537. The same census/survey identified 199,819 individuals, or approximately 16.5% of the non-institutionalized population, age 5+ as having a disability or a "long lasting sensory, physical, or mental impairment." Recognizing that this excludes a significant portion of people with disabilities because they live in institutions or long term care facilities, the actual figure will be higher.

Thus, the U.S. Census Bureau estimates that 54 million Americans or about 20% of the U.S. population are individuals with disabilities. Extrapolation to the Hawaii 2004 population base of 1,262,840 people yields an estimate of 252,568 individuals with disabilities.

Some people with disabilities will not require special assistance during an emergency because they are able to take care of themselves. Therefore, while some 16.5 - 20% of the total population has a disability, the national planning average used by emergency management offices, according to an informal national survey conducted by the National Office on Disability, is notably lower at 10 - 13% (National Council on Disability, 2002). This figure acknowledges the self-support capabilities of many people with disabilities and applies to those who need help in an emergency.

Based upon those figures of 10 - 13% extrapolated to Oahu's population of 900,000, the estimated number of people with disabilities for the purposes of emergency management planning is between 90,000 and 117,000 individuals.

- 3. Emergency Shelters.** In December 1998, State Civil Defense completed a State Emergency Sheltering Plan which called for a target of 472,000 emergency shelter spaces. This target is based on the assumption that 35 percent of the population and visitors would seek public emergency shelters in a strong hurricane (Category 2 and higher). The Plan identified a State wide emergency shelter space shortfall for 175,000 people. The majority of the shelter space shortfall centered on Oahu with a shortfall of 111,000 spaces.

In general, the Oahu behavioral analyses found that between 40 and 75 percent of residents would evacuate to some other location if local civil defense or emergency management officials described an approaching hurricane as a weak storm. That percentage increased to 90 percent if the hurricane was described as a strong storm. Given these analyses, the State Emergency Sheltering Plan focused on 35 percent as the average percentage per county of those residents leaving their homes who will go to public shelters during any or all storms.

The emergency shelter shortfall for residents and visitors based on the 1998 Emergency Shelter Plan is currently at 123,600 spaces. Under new and developing hurricane emergency shelter criteria, this shortfall will **increase**.

Those public buildings used as designated public emergency shelters are currently built to the 1997 Uniformed Building Code which requires buildings to meet 80 mph sustained winds with peak gusts up to 105 mph (Category 2 hurricane includes sustained winds from 96-110 mph). Although there is an initiative to adopt a stronger building code for public buildings serving as emergency shelters, the current inventory of emergency shelters will require the evacuation of

certain communities in the event a Category 4 hurricane impacts Oahu and the islands of Kauai, Molokai, Lanai, and Maui.

As mentioned, there is an ongoing initiative to address the evacuation and sheltering of the Special Needs population. The State will need federal assistance through a Presidential Emergency Declaration or Disaster Declaration to obtain support from FEMA for additional Disaster Medical Assistance Teams, Veterinary Medical Assistance Teams, and active military organizations from U.S. Northern Command to assist the State in operating emergency shelters for the Special Needs population in the Level II category.

C. Catastrophic Event Planning. The following responses are our best efforts to describe critical issues and constraints that seriously limit the State's ability to manage a catastrophic event with evacuation and shelter requirements comparable to Hurricanes Katrina and Rita:

1. What changes in authorities or regulations are necessary for your plan to meet the demands of a catastrophic event?

Answer: At the request of the Governor, the President must declare an emergency or disaster for the State of Hawaii early in the pre-landfall stage of a Category 4 or stronger hurricane forecast to impact anywhere in the State of Hawaii. The Under Secretary of Preparedness to include FEMA must adopt regulations and policies to be more involved in assisting states and urban areas in catastrophic planning especially for the access to resources outside of State jurisdiction.

2. What actions are being taken to ensure resiliency of your social services and to ease enrollment processes in the event of a catastrophic event?

Answer: The State and its four counties have initiated a Special Needs Interagency Working Group. The purpose of this working group is to develop a strategic management plan that includes milestones to improve evacuation and sheltering plans for Special Needs populations (Level II). Further discussion will be facilitated among the Department of Human Services, the Department of Health and other state agencies to ascertain barriers to services as a result of enrollment processes. The strategic management plan also includes milestones and objectives for the State Department of Health, State Department of Human Services, and American Red Cross.

