



LOCAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

PROGRAM STANDARDS WORKBOOK

FOR ASSESSING A LOCAL OR INTER-JURISDICTIONAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

This document was prepared under a grant from FEMA's Grant Programs Directorate, U.S. Department of Homeland Security. Points of view or opinions expressed in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of FEMA's Grant Program Directorate of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1: Introduction to Workbook	1
Chapter 2: Introduction to Local Emergency Management Program Standards	8
Chapter 3: Emergency Management Program: Program Management Assessment.....	9
Chapter 4: Emergency Management Program: Program Elements Assessment	16
Attachment A: Standard Assessment Summary Report.....	76
Attachment B: Supporting Information	81
Supplemental Information: Pre-Disaster Emergency Management Program Requirements	86

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE WORKBOOK

1-1: Purpose

This workbook is intended for a local or inter-jurisdictional emergency management program as a guide for measuring its status in relation to acceptable emergency management standards. It provides a means for strategic improvement of emergency management programs striving to attain a standard of excellence.

1-2: Laws and Authorities

The following are State of Michigan and federal authorities that pertain to emergency management and which apply to (some of) the standards contained in this workbook.

- Michigan Emergency Management Act (P.A.) 390 of 1976, as amended
- Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000
- Homeland Security Act of 2002
- Homeland Security Presidential Directive (HSPD)-5
- Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, as amended
- Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950

1-3: Development and Maintenance

These standards derive from the Emergency Management Standard, September 2010, of the Emergency Management Accreditation Program (EMAP). This workbook has been developed by the Michigan State Police, Emergency Management and Homeland Security Division (MSP/EMHSD) and supersedes EMD Pub 206 and Pub 206a, as a consolidated document. It will be reviewed and updated as needed.

1-4: Organization and Format

This document is divided into four chapters. The first chapter (Introduction to the Workbook), provides general information about the use of the workbook and a list of definitions for terms included in it. The second chapter (Introduction to Local Emergency Management Program Standards) contains information about the standards that the state has accepted for local emergency management programs. The third chapter (Local Emergency Management Program: Program Management Assessment) contains standards and a self assessment pertaining to the program management of an emergency management program. The fourth chapter (Local Emergency Management Program: Program Elements Assessment) contains standards and a self assessment pertaining to the program elements of an emergency management program. Appendix A is an assessment summary report that allows the user to input whether the standard has been met or

not for quick reference. Appendix B provides supplemental information pertaining to the specific requirements for state disaster assistance. The last part of this document is information regarding the pre-disaster requirements for emergency management programs to be eligible for disaster assistance.

1-5: Assessment Guidelines

Each standard is supported by assessment guidelines to provide direction for the emergency management program to meet the standard. These guidelines include the following:

- a. **Standard** - the description of the standard derived from the EMAP.
- b. **Authority** - the reference to either State of Michigan or federal emergency management regulations from which the standard is applicable to. Authorities and their provisions that are cited with the standards in this document are:
 - I. Robert T. Stafford, Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, as amended – for the provision of federal preparedness and disaster assistance.
 - II. P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended – for the appointment of a local emergency management coordinator; establishment of a local emergency management program; and provision of state assistance to counties and municipalities upon the declaration of a state of disaster or emergency.
 - III. Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 – for the provision of hazard mitigation assistance.
 - IV. Homeland Security Act of 2002, authorizing the HSPD-5 – for the provision of federal preparedness assistance, through the adoption of the National Incident Management System (NIMS). [Governor's Executive Directive 2005-9 requires adoption of the NIMS for the provision of federal preparedness assistance (through the State) to subgrantees].

In some instances, a standard may not be applicable to a regulation, yet the standard is still important to attain a level of excellence in emergency management and necessary for EMAP accreditation. Standards not applicable to a regulation will reference "EMAP Accreditation Only" as its authority.

- c. **Intent**- a statement that clarifies the application of the standard in emergency management.
- d. **Self Assessment** – Provides the method to help meet the standard. Elements of federal, state, and local material exist to help a program identify examples that may achieve the standard. Other elements not listed should be reviewed as well. A "Yes" or "No" question is asked to identify if the program meets the standard, and a rationale box provides the area for the program to describe the reasoning for meeting or not meeting the standard. The rationale may indicate a corrective action plan and date of compliance when the standard will be met by the program.

1-6: Assessment Instructions:

The following is an example of how an emergency management program could be assessed using these standards.

1. Identify all individuals who have responsibilities with the emergency management program and set up a meeting to establish a schedule for completing the assessment.
2. Gather material supporting preparedness, prevention, response, recovery, and mitigation strategies in the following elements:
 - Program administration and coordination
 - Financial management
 - State and local laws and authorities
 - Hazard analysis and mitigation
 - Prevention activities
 - Emergency Planning and procedures
 - Incident management
 - Resource management and logistics
 - Mutual Aid
 - Communications and warning
 - Emergency Operations Center (EOC)
 - Training and exercising
 - Crisis communication, public education and information
 - Other
3. Review the standards in Chapter 3 and Chapter 4.
4. Identify the statute/law from which the standard receives its authority. Each standard has been reviewed to determine whether it's applicable to a state or federal authority. If so, the statute/law is referenced under "Authority". If the standard is not relevant to any authorities.
5. Review the "intent" statement to provide additional description and guidance to the standard and relevance to the authority to which it is applicable.
6. Review the pertinent material gathered in step 2 and consult with stakeholders of the program who can provide support for meeting the standard.
7. Determine whether or not the standard can be met with what exists for the program, indicate this decision with a "Yes" or "No" answer, and write a rationale supporting the decision.
8. Use the Summary Report in Attachment A, as a quick reference, to indicate whether the standard has or has not been met, and provide comments. The comment box is a good place to indicate a corrective action date for complying with the standard.

NOTE: EMAP accreditation requires providing authentication for meeting the standard to include: written documentation, verbal explanation (interview), and/or direct observation

1-7: Assumptions

1. To be eligible for state and federal disaster assistance, a county jurisdiction, and/or a municipality of 10,000 or more persons, which has an appointed emergency management coordinator, has established and maintains an emergency management program pursuant to P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended.
2. For EMAP accreditation, the rationale for complying with the standard will be at the discretion of EMAP officials and examples given in this guidance of the elements that support the standard are only guidelines.

1-8: Objectives

A number of objectives can be identified and achieved during the standards assessment including, but not limited to:

- a. A valid examination of the emergency management capabilities of the local jurisdiction.
- b. The establishment of baseline information pertaining to emergency management.
- c. Increased awareness and collaborative dialog between local partners with emergency management responsibilities.
- d. An examination of the goals, objectives, and the mission of the jurisdiction's emergency management program.
- e. Development of action plans and strategic initiatives to maintain or improve the emergency management capability of the local jurisdiction.

1-9: Definitions

CONTINUITY OF GOVERNMENT – Capability to ensure survivability of constitutional and democratic government and the continuity of essential government functions.

CONTINUITY OF OPERATIONS – Capability to continue essential functions and to preserve essential facilities, equipment and records across a broad range of potential emergencies.

DAMAGE ASSESSMENT – The systematic process of determining and appraising the nature and extent of loss, suffering, or harm to a community resulting from an emergency or disaster.

DISASTER – A severe or prolonged emergency which threatens life, property, environment, or critical systems.

EMERGENCY – An incident or set of incidents, natural or human caused, that requires responsive actions to protect life, property, environment, or critical systems.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT - the preparation for and carrying out of all emergency functions, other than military functions, to minimize injury and to repair damage resulting from disasters caused by fire, flood, storm, earthquake, or other natural causes, or enemy attack, sabotage, or other hostile action, and to provide support for rescue operations for persons and property in distress.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT ACCREDITATION PROGRAM - is a voluntary review process for state and local emergency management programs. Accreditation is a means of demonstrating, through self-assessment, documentation and peer review, that a program meets national standards for emergency management programs.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AND HOMELAND SECURITY DIVISION - The division within the MSP that coordinates the comprehensive emergency management activities of state and local government and maintains the Michigan Emergency Management Plan (MEMP).

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM – The program designated by a jurisdiction to coordinate all components of the emergency management system, pursuant to administrative rule R30.51 (e), “State Assistance to Counties and Municipalities”, of the Michigan Administrative Code.

EMERGENCY OPERATIONS PLAN – The public policy document developed by a local jurisdiction for the purpose of organizing and coordinating the emergency management activities of the jurisdiction(s) identified in the document. (Emergency Operation Plans (EOP) are also referred to as “Emergency Action Guidelines” or “EAGs”. Although differing slightly in format and level of content, EOPs and EAGs are, for all intents and purposes, identical documents.)

ESSENTIAL PROGRAM FUNCTIONS – Activities that enable an agency, department, organization or individual to carry out emergency response actions, provide vital services, protect the safety and well-being of the citizens of the jurisdiction, and maintain the economic base of the jurisdiction.

HAZARD – Something that has the potential to be the primary cause of an incident.

HAZARD IDENTIFICATION AND RISK ANALYSIS – A process to identify threats and hazards and their associated risk to persons, property, and structures and to improve protection from natural and human-caused hazards. The Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (HIRA) serves as a foundation for planning, resource management, capability development, public education, and training and exercises.

INCIDENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM – An incident management system is a formalized and institutionalized system that addresses the principles of command and the basic functions of planning, operations, logistics, finance, and administration. An incident management system is modular, scalable, interactive, and flexible; it includes common terminology, manageable span of control, unified command,

consolidated action plans, multi-agency coordination, and integrated communications. Examples include the National Incident Management System, Incident Command System (ICS), or a multi-agency coordination system.

INTELLIGENCE – The results of the process by which specific types of information are requested, collected, and analyzed.

JURISDICTION – a political subdivision or the range of authority or control of a political subdivision.

MITIGATION – Activities that provide a critical foundation to reduce the loss of life and property from natural and/or manmade disasters by avoiding or lessening the impact of a disaster and providing value to the public by creating safer communities. Mitigation seeks to fix the cycle of disaster damage, reconstruction, and repeated damage. These activities or actions, in most cases, will have a long-term sustained effect.

MUTUAL AID AGREEMENT – Written or oral agreement between and among agencies/organizations and/or jurisdictions that provides a mechanism to quickly obtain emergency assistance in the form of personnel, equipment, materials, and other associated services. The primary objective is to facilitate rapid, short-term deployment of emergency support prior to, during, and/or after an incident.

PREPAREDNESS – Actions that involve a combination of planning, resources, training, exercising, and organizing to build, sustain, and improve operational capabilities. Preparedness is the process of identifying the personnel, training, and equipment needed for a wide range of potential incidents, and developing jurisdiction-specific plans for delivering capabilities when needed for an incident.

PREVENTION – Actions to avoid an incident or to intervene to stop an incident from occurring. Prevention involves actions to protect lives and property. It involves applying intelligence and other information to a range of activities that may include such countermeasures as deterrence operations; heightened inspections; improved surveillance and security operations; investigations to determine the full nature and source of the threat; public health and agricultural surveillance and testing processes; immunizations, isolation, or quarantine; and, as appropriate, specific law enforcement operations aimed at deterring, preempting, interdicting, or disrupting illegal activity and apprehending potential perpetrators and bringing them to justice.

RECOVERY – The development, coordination, and execution of service- and site-restoration plans; the reconstitution of government operations and services; individual, private-sector, nongovernmental, and public-assistance programs to provide housing and to promote restoration; long-term care and treatment of affected persons; additional measures for social, political, environmental, and economic restoration; evaluation of the incident to identify lessons learned; post incident reporting; and development of initiatives to mitigate the effects of future incidents.

RESPONSE – Immediate actions to save lives, protect property and the environment, and meet basic human needs. Response also includes the execution of emergency plans and actions to support short-term recovery.

THREAT - Natural or manmade occurrence, individual, entity, or action that has or indicates the potential to harm life, information, operations, the environment, and/or property.

CHAPTER 2

INTRODUCTION TO LOCAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM STANDARDS

2-1: Situation

Pursuant to Rule 30.409 of P.A. 390, of 1976, as amended each county must appoint an emergency management coordinator. In addition, a municipality of a population of 10,000 or more people may appoint an emergency management coordinator, or appoint the county emergency management coordinator as the coordinator for the municipality. Further, a county or a municipality that has appointed an emergency management coordinator may, in accordance to Rule 30.410 of P.A. 390, of 1976, as amended, establish through local legislation, an emergency management program that creates an emergency management organization to provide for disaster mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery activities. If the local emergency management program for each county, and for each municipality that has appointed a separate emergency management coordinator, seeks to be eligible for state and federal emergency management assistance, they must abide by additional state and federal authorities.

The status of an emergency management program permits the county or municipality to receive state and federal assistance for purposes such as reimbursement for disaster response, hazard mitigation, and emergency preparedness activities. It is recommended that emergency management programs maintain their status and abide by state and federal statutes in order to support and provide an emergency management capability for their communities. To help this effort, the MSP/EMHSD has recognized 64 standards, established by the EMAP, for emergency management programs to achieve the capability.

2-2: Concept of Standards

The standards in the following chapters are feasible for any jurisdiction, however a jurisdiction must adapt to the intent of the standard based on its ability to provide an emergency management function. There are a total of 64 standards, of which 32 are relevant to laws and authorities such as P.A. 390, of 1976 as amended, the Robert T. Stafford, Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, as amended, and the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000, in order to be eligible for state and federal emergency management assistance. The other 32 standards are voluntary for a program, but are recognized as equally important. Emergency management programs seeking to attain an accredited program through the EMAP must comply with all 64 standards, based on evaluation by EMAP officials.

Completing the assessments in chapters three and four will improve an emergency management program including: increasing collaboration amongst program stakeholders; assessing capabilities and ultimately identifying methods to enhance them as part of strategic planning; and developing or enhancing a whole community approach to emergency management.

CHAPTER 3

LOCAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM: PROGRAM MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENT

An emergency management program is characterized by visible leadership, support, endorsement, and engagement demonstrated through the elements of its program. This chapter provides a strategy for an emergency management program to assess standards that focus on the program's administration, coordination, and stakeholder involvement.

The following three sections in this chapter encompass six standards:

Section 3.1: Emergency Management Program Administration, Plans and Evaluation

Section 3.2: Emergency Management Program Coordination

Section 3.3: Advisory Committee

Standard 3.1.1: The jurisdiction has a documented emergency management program that includes an executive policy or vision statement for emergency management, a multi-year strategic plan, developed in coordination with emergency management program stakeholders that defines the mission, goals, objectives, and milestones for the emergency management program and includes a method for implementation.

Authority: For EMAP Accreditation only.

Intent: To develop a strategic plan to help a program identify where it presently stands, where it wants to be, and how will it get there over the next two, five, or ten years.

Self Assessment: Review and identify all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Developing a strategic plan.
- Adopting an emergency management resolution.
- Enabling legislation for the emergency management program.
- Developing a strategy for the Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC).
- Adopting by local resolution, EMHSD Pub 206 as the recognized standards for local emergency management in the State of Michigan, and implementation for achieving the standards.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 3.1.2: The emergency management program has a documented method and schedule for evaluation, maintenance, revision, and corrective action for elements contained in Chapter 3 and Chapter 4 of this document, and conducts an evaluation of the objectives consistent with the program’s policies.

Authority: For EMAP Accreditation only.

Intent: There exists a method to identify and evaluate how the program is progressing in implementing objectives and achieving goals. The assessment will determine if additional time and capabilities are needed in specific program areas, which can identify issues early on for the program and creative or feasible solutions can be offered.

Self Assessment: Review and identify all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Identifying methods and schedules for reviewing and updating emergency plans.
- Maintaining and evaluating exercising or training programs.
- Adopting the Homeland Security Exercise Evaluation Program (HSEEP).
- Conducting capability assessments as identified under local planning team responsibilities.
- Assigning LEPC activities.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 3.2.1: The jurisdiction has a designated emergency management agency, department, or office empowered with the authority to administer the emergency management program on behalf of the jurisdiction.

Authority: For EMAP Accreditation only.

Intent: There is a designated office within the jurisdiction to administer the emergency management program to ensure the assignment of responsibilities is conducted and to which accountability is assigned. County programs are typically located within the sheriff's dept, and municipal programs are typically designated either within the police department or the fire department.

Self Assessment: Review and identify all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Designating the program under any jurisdiction's department or agency through the emergency management resolution or ordinance.
- Designating the program in the jurisdiction's emergency plans.
- Submission of EMD-21 Form, Emergency Management Coordinator Information.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 3.2.2: There is an appointed emergency management coordinator to coordinate all matters pertaining to emergency management in the jurisdiction, including mitigation preparedness, response, and recovery.

Authority: P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended.

Intent: There is an emergency management coordinator that is appointed in order to coordinate the emergency management assistance for, and activities of, the jurisdiction with state and federal officials in the event of a declared disaster or emergency for that jurisdiction. Pursuant to P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended, a county shall appoint an emergency management coordinator, and a municipality of 10,000 or more people may appoint an emergency management coordinator.

Self Assessment: Review and identify all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Submitting a current EMD-21 form indicating appointment of:
 - a. an emergency management coordinator, for a county jurisdiction, or
 - b. an emergency management coordinator for a municipality with a population of 10,000 or more people.
- Establishing the position of emergency management coordinator through local legislation.
- Adopting local legislation that enables a program capable of coordinating all mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery activities in the jurisdiction.
- Establishing the day-to-day duties of the coordinator through local legislation.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 3.3.1: There is an appointed local emergency management advisory council and/or local planning team that provides for coordinated input by emergency management program stakeholders in the preparation, implementation, evaluation, and revision of the Emergency Management Program.

Authority: (State) Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP); with the creation of a local planning team.

Intent: There is an advisory council that assists the emergency management coordinator with the preparation, implementation, and evaluation necessary to keep the program current and adequate. The council should consist of the emergency management coordinator and others having expertise, knowledge or authority to commit resources from all key areas within the jurisdiction.

For the provision of assistance through the (State) HSGP within the regionalization structure, a county emergency management program must have a local planning team. A separate municipal emergency management program from the county must assign a representative to serve on the county local planning team. Local planning teams assess the capabilities of the program and identified shortfalls that can be corrected through homeland security funding initiatives.

Self Assessment: Review and identify all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Appointing a local emergency management advisory council. In some communities the role of the advisory council could be handled by the LEPC, the 9-1-1 Board, or other similar existing committee. This may be identified under the local emergency management resolution.
- Appointing a local planning team composed of all first responder disciplines and programs in the county. This appointment must be indicated on the "Planning Team Certification" form provided in the MSP/EMHSD Info Letter Vol 06-12.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 3.3.2: The advisory council and/or planning team meet with a frequency determined by the emergency management program coordinator.