3. What actions are being taken to fully address requirements for populations with special needs, particularly persons with disabilities?

Answer: See above. Additionally, the Governor's administrative budget for FY 2006-2007 will include funding for the retrofit of public buildings that could serve as emergency shelters. Funding will include resources needed to equip emergency shelters solely dedicated for the Level II Special Needs population groups.

4. What actions are being taken to ensure prompt evacuation of patients (ambulatory and non-ambulatory) from health care or other facilities?

Answer: State regulations require health care providers for Special Needs population groups to develop emergency plans for their residents or patients. These plans are

supplemented by county and State evacuation plans involving use of public transportation assets, private transportation resources under contract, resources of the Hawaii National Guard, to include resources from active military organizations under the Defense Support to Civil Authorities mutual aid agreements. As part of the Special Needs Planning process previously described, discussion has ensued regarding review of existing procedures and processes for review and expectations of facility/program evacuation plans. In addition, further discussion needs to occur to assure that existing plans in place for acute care facilities (hospitals) are interfaced with these efforts to assure integration of the various plans.

5. What actions are being taken to ensure prompt augmentation of response resources (i.e. law enforcement) following a catastrophic event?

Answer: Current State and county response plans include the immediate employment of State law enforcement agencies and local police departments. Current plans also include the augmentation of the Hawaii National Guard to support State and county law enforcement activities and tasks.

6. What actions are being taken to strengthen regional planning and ensure requests for assistance, which are typically sequential (local-State-Federal) can meet urgent needs?

Answer: State and county emergency operating plans and protocols have for some time included the use of active military (under law), Hawaii National Guard, and federal emergency response teams when authorized by a Presidential Emergency or Disaster Declaration. From a regional perspective, the U. S. Pacific Command may use available resources within the Pacific Theater to assist in emergency response activities (pre-land fall and post-landfall). FEMA Region IX continues to include Hawaii in its Regional Interagency Steering Committee (RISC) activities which have resulted in hurricane preparedness exercises and planning workshops. **(However, this activity is marginally effective. The Department of Homeland Security and FEMA needs to be more involved in assisting states in the development of catastrophic event plans).** Hawaii State Civil Defense Agency and its sister divisions Hawaii Army National Guard and Air National Guard have developed solid relationships with Alaska, Guam, American Samoa, Washington State, and with California, and with Arizona.

7. What actions are being taken to ensure delivery networks of critical services and supplies / products are adequate to meet the increased demand in a catastrophic event?

Answer: State and county agencies continue to work with appropriate government and industry organizations to build capabilities, storage capacities, emergency supplies for a catastrophic event. These efforts include: the ongoing efforts of the State Energy Council and U. S. Army Corps of Engineers to identify emergency generators across the State; the State Department of Health completion of a Strategic National Stockpile Plan; and the Healthcare Association of Hawaii's initiatives to build hospital capabilities for a bio-terrorist incident. Simply stated, the State and counties have much work ahead in planning for the storage of emergency food supplies and re-supply operations.

8. **What actions are being taken to ensure your evacuation planning is mutually supportive among contiguous jurisdictions and States, uses all available transportation modes (ground, rail, air, and sea) and resources, identifies routes of egress / ingress; and identifies destinations and shelter options for displaced populations?**

Answer: Hawaii is an insular State. Islands are separated by ocean channels. The west coast of the Continental United States is approximately 2,500 miles away. Current evacuation planning to out-of-state destinations only addresses the evacuation of our tourist or visitor populations.

- D. Status of Emergency Operations Plans.** The following responses are related to county and State Emergency Operating Plan components for emergency evacuations and sheltering in the event of a Category 4 (Saffir-Simpson Scale) or stronger hurricane impacting the State of Hawaii:

1. Is it *adequate*?

Answer: No. County emergency operating plans are being revised but are do not fully comply with SLG 101 and with other guidance i.e. National Planning Scenarios; Target Capabilities List. The State Plan for Emergency Preparedness and Response, Volume III Disaster Response and Assistance was published in 1991. Portions of this plan have been revised but the current plan does not parallel the National Response Plan.