Authority: For EMAP Accreditation only.

Intent: The emergency management program coordinator should be responsible for determining when the advisory council meets. It is important to maintain relationships between the stakeholders of the response agencies and department officials; discussing up and coming activities, exercises, local planning efforts, changes to Authorities that affect the program, and other relevant activities. If a local planning team exists, the team should meet annually to perform capability assessments and other responsibilities as directed by the MSP/EMHSD for Homeland Security funding eligibility. Meetings should be prior to a regional homeland security planning meeting for the program to report capability needs and submit a request for allocation from the regional HSGP award.

Self Assessment: Review and identify all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Establishing a schedule in the strategic plan or other planning documents that identifies a schedule for meeting with program stakeholders.
- Reporting team/stakeholder meetings on annual work agreement forms.
- Submitting a general schedule of meetings to the district coordinator.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

CHAPTER 4

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM: PROGRAM ELEMENTS ASSESSMENT

Chapter 4 contains standards related to the elements of a program which are considered necessary for a viable program. The program's elements are intended to describe the program, including all activities that fall within the scope and purview of the program coordinator as well as the activities he/she coordinates. This includes organizations and agencies assigned prevention, protection, preparedness, mitigation, response, and recovery functions. The program is defined broadly to include activities that bear on the success of the program rather than to exclude activities for which the program coordinator is not directly responsible.

The following fifteen sections encompass fifty-eight standards.

Section 4.1: Administration and Finance: fiscal and administrative procedures in place which support day-to-day and disaster operations.

Section 4.2: Laws and Authorities: legal statutes and Authorities establishing responsibility for development and maintenance of the emergency management program.

Section 4.3: Hazard Identification, Risk Assessment and Consequence Analysis: the responsibilities and activities associated with the identification of hazards and assessment of risks to persons, public and private property, and structures.

Section 4.4: Hazard Mitigation: a program that regularly and systematically utilizes resources to reduce or eliminate the effects of emergencies associated with the risks identified in the hazard identification and risk assessment.

Section 4.5: Prevention: hazard deterrence responsibilities, processes, policies and procedures.

Section 4.6: Operational Planning: documents that describe emergency response; continuity of operations; continuity of government; and recovery from emergencies or disasters.

Section 4.7: Incident Management: a system to analyze emergency situations and provide for clear and effective response and recovery.

Section 4.8: Resource Management and Logistics: pre-emergency, systematic identification of resource requirements, shortfalls and inventories consistent with the hazard identification and risk assessment.

Section 4.9: Mutual Aid: cooperative agreements, contractual service agreements, memoranda of understanding, and regional and/or other arrangements that provide additional equipment, supplies, facilities, and/or personnel.

Section 4.10: Communications and Warning: a plan that provides for using, maintaining, and augmenting all of the equipment necessary for efficient preparation for, response to and recovery from emergencies or disasters.

Section 4.11: Operations and Procedures: operational plans and procedures that are developed, coordinated and implemented among all stakeholders.

Section 4.12: Facilities: facilities necessary to adequately support response and recovery activities.

Section 4.13: Training: a program that includes the assessment, development and implementation of appropriate training for Program officials, emergency management/response personnel and the public.

Section 4.14: Exercises, Evaluations and Corrective Actions: a process to exercise plans, evaluate response and training, and make corrective actions.

Section 4.15: Crisis Communications, Public Education and Information: plans and procedures for crisis communication, public information and education.

Standard 4.1.1: The emergency management program has financial and administrative procedures in place following existing jurisdiction-wide procedures for use before, during, and after an emergency or disaster.

Authority: For EMAP Accreditation only.

Intent: There exist financial and administrative procedures to expedite the process for providing assistance before, during, and after an emergency. Procedures should encompass all concepts of personnel, equipment, and financial assistance to capture and account for every allowable expense pursuant to state and federal assistance.

Self Assessment: Review and identify all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Establishing financial and administrative responsibilities as indicated in the emergency planning documents.
- Establishing procedures used for coordinating assistance with state and federal officials.
- Establishing procedures for applying for a governor’s declaration pursuant to P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended.
- Establishing procedures for submitting reimbursement requests.
- Establishing procedures for maintaining financial records pursuant to P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended.
- Creating time and attendance reports for emergency management activities.
- Submitting quarterly reports to the district coordinator.
- Maintaining and submitting travel and expense vouchers.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.1.2: Procedures provide for maximum flexibility to expeditiously request, receive, manage, and apply funds in emergency situations to ensure timely delivery of assistance and cost recovery.

Authority: For EMAP Accreditation only.

Intent: An emergency or disaster situation can change in any moment without notice hindering the ability to provide assistance and cost recovery activities. This includes inability to contact authorizing individuals, elected officials, or others who have the authority for providing resources. Procedures need to be written and take into account methods to allow for other individuals to step up in absence of another in order to provide immediate assistance, and for other means that provide a “band aid” solution until the situation is contained and proper financial and administrative procedures can be followed.

Self Assessment: Review and identify all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Identifying all agencies authorized to perform financial and administrative duties in emergency plans for applying funds.
- Establishing mutual aid procedures for requesting and reimbursing resources.
- Establishing Memorandum of Understandings (MOUs) to expedite assistance.
- Assigning individuals to authorize financial and administrative activities in absence of officials.
- Establishing policy that allows for various methods of authorization, i.e., electronic signatures, verbal communication, etc.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.2.1: The emergency management program shall comply with applicable legislation, Authorities, directives and policies. Legal authorities provide flexibility and responsiveness to execute emergency management activities in emergency and non-emergency situation. The emergency management program’s responsibilities are established in state and local law. Legal provisions identify the fundamental authorities for the emergency management program, planning, funding mechanisms, and Continuity of Government (COG).

Authority: P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended.

Intent: It is the intent of the standard that an emergency management program conducts activities in accordance to state and local law to provide for disaster mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery efforts. Pursuant to P.A. 390 of 1976, R30.51 as amended, in order to maintain program status and be eligible for state disaster assistance, the program must comply with the applicable program requirements. Local legislation also establishes the responsibilities for the program and legal provisions establish the authority to execute emergency management activities.

Self Assessment: Review and identify all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Adopting local emergency management resolution, ordinance, or other legislation that allows the Chief Elected Official (CEO) to execute emergency management activities in emergency and non-emergency situations.
- Appointing an emergency management coordinator.
- Conducting activities identified through the local emergency management program’s annual work agreement.
- Developing/maintaining an EOP/EAG.
- Designating personnel to staff emergency functions as identified in the EOP/EAG.
- Establishing the emergency duties and powers of the CEO in writing.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.2.2: The emergency management program maintains a process for identifying and addressing proposed legislative and regulatory changes.

Authority: For EMAP Accreditation only.

Intent: The emergency management program should have a process in place that addresses changes required by State and federal legislative and regulatory actions which may affect the sustainment and responsibilities of the emergency management program. The process includes who the stakeholders are, gathering and monitoring the information, assigning responsibility, and a schedule for addressing changes.

Self Assessment: Review and identify all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Conduct advisory council or local planning team meetings to identify and discuss the program.
- Establishing partnerships with other relevant organizations.
- Attending quarterly district meetings.
- Participating in the Michigan Emergency Management Association.
- Attending conferences, summits, trainings.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.3.1: The emergency management program identifies the natural and human-caused hazards that potentially impact the jurisdiction using a broad range of sources. The emergency management program assesses the risk and vulnerability of people, property, the environment, and its own operations from these hazards.

Authority: Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000.

Intent: The foundation for which a jurisdiction’s emergency management actions are built is based on the vulnerable hazards identified and the risks on people, property, and the environment. Hazard identification comes from multiple sources to ensure that all hazards are accounted for and analyzed for potential risk. Pursuant to the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000, a HIRA is required to be eligible for federal hazard mitigation assistance.

Self Assessment: Review and identify all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Conducting a hazard identification and risk assessment in accordance to a planning process, such as provided in EMD Pub 207.
- Developing a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) approved hazard mitigation plan.
- Utilizing the Michigan Hazard Analysis for assessment of hazards.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.3.2: The emergency management program conducts a consequence analysis for the vulnerable hazards to consider the impact on the public; responders; continuity of operations including continued delivery of services; property, facilities, and, infrastructure; the environment; the economic condition of the jurisdiction and public confidence in the jurisdiction’s governance.

Authority: Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000.

Intent: The program, through this process, identifies the consequences of the hazards for vulnerable areas. This analysis helps to prepare and plan better for these vulnerable areas, anticipating consequences or actions and developing contingency plans. It helps the program identify potential mitigation projects to alleviate the impacts and consequences from the hazards. Pursuant to the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000, a consequence analysis is required to be eligible for federal hazard mitigation assistance.

Self Assessment: Review and identify all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Conducting a consequence analysis in accordance to a planning process, such as provided in EMD Pub 207.
- Developing hazard specific plans that indicate impacts on vulnerable areas.
- Developing a Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) or COG Plan indicating potential impacts/disruptions to essential functions.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.4.1: The emergency management program has a mitigation program to eliminate hazards or mitigate the effects of hazards that cannot be reasonably prevented. The mitigation program identifies ongoing opportunities and tracks repetitive loss. The emergency management program implements mitigation projects according to a plan that sets priorities based upon loss prevention.

Authority: Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000.

Intent: The emergency management program establishes a hazard mitigation program to provide more time and strategic focus in hazard mitigation responsibilities, especially if a separate coordinator is hired to manage the program. A jurisdiction may want to consider having a separate program to dedicate more time to lessen impacts on people, property, and environment if the HIRA and consequence analysis is substantial.

Self Assessment: Review and identify all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Establishing a local hazard mitigation program through ordinance or resolution.
- Developing a strategy for the hazard mitigation program that identifies its goals and objectives to include tracking repetitive losses, and implementing mitigation projects.
- Developing a hazard mitigation plan, explaining the mitigation projects and intentions to eliminate or mitigate hazards.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.4.2: The mitigation program participates in applicable federal, state, tribal, local and/or public/private mitigation efforts.

Authority: For EMAP Accreditation only.

Intent: The mitigation program integrates with all public, private, and tribal entities as the hazard mitigation analysis and implemented projects affects all people, property, and environment. Participation is critical from all, including educating one another in order to work together to lessen impacts of hazards.

Self Assessment: Review and identify all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Attending public, private, and tribal meetings pertaining to land use planning or other applicable areas.
- Incorporating federal, state, tribal, local, and/or public/private mitigation activities within the program’s strategy.
- Incorporating participation and relevant activities applicable to these entities in the local hazard mitigation plan.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.4.3: The emergency management program provides technical assistance consistent with the scope of the mitigation program, such as implementing building codes, fire codes, and land-use ordinances.

Authority: For EMAP Accreditation only.

Intent: The emergency management program adopts and promotes the efforts of codes and ordinances administered by local departments that are intended for safety and sustainability purposes which, as a result of their implementation, help to mitigate impacts from hazards.

Self Assessment: Review and identify all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Developing a hazard mitigation plan that proposes various mitigation actions such as building codes, fire codes, and land-use ordinances.
- Conducting meetings and presentations to the general public and entities on activities that can be done to mitigate hazards.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.4.4: The emergency management program has a process to: 1. monitor overall progress of the mitigation strategies, 2. document completed initiatives, and 3. determine the reduction or limitation of hazard impact in the jurisdiction from the results of the mitigation initiatives.

Authority: Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000.

Intent: The emergency management program monitors the jurisdiction's mitigation efforts, by assessing the initiatives/actions taken and how well they have or may improve lessening the impact of hazards. This can help determine feasibility or the necessity of additional initiatives which may hinder or put a burden on the program's capabilities, therefore it is recommended as part of a strategic planning process.

Self Assessment: Review and identify all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Partnering with a community planning agency or land use planning organization to monitor progress of mitigation strategies in concert with land use planning efforts.
- Publishing annual reports of mitigation success stories in community publications.
- Implementing the mitigation monitoring process outlined in the hazard mitigation plan.
- Conducting project tracking monitoring and closeout procedures.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.4.5: The mitigation plan is based on natural and human-caused hazards identified by the emergency management program and the risk and consequences of those hazards. The mitigation plan for the jurisdiction is developed through planning processes involving emergency management program stakeholders and establishes short-term and long-term strategies, goals, objectives, and actions to reduce risk to the hazards identified. The emergency management program implements a process and documents project ranking based upon the greatest opportunity for loss reduction and documents how specific mitigation actions contribute to overall risk reduction.

Authority: Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000.

Intent: It is the intent of the standard that the mitigation plan is developed through a collaborative planning effort from the local government and general public. It describes the hazard mitigation actions that the jurisdiction intends to implement to reduce overall impacts from hazards, while protecting the people, property, and environment. The plan identifies what should be done, how it will be done, and the results of doing it.

Self Assessment: Review and identify all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Developing a local hazard mitigation plan that is written in accordance to the plan content requirements 44CFR 201.6.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.5.1: The emergency management program has a process to prevent incidents. Prevention processes are based on information obtained from a hazard identification and risk assessment, intelligence activities, alert networks and surveillance programs and other sources of information obtained from internal and external stakeholders.

Authority: For EMAP Accreditation only.

Intent: The emergency management program implements strategies to prevent hazards from reaching the community and causing an incident having impact. Whereas mitigation activities are long-term projects that are held in-place for permanent purposes, prevention activities are short-term and adapt to changes or needs. Prevention incidents commonly are implemented by a law enforcement agency.

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Utilizing law enforcement surveillance programs and systems.
- Using public warning systems or announcements of inclement weather approaching, which allows people time to prepare and/or evacuate out of the area.
- Conducting weather spotting activities.
- Training personnel to identify suspicious activities, i.e. “Seven Signs of Terrorism” video.
- Promoting the “See Something, Say Something” campaign.
- Assigning intelligence operations staff / liaison with external agencies.
- Tracking messages from the Homeland Security Information Network (HSIN).
- Utilizing the Michigan Critical Incident Management System (MI CIMS) or other monitoring system.
- Assigning responsibility to the emergency management coordinator to coordinate prevention activities.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.5.2: The emergency management program has a strategy among disciplines to coordinate prevention activities, to monitor the identified threats and hazards, and adjust the level of prevention activity commensurate with the risk.

Authority: For EMAP Accreditation only.

Intent: The emergency management program recommends implementation of prevention activities from all disciplines including fire, law enforcement, Emergency Medical Services (EMS), health, etc. – any agency that plans and prepares for threats and hazards. Each agency should be involved in prevention activities to a degree, based on their agency’s responsibilities and capabilities for conducting activities.

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Assigning prevention activities to each agency identified in the jurisdiction’s basic plan portion of the emergency plan.
- Establishing a jurisdiction wide prevention activities coordinator to coordinate with all agencies in prevention activities.
- Participating in the HSIN.
- Developing a Critical Infrastructure Protection Plan and identifying roles and responsibilities.
- Utilizing MI CIMS or other monitoring system to identify and coordinate prevention activities within the EOC.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.5.3: The emergency management program has procedures for exchanging information between internal and external stakeholders to prevent incidents.

Authority: For EMAP Accreditation only.

Intent: The emergency management program communicates and exchanges threat information between internal and external stakeholders, upon notice, to help one another prepare and act on potential impacts to the jurisdiction.

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Utilizing MI CIMS or other incident management software.
- Utilizing the HSIN.
- Establishing procedures for coordinating reporting with Regional Michigan Intelligence Operation Center (MIOC) liaison and State MIOC.
- Conducting information sharing procedures.

Self Assessment: Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.6.1: The emergency management program has developed the following plans, through a planning process involving stakeholders that addresses all hazards identified in the HIRA and provides for regular review and revision of plans:

- a) EOP/EAG
- b) Communications Plan
- c) Recovery Plan
- d) COOP
- e) COG

Authority: P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended, and as authorized for compliance with MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a.

Intent: Necessary plans are developed to provide direction and guidance in response to all phases and functions of emergencies and the plans are developed by program stakeholders through a planning process that analyzes and determines the hazards to which the jurisdiction is vulnerable. The program reviews the plan and revises it on a regular basis to maintain planning for hazards to which the jurisdiction is vulnerable, and to integrate new hazards, if identified. [Pursuant to P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended, programs are only required to develop an EOP/EAG].

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Developing an EOP/EAG through a planning process consistent with FEMA’s Guide for “Developing State and Local Emergency Operations Plans”, CPG 101 or MSP/EMHSD Pub 201 “Local Emergency Planning Workbook”.
- Utilizing the “Local Hazard Mitigation Planning Workbook”, EMD Pub 207 in the development of plans.
- Utilizing of the “Local Continuity of Planning Handbook”, MSP/EMHSD Pub 110a in the development of plans.
- Utilizing of the Statewide Communications Interoperability Plan (SCIP) in the development of plans.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.6.2: The plans identified in Standard 4.6.1 address the following:

- a) Purpose, scope and/or goals and objectives,
- b) authority,
- c) situation and assumptions,
- d) functional roles and responsibilities for internal and external agencies, organizations, departments and positions,
- e) logistics support and resource requirements necessary to implement plan,
- f) concept of operations,
- g) plan maintenance

Authority: MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a; authorized by P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended.

Intent: It is the intent of the standard that plans contain the basic information of the jurisdiction’s response and recovery purposes and describe the overall operational concept and functions that have been determined to be adequate for the jurisdiction’s emergency needs.

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Developing an EOP/EAG that contains the basic plan content requirements identified in this standard and in MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.6.3: The emergency operations plan/response plan identifies and assigns specific areas of responsibility for performing essential functions in response to an emergency or disaster. [A list of areas of responsibility to be addressed include those plan standards identified in MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a, Review Guide for Local Emergency Operations Plans and Emergency Action Guidelines].

Authority: MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a; authorized by P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended.

Intent: The emergency operations plan identifies and assigns responsibility to specific emergency management functions, as necessary, in response and recovery operations. These functions are contained within the MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a Review Guide.

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Developing an Emergency Operations Plan that contains the plan content requirements identified in MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.6.4: The recovery plan or strategy addresses short-term and long-term recovery priorities and provides guidance for restoration of critical functions, services, vital resources, facilities, programs, and infrastructure to the affected area.

Authority: MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a; authorized by P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended.

Intent: The jurisdiction identifies short-term and long-term priorities that address how it will restore critical functions, services, vital resources, facilities, programs and infrastructure to affected areas. Pursuant to P.A. 390 of 1976 as amended, emergency operations plans must address short-term recovery activities.