2. Is it *feasible*?

Answer: No. Within the context of catastrophic event planning, a much broader approach needs to be taken in developing plans for the mass evacuations out-of-state involving 120,000 visitors and 200,000 residents.

3. Is it *acceptable*?

Answer: No. See above.

- E. Operational Solutions.** In 2004, State and county civil defense agencies initiated planning workshops with FEMA, U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, American Red Cross, and other State and county organization for a catastrophic event i.e. Category 4 hurricane impacting the Hawaiian islands. Areas addressed included temporary housing and disaster debris management planning. This planning effort needs to be continued in early 2006 prior to the revision of county and State emergency operating plans. Other short-term actions may include FEMA assistance in catastrophic planning from a regional and national level. Mass evacuations to out-of-state destinations and evacuation centers will involve Inter-State, national, and international agreements.

- F. Preparedness Solutions.** Long-term actions to build the capability needed to address critical issues and constraints identified in the self-assessment include:

- Adopt stronger State wide building codes to sustain Category 4 hurricane force winds.
- Design and construct State public buildings to withstand Category 4 hurricane winds beginning State Fiscal Year 2007.

- Design and construct State public buildings to withstand Category 4 hurricane winds beginning State Fiscal Year 2007.
- Retrofit existing public buildings with hurricane wind resistive devices capable of withstanding Category 4 and higher hurricane force winds.
- Increase the inventory of public emergency shelters throughout the State with emphasis on Special Needs groups to include pet-friendly animal emergency shelters.
- Encourage if not mandate private industry to include healthcare facilities to retrofit buildings to withstand Category 4 and higher hurricane force winds.
- Develop a federal catastrophic plan for the Pacific that outlines procedures for mass evacuations to the Continental U. S. or to non-threatened areas.
- Revise and maintain State and county emergency response plans which must include provisions for mass evacuations to out-of-state destinations in the event a catastrophic disaster is imminent.
- Revise State emergency preparedness plans consistent with the National Emergency Management Baseline – Capability Assessment Program specifically on planning and resource management.
- Develop investment strategies consistent with the State and Urban Area Security Initiative requirements for FY 2006 Homeland Security Grants.
- Continue to build State and county capabilities consistent with National Preparedness Goal priorities including Target Capabilities Lists.
- Continue to develop a plan to address the non-medical response during a pandemic flu period. This scenario will constitute a catastrophic event in that a pandemic flu will overwhelm the response systems at the county, State levels and significantly interrupt federal government operations and emergency services to such an extent that national security will be threatened.
- Expand the FEMA and State Pre-positioned Disaster Supply Program and work with the Defense Logistics Supply Center with preprinted requisitions for emergency re-supply.
- Continue to integrate catastrophic event planning considerations from all emergency response stakeholders representing government and non-government organizations.

Fact Sheet

June 16, 2006
Contact: DHS Press Office, 202-282-8010

NATIONWIDE PLAN REVIEW

Assessing Catastrophic Planning Nationwide

The *Nationwide Plan Review*, the most comprehensive assessment of catastrophic planning yet undertaken in this country, was designed and conducted by the Department of Homeland Security in conjunction with all 56 U.S. States and Territories and 75 of the nation's largest urban areas. The assessment consisted of two phases and was conducted in just over six months.

A Comprehensive, Peer-Validated, Review

The two-phase methodology consisted of a self-assessment by States and urban areas of their own emergency operation plans, followed by an expert peer review. Both phases focused on whether emergency operations plans were sufficient for managing a catastrophic event. The Phase 1 Report, issued February 10, 2006, was compiled using self-assessment data received from States and urban areas. For Phase 2, Peer Review Teams comprised of 77 former State and local homeland security and emergency management officials visited every State and 75 urban areas to review and validate the self-assessments. In total, the Phase 2 teams spoke with 1,086 public safety and homeland security officials and reviewed 2,757 emergency operations plans and related documents. The Phase 2 Report reflects findings from both phases of the Nationwide Plan Review.

No Impact on Homeland Security Grants Program

The 2006 Homeland Security Grant Awards and the Nationwide Plan Review are separate initiatives. The Nationwide Plan Review did not examine the grant applications or awards for any State or urban area. Nor did its findings influence State or urban area grant applications, since the assessment was not completed until after State and urban areas had submitted their grant applications to DHS for review. While States and urban areas are strongly encouraged to review the findings and develop corrective actions, FY06 grant awards will not be adjusted based on the findings of the Nationwide Plan Review.

More Emphasis on Catastrophic Planning Needed

Planners and emergency management officials at all levels of government are working to strengthen plans and formalize mutual aid agreements. Existing plans and capabilities serve the nation well for the events most common in the United States. However, the review found that disaster planning for catastrophic events in the United States suffers from outmoded planning processes, products, and tools. Plans are not coordinated in a systematic fashion and fail to account for the scope of catastrophic events that could potentially occur. The Review outlines 15 initial conclusions for States and urban areas and

24 for the Federal government. Most focus on the need to make specific improvements in plans and to modernize national planning efforts (see attached list of initial conclusions).

The conclusions for States and urban areas include the need for coordination of planning across jurisdictions and levels of government; evacuation; special needs populations; plans for continuity of operations and continuity of government; assuring a command structure; patient tracking; resource management; and both operational and public communications.

The conclusions for the Federal government are focused on providing the tools to build a shared national homeland security planning system; strengthening collaboration and coordination; improving emergency communications; creating incentives for planning and planning excellence; strengthening regional planning capabilities; and developing a common reference system.

Review Summaries

The Nationwide Plan Review process analyzed whether existing emergency plans for States and urban areas are sufficient for managing a catastrophic event. State and urban area summaries reflect the following three assessment levels:

- **Sufficient:** Plans comply with Federal guidance and could meet the requirements of a catastrophic incident.
- **Partially Sufficient:** Plans partially comply with Federal guidance and could meet some, but not all, requirements of a catastrophic incident.
- **Not Sufficient:** Plans were not in place at the time of the Review that were compliant with applicable Federal guidance and could not meet the requirements of a catastrophic incident.

Planning Modernization

The report acknowledges that a strong majority of States and urban areas are already undertaking initiatives to modernize and strengthen existing catastrophic plans. DHS will work collaboratively with States and urban areas to improve plans, support training and exercise initiatives, and engage in discussions on how to meet the catastrophic planning challenges identified in the final Report. The goal remains that communities and states, along with the federal government, possess strong emergency plans that unite national efforts in response to catastrophic disasters. The Department's Undersecretary for Preparedness has established a National Preparedness Task Force to oversee planning modernization and act on specific conclusions. The Task Force will bring together DHS preparedness policy, planning, exercise, evaluation, and field management assets to offer comprehensive solutions to homeland security challenges.

The purpose of the Nationwide Plan Review was to assess the aggregate status of planning at the national level and identify actions to strengthen catastrophic planning. The Department provided participating jurisdictions with detailed individual reports and has encouraged participating States, Territories, and urban areas to translate the findings and conclusions into specific, corrective actions.

Catastrophic incidents by their very nature cut across geographic and political boundaries. Emergency planning must be empowered to collaborate across those boundaries, within a comprehensive and interrelated system. The initial conclusions in this report reflect an understanding that coordinated planning for catastrophic events is of crucial importance to the safety and security of our Nation whether we are preventing and protecting or responding and recovering.

###

Fact Sheet

June 16, 2006
Contact: DHS Press Office, 202-282-8010

NATIONAL PLAN REVIEW INITIAL CONCLUSIONS

Initial Conclusions for States and Urban Areas:

1. The majority of the Nation's current emergency operations plans and planning processes cannot be characterized as fully sufficient to manage catastrophic events as defined in the National Response Plan (NRP).
2. States and urban areas are not conducting adequate collaborative planning as a part of "steady state" preparedness.
3. Assumptions in Basic Plans do not adequately address catastrophic events.
4. Basic Plans do not adequately address continuity of operations and continuity of government.
5. The most common deficiency among State and urban area Direction and Control Annexes is the absence of a clearly defined command structure.
6. Many States and urban areas need to improve systems and procedures for communications among all operational components.
7. All Functional Annexes did not adequately address special needs populations.
8. States should designate a specific State agency that is responsible for providing oversight and ensuring accountability for including people with disabilities in the shelter operations process.
9. Timely warnings requiring emergency actions are not adequately disseminated to custodial institutions, appropriate government officials, and the public.
10. The ability to give the public accurate, timely, and useful information and instructions through the emergency period should be strengthened.
11. Significant weaknesses in evacuation planning are an area of profound concern.
12. Capabilities to manage reception and care for large numbers of evacuees are inadequate.
13. Capabilities to track patients under emergency or disaster conditions and license of out-of-State medical personnel are limited.
14. Resource management is the "Achilles heel" of emergency planning. Resource Management Annexes do not adequately describe in detail the means, organization, and process by which

States and urban areas will find, obtain, allocate, track, and distribute resources to meet operational needs.