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Identifying long term and short-term recovery priorities in strategic plans or emergency plans.
- Assigning recovery actions for disciplines and public service agencies.
- Conducting COOP.
- Developing a Critical Infrastructure Protection Plan.
- Establishing a method of coordinating with utility companies for the restoration of utility services.
- Establishing Mutual Aid Agreements (MAA)/MOUs with utility companies.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.6.5: COOP identify and describe how essential functions will be continued and recovered in an emergency or disaster. The plan(s) identify essential positions and lines of succession, and provide for the protection of safeguarding of critical applications, communications, resources, vital records/databases, processes and functions that must be maintained during response activities and identify and prioritize applications, records, processes and functions to be recovered if lost. Plan(s) are developed for each organization performing essential functions. The plan(s) address alternate operating capabilities and facilities.

Authority: MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a; authorized by P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended.

Intent: The jurisdiction identifies how essential functions will be continued and how vital resources and records will be protected during the emergency in order to maintain government operations and services. Pursuant to P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended, emergency operations plans must address lines of succession, protection of vital records, and other similar areas as indicated in MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a.

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Developing a COOP.
- Developing an EOP/EAG that includes the relevant continuity of operations items identified in MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a.
- Adopting local legislation for the continuity of operations.
- Establish policy for agency vital records/database protection.
- Adopting Act 303, Public Acts of 2000, the Emergency Interim Local Succession Act.
- Listing of primary and alternate EOCs.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.6.6: The COG plan identifies how the jurisdiction’s constitutional responsibilities will be preserved, maintained, or reconstituted. The plan includes identification of succession of leadership, delegation of emergency authority, and command and control.

Authority: MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a; authorized by P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended.

Intent: The jurisdiction identifies the individuals who will continue the constitutional responsibilities of the local government and authorize emergency response, and command and control. Pursuant to P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended, emergency operations plans must address the individuals responsible for activating the plan and personnel and resources, and directing emergency response and recovery as indicated in MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a.

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Developing a COG.
- Developing an EOP/EAG that includes the relevant continuity of government items identified in MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a.
- Adopting local legislation referencing continuity of government.
- Utilizing the Local Continuity Planning Handbook, MSP/EMHSD Pub 110a.
- Act 303, Public Acts of 2000, the Emergency Interim Local Succession Act.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.7.1: The emergency management program has formally adopted an incident management system (i.e. NIMS). The system includes but may not be limited to the following concepts: modular organization, unified command, multi-agency coordination, span of control, common terminology, action planning process, comprehensive resource management, integrated communications and predesignated facilities.

Authority: HSPD-5 that requires the adoption of the NIMS.

Intent: It is the intent of the standard to utilize an incident management system, preferably the NIMS per Executive Directive 2005-9 and HSPD-5, to provide for an efficient and effective emergency response operation amongst multiple agencies and jurisdictions. Adoption of the NIMS is required for eligibility to received federal preparedness grants.

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Adopting an incident management system through local legislation, resolution, or ordinance.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.7.2: The emergency management program has a single point of contact to serve as the coordinator for implementing the incident management system.

Authority: HSPD-5 which requires the adoption and implementation of the NIMS.

Intent: The emergency management program has an appointed individual who serves as the liaison for coordinating and managing the implementation of the incident management system for the jurisdiction.

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Designating the local emergency management coordinator or other recognized individual to serve as point of contact.
- Assigning duties of the emergency management coordinator, including as a point of contact, within the emergency plan or position description.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.7.3: The emergency management program ensures all personnel, with an emergency response role, receive training on its incident management system.

Authority: HSPD-5 which requires the adoption and implementation of the NIMS.

Intent: Emergency personnel, as part of the incident management organization of the emergency management program, must consistently understand the operations of the system in order to work together and provide for an efficient and effective operational system.

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Identifying appropriate personnel to complete the courses.
- Acquiring letters of support from department heads for training personnel.
- Maintaining training record databases.
- Incorporating training requirements into position descriptions.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.7.4: The emergency management program ensures that procedures address coordination activities with all personnel with an emergency response role including supervisor, subordinate and lateral elements, as well as neighboring jurisdictions.

Authority: MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a; authorized by P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended.

Intent: The emergency management program has a method (e.g. the ICS) for the coordination and control of multi-jurisdictional emergency response organizations that respond to an incident. It also has a plan for the coordination and control of individuals responsible for activating the jurisdiction’s plan and emergency personnel and resources, and directing the emergency response and recovery. Pursuant to P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended, emergency operations plans must address a method for the coordination and control of multi-jurisdictional emergency response organizations to an incident (e.g. the ICS).

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Assigning a method of command and control identified in emergency planning documents, such as the ICS.
- Identifying an organizational structure and a coordination system in the emergency plan.
- Utilizing common terminology in the emergency planning documents.
- Identifying lead agencies or supporting agencies in emergency plans.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.7.5: The incident management system includes specific organizational roles and responsibilities for each incident management function.

Authority: MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a; authorized by P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended.

Intent: Roles and responsibilities have been identified for each incident management function described in the plan. Pursuant to P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended, emergency operations plans must address the organizational structures, roles and responsibilities, policies, and protocols that provide emergency support, as indicated in MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a.

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Identifying the organizational structures, roles and responsibilities, policies, and protocols for providing emergency support in the emergency planning documents.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.8.1: The emergency management program has a resource management system that includes objectives and implementing procedures that address the identification, location, acquisition, storage, maintenance and testing, timely distribution, and accounting for services and materials to address the hazards identified by the jurisdiction.

Authority: For EMAP Accreditation only.

Intent: The emergency management program maintains a robust resource management system consisting of methods to identify, locate, acquire, store, maintain and test resources.

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Using a resource management system, such as the MI CIMS, capable of requesting, location, tracking, and maintaining resource status.
- Adopting Michigan Emergency Management Assistance Compact (MEMAC) and abiding by the protocols.
- Conducting equipment maintenance activities and testing equipment.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.8.2: Resource management objectives are established by conducting a periodic gap analysis.

Authority: For EMAP Accreditation only.

Intent: The emergency management program conducts periodic gap analysis to refine and fulfill the processes in managing resources.

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Conducting a planning meeting to analyze and determine actions to identify mutual aid assistance, training activities, and resources systems.
- Conducting assessments measured against standard capabilities, such as the core capabilities listed within the National Preparedness Goal.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.8.3: Resource needs and shortfalls are identified by the emergency management program through a comprehensive assessment that is conducted periodically. Resource needs and shortfalls are prioritized and addressed through a variety of initiatives, which include the budget process, executive process, MAAs, MOUs, contractual service agreements, or business partnerships and steps necessary to overcome any shortfalls.

Authority: MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a; authorized by P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended.

Intent: The emergency management program conducts an assessment to determine shortfalls in resource capabilities, and there exists initiatives that may address the shortfalls and reduce resource gaps. Pursuant to P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended, emergency operations plans must address, in each section, a system for augmenting existing resources, e.g. mutual aid, informal agreements between counties.

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Assessing capabilities against the core capabilities listed within the National Preparedness Goal.
- Conducting exercises and identifying shortfalls.
- Reviewing MAAs and MOUs, and renewing contracts.
- Signing onto MEMAC or the Michigan Mutual Aid Box Alarm System (MABAS) for Fire Departments.
- Establishing contracts with Volunteers Organizations Active in Disaster (VOAD).

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.8.4: The resource management system includes procedures that address the following:

- a) Activating those resources prior to and during an emergency
- b) Dispatching resources prior to and during an emergency
- c) Deactivating or recalling resources during or after an emergency

Authority: MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a; authorized by P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended.

Intent: The resource management system initiates a continuous cycle for activating, deploying, and deactivating resources to ensure sustainment of resource capabilities. Improper procedures in these steps can result in faulty resources and inefficient response operations. Pursuant to P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended, emergency operations plans must identify individuals responsible for activating emergency personnel and resources as indicated in EMHSD Pub 201a.

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Utilizing the MI CIMS for managing resource requests and activation.
- Adopting MEMAC procedures.
- Establishing a credentialing system and procedures for credentialing personnel.
- Developing mobilization procedures for strike teams, damage assessment teams, etc.
- Developing activation and deactivation procedures for the EOC, Joint Information Center (JIC), etc.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.8.5: The emergency management program maintains a system and a plan for obtaining internal and external resources.

Authority: For EMAP Accreditation only.

Intent: The emergency management program has a system for obtaining resources to be used for emergency response and recovery operations.

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Utilizing the MI CIMS.
- Utilizing other systems to obtain internal and external resources.
- Abiding by MEMAC procedures.
- Obtaining EOC personnel training completion records.
- Utilizing resource Registries.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.8.6: The emergency management program has a resource management process allowing for acceptance, management, and distribution of donation of goods and materials, services, personnel, financial resources and facilities either solicited and/or unsolicited.

Authority: MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a; authorized by P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended.

Intent: The emergency management program has a process to manage the donation of solicited and unsolicited goods, including services and personnel. Though donations are welcomed by the community, they can be a detriment to emergency management personnel if managed poorly. Pursuant to P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended, emergency operations plans must contain procedures to collect and distribute donated goods arriving for the community, and contain procedures to organize and coordinate the arrival of emergency volunteers as indicated in MSP/ EMHSD Pub 201a.

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Developing a process similar to that identified in the Disaster Donations Management Plan, i.e., MSP/EMHSD Pub 107, Michigan Disaster Logistics and Donations Management Plan.
- Creating a MOU with VOAD organization for coordination of volunteers and donated goods.
- Utilizing the 211 system for coordinating/assisting with donated goods.
- Accounting system for volunteer personnel.
- Coordinating personnel resources with the MI Volunteer Registry.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.9.1: The emergency management program implements MAAs in plans and/or procedures.

Authority: For EMAP Accreditation only.

Intent: The emergency management program, through the activation of plans and procedures, implements MAAs when resources become exhausted or assistance is needed.

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Identifying a method of activating mutual aid amongst jurisdictions/agencies and which is indicated in plans/procedures.
- Indicating, in each section of the plan, a mutual aid system that is used to augment existing resources between jurisdictions.
- Identifying the persons responsible, in plans and/or procedures, for implementing/activating MAAs.
- Identifying the responsibilities of the CEO as indicated in P.A. 390, as amended, relevant to mutual aid assistance.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.9.2: The emergency management program maintains and implements MAAs, contractual service agreements, MOU, and regional and/or other arrangements that provide additional equipment, supplies, facilities, and/or personnel.

Authority: For EMAP Accreditation only.

Intent: The emergency management program implements agreements or contracts with other entities to provide equipment, supplies, facilities and/or personnel.

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Initiating meetings between organizations to review resources and agreement initiatives.
- Maintaining a database of resource providers.
- Establishing MOU/MAAs with other entities.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.10.1: The emergency management program has a plan to communicate both internally and externally with all emergency management program stakeholders and emergency personnel; system interoperability has been addressed in the development process. Communications have been designed for the specific hazards and requirements of the jurisdiction’s potential operating environments, and are sufficiently robust to provide alternative means of communications in case of failure in primary system(s).

Authority: MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a; authorized by P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended.

Intent: The emergency management program is capable of communicating internal and externally to emergency personnel and that there exists an alternative means for communicating in case of a failure of the primary system. The system should be interoperable with other communication systems. Pursuant to P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended, emergency operations plans must contain procedures to disseminate disaster related information to response personnel, EOC staff, state and federal government officials and the public. Also, procedures must be in place for notifying key personnel when activating the EOC. There exists a method for augmenting existing communication capabilities of emergency response organizations and critical facilities and for communicating between the EOC and the incident command post. Requirements are indicated in MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a.

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Establishing a method of communication to internal and external emergency personnel provided in the EOP/EAG.
- Using a smart messaging system.
- Writing procedures for notifying personnel to report to the EOC.
- Developing community messaging systems.
- Developing an interoperable communications plan.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.10.2: Communication systems are regularly tested on an established schedule under operational conditions and results documented and addressed.

Authority: For EMAP Accreditation only.

Intent: In order to maintain communication capability and operations, the system is routinely tested under various conditions and the tests are documented and issues are addressed, if detected.

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Establishing a schedule for testing communications.
- Establishing policies for testing communications, which include documenting results.
- Identifying 911 dispatch center radio tests schedule.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.10.3: The emergency management program has a plan to initiate, receive, and/or relay warnings to alert key decision makers and emergency personnel. This capacity has been designed for the specific hazards and requirements of the jurisdiction’s potential operating environments, and includes redundancy to provide alternative means of notification in case of failure in primary system(s).

Authority: For EMAP Accreditation only.

Intent: The emergency management program identifies how it intends to notify key officials and emergency personnel of warnings about specific hazards and needs related to the jurisdiction’s operating capabilities. There also exists an alternative means of notification in case of primary systems failure.

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Establishing a system in place for notifying/alerting key officials and emergency personnel, i.e., pagers, email, smart messaging, telephones.
- Using National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) radios to receive weather warnings.
- Using the HSIN.
- Utilizing the Law Enforcement Information Network (LEIN) to receive and relay warnings.
- Utilizing MI CIMS for disseminating and retrieving warnings.
- Providing alternate systems to a primary system.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.10.4: Notification systems are regularly tested on an established schedule under operational conditions and results documented and addressed.

Authority: For EMAP Accreditation only.

Intent: Notification and warning systems are tested on a regular basis to ensure its operational capability and the results of the test are documented.

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Scheduling testing of notification systems.
- Conducting exercises that will include notification system operation.
- Conducting pager/telephone tests for personnel.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.10.5: The emergency management program has developed and maintains a plan to disseminate emergency alerts and warnings to the public potentially impacted by an actual or impending emergency and to communicate reliably with the population within its jurisdiction. Communications have been designed for the specific hazards and requirements of the program's potential operating environments, and include redundancy to provide alternative means of warning in case of failure in primary system(s). The plan addresses dissemination of alerts and warnings to vulnerable populations as defined by the emergency management program.

Authority: MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a; authorized by P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended.

Intent: The emergency management program identifies how it intends to disseminate emergency alerts and warning to the public that could potentially be impacted by an impending emergency. This includes the system for disseminating information to functional and access needs populations. Pursuant to P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended, emergency operations plans must contain procedures for warning special locations, such as schools, hospitals, nursing homes, major industries, institutions and place of worship as well as functional and access needs populations. In addition the plan must have procedures for activating the public warning system, i.e., sirens, public announcement systems, media contacts. Complete descriptions provided in MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a.

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Writing procedures for warning special locations in emergencies.
- Writing procedures for warning functional and access needs populations in emergencies.
- Writing procedures for activating sirens.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.10.6: Warning systems are regularly tested on an established schedule under operational conditions and results documented and addressed.

Authority: For EMAP Accreditation only.

Intent: Warning systems are tested on a routine basis in operational conditions and that the results of the tests are documented.

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Establishing a schedule for testing the warning systems.
- Writing a policy for documenting the tests of warning systems.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.10.7: The emergency management program has developed and maintains formal written procedures to ensure personnel familiarity with and the effective operation of the systems and capabilities of the communications, notifications, and warnings systems. These procedures address the specific hazards and requirements of the emergency management program’s potential operating environments, clearly delineate any decision making processes or triggering events, and are reviewed and updated regularly on an established schedule. The review/update process is recorded and documented.

Authority: For EMAP Accreditation only.

Intent: The emergency management program ensures personnel are familiar with operating the communications, notifications, and warning systems.

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Writing procedures to ensure that operation of the notification and warning systems are efficient and effective for all.
- Writing procedures for activating notification and warning systems.
- Maintaining a record of changes, including date and updates made, on each procedure.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.11.1: The Emergency Management Program has procedures to implement plans.

Authority: MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a; authorized by P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended.

Intent: The emergency management program implements its plans to provide a coordinated response capability to the jurisdiction. Inability to implement a plan correctly or on time can result in increased risks to the vulnerable areas. Pursuant to R30.51, P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended, the emergency management program must provide evidence that it had implemented the emergency operations plan in a timely manner at the beginning of the disaster or emergency. In addition, the emergency operations plan must identify the individuals responsible for implementing each section/annex of the plan. Requirements are described in MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a.

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Identifying individuals authorized to activate the emergency operations plan, and other plans.
- Identifying the primary section holders or annex heads responsible for implementing the plan.
- Having the signatures of the primary section holders or annex heads accepting responsible for maintaining their section/annex of the plan.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.11.2: Procedures reflect operational priorities including life, safety, health, property protection, environmental protection, restoration of essential utilities, and restoration of essential functions and coordination of among all levels of government.

Authority: For EMAP Accreditation only.

Intent: The emergency management program ensures procedures prioritize the protection of people, property, and environment. Incident objectives must reflect the need to protect these vital resources.

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Establishing procedures that initiate actions to protect people, property, and the environment.
- Establishing procedures for the clearance and proper disposal of debris.
- Establishing a method of coordinating with utility companies the restoration of utility services.
- Establishing procedures for health/medical care at shelter facilities.
- Establishing procedures for determining protective actions.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.11.3: Procedures are applicable to all hazards identified in the HIRA.

Authority: For EMAP Accreditation only.

Intent: Procedures are applied to all-hazards, not just specific hazards

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Identifying all hazards to which the jurisdiction is vulnerable and conducting risk assessments.
- Using a scenario-based planning process.
- Identifying all hazards in the appendices of the EOP/EAG sections/annexes.
- Identifying the purpose of the plan.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.11.4: Procedures are developed to guide situation and damage assessment, situation reporting, and incident action planning

Authority: MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a; authorized by P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended.

Intent: There exist procedures that assesses the situation of the emergency and based on the assessment, recommended actions are developed that will alleviate the risk and impact on vulnerable areas. Pursuant to R30.51, P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended, the emergency operations plan must have procedures that cover the inspection, designation, and documentation of damaged structures, as indicated in MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a.

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Establishing damage assessment team/capabilities.
- Conducting incident action planning.
- Utilizing ICS forms.
- Utilizing MI CIMS for recording data and damage assessment information.
- Developing procedures for situational reporting.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.12.1: The emergency management program has a primary and alternate facility capable of coordinating and supporting sustained response and recovery operations consistent with the emergency management program’s risk assessment.

Authority: MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a, authorized by P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended.

Intent: There exists a primary and an alternate EOC for the program to coordinate the emergency response and recovery operations. Pursuant to P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended, emergency operations plans must contain a map or listing of the locations of the primary and alternate EOC, as indicated in MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a.