15. To strengthen catastrophic planning capabilities, States and urban areas should clearly define resource requirements, conduct resource inventories, match available resources to requirements, and identify and resolve shortfalls.

Initial Conclusions for the Federal Government:

1. Planning products, processes, tools, and technologies should be developed to facilitate a common nationwide approach to catastrophic planning in accordance with the National Preparedness Goal's National Priority to Strengthen Planning and Citizen Preparedness Capabilities.
2. Planning modernization should be fully integrated with other key homeland security initiatives.
3. Clear guidance should be developed on how State and local governments plan for coordinated operations with Federal partners under the National Response Plan.
4. Existing Federal technical assistance should be used to help States and urban areas address the specific issues identified during the Nationwide Plan Review.
5. Critical tasks, target capabilities, and associated performance measures, such as those identified in the National Preparedness Goal should serve as the common reference system for planning and the language of synchronization.
6. Detailed planning assumptions and planning magnitudes for catastrophic incidents should be defined, such as has been initiated through the National Planning Scenarios.
7. Current preparedness data should be readily accessible to planners.
8. Regional planning capabilities, processes, and resources should be strengthened in accordance with the National Preparedness Goal's National Priorities to Expand Regional Collaboration and Strengthen Planning and Citizen Preparedness Capabilities.
9. Collaboration between government and non-governmental entities should be strengthened at all levels, as outlined in the National Preparedness Goal's National Priority to Expand Regional Collaboration.
10. The Federal Government should develop a consistent definition of the term "special needs."
11. The Federal Government should provide guidance to States and local governments on incorporation of disability-related demographic analysis into emergency planning.
12. Federal, State, and local governments should work with the private sector to identify and coordinate effective means of transporting individuals with disabilities before, during, and after an emergency.
13. Improvements in public preparedness and emergency public information should be implemented in accordance with the National Preparedness Goal's National Priority to Strengthen Planning and Citizen Preparedness Capabilities.
14. Federal, State, and local governments should take action to better integrate non-governmental resources to meet surge capacity.
15. The Federal Government should provide the leadership, doctrine, policies, guidance, standards, and resources necessary to build a shared national homeland security planning system.

16. Identification of desired technologies, tools, and architecture(s) for the national homeland security planning community should be included in the National Priority to Strengthen Planning and Citizen Preparedness Capabilities.
17. Comprehensive national guidance on the potential consequences associated with catastrophic risks and hazards should be developed to drive risk management and operational planning.
18. Development of focused training, education, and professional development programs for homeland security planners should be included in the National Priority to Strengthen Planning and Citizen Preparedness Capabilities.
19. Collaborative planning and planning excellence should be incentivized. Funding and projects should be linked to operational readiness through a specific task or capability in a plan or plan annex.
20. Federal, State, and local governments should increase the participation of people with disabilities and disability subject-matter experts in the development and execution of plans, training, and exercises.
21. The Federal Government should provide technical assistance to clarify the extent to which emergency communications, including public information associated with emergencies, must be in accessible formats for persons with disabilities. This assistance should address all aspects of communication, including, for example, televised and other types of emergency notification and instructions, shelter announcements, and applications and forms for government and private disaster benefits.
22. The status of the Nation's plans should be a central focus of the annual report to the President on the Nation's preparedness required by Homeland Security Presidential Directive 8 (HSPD-8)
23. Emergency Operations Plans should be a focal point for resource allocation, accountability, and assessments of operational readiness.
24. Performance management frameworks to support the National Preparedness Goal should measure the ability to:
 - Integrate a multi-jurisdictional and multi-agency response based on the intersection of tasks and capabilities in combined plans; and
 - Maintain operations in the face of disruptions of service, damage to the environment in which operations occur, or loss of critical resources.

###