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Designating a primary and alternate EOC.
- Using the guidance for EOC Management provided in EMHSD Pub 201, “Local Emergency Planning Workbook”.
- Creating a map or listing of EOCs in emergency planning documents.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.12.2: The emergency management program has tested procedures for activation, operation, and deactivation of primary and alternate facilities.

Authority: For EMAP Accreditation only.

Intent: The emergency management program ensures activation, operation, and deactivation of primary and alternate facilities to provide an adequate coordination to emergency response and recovery functions.

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Conducting full-scale exercises utilizing the EOC.
- Documenting the transition of the EOC status in real-time emergencies and noting concerns or triggers.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.13.1: The emergency management program has a formal, documented training program composed of training needs assessment, curriculum, course evaluation, and records of training. The training needs assessment addresses all personnel with responsibilities in the Emergency Management Program, including key public officials.

Authority: For EMAP Accreditation only.

Intent: The emergency management program identifies the necessary training for personnel as part of the emergency management program, including key officials who have responsibilities in accordance to the emergency operations plan. The curriculum is assessed in accordance with the needs of the program, as well as in accordance to other directives, i.e., NIMS. The program maintains a record for individuals to verify completion for certification purposes.

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Adopting The NIMS Training Program, providing guidance to identify individuals and curriculums.
- Assessing personnel training in accordance to credentialing requirements.
- Working towards achieving the Professional Emergency Managers (PEM) certification.
- Utilizing the MITRAIN system as a training database.
- Conducting program capability reviews and assessment.
- Using the Emergency Management Training Curriculum Guide: EMD Pub 701.
- Using the State of Michigan Training and Exercise Plan for reference.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.13.2: Emergency personnel receive and maintain training consistent with their current and potential responsibilities. Specialized training related to the threats confronting the jurisdiction is included in the training program.

Authority: For EMAP Accreditation only.

Intent: Emergency personnel have the skills and capabilities necessary to perform their assigned responsibilities for responding to the threats and hazards identified in the jurisdiction's HIRA. Likewise, individuals responsible for plan development and implementation of the jurisdiction's EOP/EAG should receive training relevant to the EOP/EAG.

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Working through the PEM training program.
- Conducting NIMS and ICS training for emergency responders.
- Completing the training provided through the Emergency Management Institute (EMI), Independent Study Program (ISP) and Professional Development Series (PDS).
- Completing Incident specific response training.
- Completing damage assessment training.
- Completing courses provided through the Emergency Management and Homeland Security Training Center (EMHSDTC).
- Completing training necessary to receive position certification and credentials, or in accordance to standards.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.13.3: Training is regularly scheduled and conducted in conjunction with the overall goals and objectives of the training program. Training is based on the training needs assessment, internal and external requirements and mandates and addresses deficiencies identified in the corrective action process.

Authority: For EMAP Accreditation only.

Intent: Maintain a training schedule for emergency management and response personnel to enhance the program’s overall capabilities for response and recovery operations. Training corrects the resource deficiencies identified in capability assessments.

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Determining what emergency skills are needed in the community and the local government for a disaster response.
- Completing training required for hazardous materials response pursuant to the State of Michigan Occupational Health Rules 325.52101 through 325.52137 (HazWoper).
- Establishing an annual budget for training expenses.
- Identifying training needs in accordance to local, state, and federal authorities for response disciplines, i.e., firefighters, EMS technicians, law enforcement.
- Providing training opportunities through several means such as: formal classes, workshops, one-on-one assistance, conferences, mentor programs.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.13.4: Records are maintained of the training program including names of those who received training, the types of training planned and conducted, and the names and qualifications of trainers. The lengths of time training records will be maintained are specified in the training program.

Authority: For EMAP Accreditation only.

Intent: There exists a database of personnel who have received training that indicates who has completed training, when their training should be refreshed, and for certification purposes. The training database contains information on the trainers who provided the training and their qualifications.

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Maintaining a database of training records including student name, courses completed and date of completion, courses to be completed.
- Maintaining a database of qualified trainers and approved courses to train.
- Obtaining training records and names of qualified instructors from State NIMS Coordinator and State Training Officer (STO).
- Assigning MITRAIN database as a record keeping system for student records.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.14.1: The emergency management program has a documented exercise program that regularly tests the skills, abilities, and experience of emergency personnel as well as the plans, policies, procedures, equipment, and facilities of the emergency management program. The exercise program is tailored to the range of hazards that confronts the jurisdiction.

Authority: P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended.

Intent: The emergency management program establishes an exercise program to test the capabilities of response and recovery operations. An exercise provides the time and resources to review and evaluate emergency management functions and make corrections to plans and procedures based on the evaluation. Pursuant to R30.51 of P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended, a local emergency management program must have an exercise that tests the emergency operations plan at least once each fiscal year (October 1 through September 30).

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Using the State of Michigan Training and Exercise Plan as guidance for the jurisdictions plan.
- Adopting the HSEEP.
- Using the 15 All-hazard planning scenarios for designing an exercise.
- Using EMD Pub 702: Disaster Exercise Manual.
- Developing a Four year exercise work plan.
- Developing exercise reports.
- Conducting annual work agreement to include identifying the schedule of an annual exercise for testing the EOP/EAG.
- Submitting After Action Report (AAR) and improvement plan post exercise.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.14.2: The emergency management program evaluates plans, procedures, and capabilities through periodic reviews, testing, post-incident reports, lessons learned, performance evaluations, exercises, and real-world events. The products of these evaluations are documented and disseminated within the emergency management program, including to key stakeholders and selected partners.

Authority: For EMAP Accreditation only.

Intent: The emergency management program, through its exercise program, evaluates its plans, procedures and capabilities. These are evaluated per standards or targeted levels of measurement.

Self Assessment: Review all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Adopting the HSEEP.
- Using the core capabilities, within the National Preparedness Goal, as a baseline for evaluation.
- Using the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Preparedness Directorate Exercise and Evaluation Division Standards Strategy.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.14.3: A process for corrective actions is implemented to prioritize and track the resolution of deficiencies in real world and exercise events. Corrective actions identified in the corrective action process are used to revise relevant plans.

Authority: MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a, authorized by P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended.

Intent: The emergency management program makes corrective actions to its plans and procedures based on the evaluation of exercises. Maintaining an emergency operations plan means that making corrections to it, as deemed necessary, will be based on exercises, or testing of the plan. Pursuant to P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended, emergency operation plans must describe the methods for developing and maintaining the emergency operations plan, as indicated in MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a.

Self Assessment: Review and identify all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Adopting the HSEEP.
- Using the EMD Pub 702: Disaster Exercise Manual.
- Updating/revising lists made to plans/procedures.
- Describing the methods for developing and maintaining the plan as indicated in EMHSD Pub 201a.
- Submitting AAR and improvement plan post exercise.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.15.1: The emergency management program maintains a documented plan and procedures for its public information function. The public information plan and procedures is designed to inform and educate the public about hazards, threats to public safety, and risk reduction through various media. The public information plan and procedures provides for timely and effective dissemination of information to protect public health and safety, including response to public inquiries and rumors. Protocols are developed to interface with public officials and VIPs. Procedures include a process for obtaining and disseminating public information materials in alternative formats.

Authority: MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a, authorized by P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended.

Intent: The emergency management program has a public information function and a plan and procedures have been developed to guide its implementation during emergencies in accordance with situational needs. The public information function must accommodate functional needs individuals. Pursuant to P.A. 390 of 1976 as amended, the emergency operations plan must describe a method for establishing an information center, procedures for emergency responders to coordinate press releases with the public information official, and procedures for informing the public, including functional needs individuals, of evacuation plans. This is referenced in MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a.

Self Assessment: Review and identify all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Developing a Public information annex or section as part of the EOP/EAG, and which contains the items identified in EMHSD Pub 201a.
- Using EMD Pub 401: Emergency Information Procedures Workbook.
- Coordinating information with the media on releases of public information material.
- Providing materials/resources in various formats for both hearing and vision impaired individuals.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.15.2: The emergency management program has an emergency public information capability that includes:

- a) a central contact facility for the media;
- b) pre-scripted information bulletins;
- c) method to coordinate and clear information for release;
- d) capability of communicating with functional and access needs populations;
- e) protective measure guideline

Authority: MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a, authorized by P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended.

Intent: The public information capability has a coordinating facility that serves as the central location for public information. The public information function ensures that information is accurate and is cleared before it is released, and that people of functional and access needs can be informed of the information as well by various translation means. Pursuant to P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended, the emergency operations plan must contain a method for establishing an information center which will be the official point of contact for the media during an emergency or disaster. It must also include procedures to coordinate and clear information with the jurisdiction's chief executive, and procedures for communicating with functional needs individuals, all as indicated in EMHSD Pub 201a.

Self Assessment: Review and identify all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Establishing a location for a JIC.
- Establishing information bulletins already established to expedite the release of information to the public.
- Establishing policy and procedure that clears information to be released to the public.
- Using translation sources, i.e. translators, teletypewriter capabilities, 211 systems, to provide information to hearing impaired, visually impaired, and non-English speaking individuals.
- Establishing processed for issuing protective actions or measures for release to the public, i.e., evacuation orders.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.15.3: Procedures are tested to support a joint information system and center.

Authority: For EMAP Accreditation only.

Intent: There are procedures establishing a joint information system and center during an emergency. These procedures implement the operation of the JIC and guide public information officials during an emergency or operation.

Self Assessment: Review and identify all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Establishing standard operating procedures for the joint information system and center activation and termination.
- Conducting a full-scale exercise evaluation to include the joint information system and center.
- Conducting JIC exercise.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.15.4: The emergency management program has designated and trained spokespersons qualified to deliver the emergency management program’s message, appropriate to the hazard and audience.

Authority: For EMAP Accreditation only.

Intent: The emergency management program has designated at least three individuals who can deliver messages and will serve in the principal role in the absence of another.

Self Assessment: Review and identify all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Designating a public information official, as well as alternates, to serve as part of the command and general staff.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

Standard 4.15.5: The emergency management program provides for information and education to the public concerning threats to life, safety, and property. These activities include information about specific threats, appropriate preparedness measures, and actions to mitigate the threats including protective actions. Public outreach activities are initiated to ensure that diverse populations are appropriately advised.

Authority: MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a, authorized by P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended.

Intent: The emergency management program has a method to educate the public concerning threats to the community and what actions commonly would be taken. The program must also ensure that individuals with functional and access needs are fully aware of this system. Pursuant to P.A. 390 of 1976, as amended, emergency operations plan must contain procedures for informing the public of evacuation plans before and during an evacuation, including individuals – (a) with disabilities or other functional and access needs; (b) with limited English proficiency; or (c) who might otherwise have difficulty in obtaining such information. In addition the plan must contain procedures to disseminate disaster related information to the public, as well as descriptions of pre-incident and post-incident public awareness, education, and communication plans and protocols. These are further described in EMHSD Pub 201a.

Self Assessment: Review and identify all assessment elements existent for the program.

Examples of elements that support the intent of the standard include, but are not limited to:

- Conducting seminars, presentations, public meetings, and other means to educate the public about threats to their life, safety and property.
- Creating public education materials to educate about emergencies and what to do, self help, in-place sheltering.
- Promoting “Do 1 Thing” activities.
- Utilizing Community Emergency Response Teams (CERT) to promote hazard awareness and planning.
- Developing materials to help families develop plans.
- Developing brochures on hazard awareness to non-English speaking people.

Has the local emergency management program achieved this standard? Yes No

Rationale for Decision:

ATTACHMENT A
STANDARD ASSESSMENT SUMMARY REPORT

	Jurisdiction Name	Date of Assessment	Conducted By:	
Standard	Comments	Unmet	Met	
3.1.1				
3.1.2				
3.2.1				
3.2.2				
3.3.1				
3.3.2				
4.1.1				
4.1.2				
4.2.1				
4.2.2				
4.3.1				

Standard	Comments	Unmet	Met
4.3.2			
4.4.1			
4.4.2			
4.4.3			
4.4.4			
4.4.5			
4.5.1			
4.5.2			
4.5.3			
4.6.1			
4.6.2			
4.6.3			
4.6.4			
4.6.5			
4.6.6			
4.7.1			

Standard	Comments	Unmet	Met
4.7.2			
4.7.3			
4.7.4			
4.7.5			
4.8.1			
4.8.2			
4.8.3			
4.8.4			
4.8.5			
4.8.6			
4.9.1			
4.9.2			
4.10.1			
4.10.2			
4.10.3			
4.10.4			

Standard	Comments	Unmet	Met
4.10.5			
4.10.6			
4.10.7			
4.11.1			
4.11.2			
4.11.3			
4.11.4			
4.12.1			
4.12.2			
4.13.1			
4.13.2			
4.13.3			
4.13.4			
4.14.1			
4.14.2			
4.14.3			

Standard	Comments	Unmet	Met
4.15.1			
4.15.2			
4.15.3			
4.15.4			
4.15.5			

Total:

64

64

ATTACHMENT B**SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

The following is a list of state and federal references and authorities, as well general guidance that can be used in achieving the standards. In addition, the courses provided through the EMI's ISP and PDS available at <http://training.fema.gov/EMI/> contains helpful information and guidance relevant to the standards.

Standard 3.1: Emergency Management Program Administration, Plans and Evaluation

- National Preparedness Goal, Core Capabilities
- PA 390 of 1976, as amended
- Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act
- Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950
- HAZWOPER standard
- Michigan Firefighter Right to Know Act
- Superfund Authorization and Reauthorization Act (SARA) Title III

Standard 3.2: Emergency Management Program Coordination

- R 30.410 of PA 390 of 1976, as amended
- Local Emergency Management Profile, EMD-21
- Emergency Management Coordinator Information Forms, EMD-21
- Emergency Management Performance Guidebook, EMD Pub 208

Standard 3.3: Advisory Committee

- PA 390 of 1976, as amended
- Local Planning Team structure as identified in the EMHSD Info Letter Vol. 06-12
- LEPC's: Organizing for Success, EMD Pub 305

Standard 4.1: Administration and Finance

- Public Assistance Grant Program, State of Michigan Applicant Handbook, EMD Pub 903
- PA 390 of 1976, as amended
- Local Emergency Management Work Agreement, EMHSD-31
- Financial Guidance, EMD Pub 904
- Emergency Management Guidebook, EMD Pub 011

Standard 4.2: Laws and Authorities

- PA 390, of PA 1976, as amended
- Sample Emergency Management Resolutions as provided in EMD Info Letter, dated April 2, 1991
- Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, as amended
- Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000
- Homeland Security Act of 2002
- HSPD - 5

Standard 4.3: Hazard Identification, Risk Assessment and Consequence Analysis

- Conducting a Hazard Analysis, as identified in EMD pub 207, Local Hazard Mitigation Planning Workbook.
- Michigan Hazard Analysis, EMD Pub 103
- National Preparedness Goal, Core Capability – Threats and Hazard Identification

Standard 4.4: Hazard Mitigation

- Local Hazard Mitigation Plan
- 44 CFR 201, Mitigation Planning
- Developing a Local Hazard Mitigation Plan as identified in EMD Pub 207, Local Hazard Mitigation Planning Workbook
- Plan content items pursuant to federal requirements provided in EMD Pub 207, Local Hazard Mitigation Planning Workbook
- Community Comprehensive Plan/Master Plan

Standard 4.5: Prevention

- Training in prevention and surveillance techniques, .e.g., “Seven Signs of Terrorism”
- MIOC
- HSIN
- LEIN (Restricted Access)
- Utilization of MI CIMS for information sharing purposes
- Adoption of building/fire codes, restricting floodplain property development,
- National Preparedness Goal, Core Capabilities – Prevention Mission Area

Standard 4.6: Operational Planning

- Review Guide for Local Emergency Operations Plans and Emergency Action Guidelines, MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a
- Local Emergency Planning Workbook, MSP/EMHSD Pub 201
- Developing State and Local Emergency Operations Plans, CPG 101
- Michigan Emergency Management Plan, MSP/EMHSD Pub 101
- Local Continuity of Planning Handbook, MSP/EMHSD Pub 110a
- Local Emergency Management Program Strategic Plan
- Act 202, P.A. of 1959, the “Emergency Interim Executive Succession Act” and Act 203, P.A. of 1959, the “Emergency Interim Local Succession Act”
- EOP/EAG, COOP, COG Communications Plan, and Recovery Plan documents
- Local Disaster Debris Management Planning Handbook, MSP/EMHSD Pub 109a

Standard 4.7: Incident Management

- “Review Guide for Local Emergency Operations Plans and Emergency Action Guidelines”, MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a
- Governor’s Executive Directive 2005-9, Adoption of the NIMS for Emergency Management in Michigan.
- HSPD-5
- NIMS implementation activities, as identified in correspondence provided by the State each fiscal year
- NIMS, February 2008
- NFPA 1600 Standard for Disaster/ Emergency Management and Business Continuity

Standard 4.8: Resource Management and Logistics

- MI CIMS Resource Request procedures
- MEMAC, October 8, 2004.
- Resource Inventory Verification and Accuracy Procedures
- Local Program and Capability Review as identified in the EMHSD Info Letter Vol. 06-12, March 30, 2006
- MAAs, MOUs, private contractual agreements – intra-county, regional, and state.
- Michigan Disaster Logistics and Donations Management Plan, MSP/EMHSD Pub 107
- Michigan Disaster Logistics and Donations Management Planning Handbook + Plan Template, MSP/EMHSD Pub 107a
- Resource Typing and Inventory Guidance letter, MSP/EMHSD January 22, 2007
- NIMS IS 703, Resource Management Unit course

Standard 4.9: Mutual Aid

- MEMAC, October 8, 2004
- MABAS MAA
- Review Guide for Local Emergency Operations Plans and Emergency Action Guidelines, MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a
- Radio Amateur Civil Emergency Services (RACES), VOAD organizations contracts/MOUs/MOAs

Standard 4.10: Communications and Warning

- Items pursuant to “Review Guide for Local Emergency Operations Plans and Emergency Action Guidelines”, MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a
- MI CIMS
- SCIP
- National Preparedness Goal, Core Capability - Operational Communications
- NIMS Supporting Technology Evaluation Program (STEP)
- National Emergency Communications Plan
- NIMS IS 704: Communications and Information Management
- Emergency Alert Systems (EAS)
- RACES coordination
- Michigan Public Safety Communication System (Michigan State Police)
- Michigan Public Service Commission (MI Dept of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs)

Standard 4.11: Operations and Procedures

- Damage Assessment reporting via MI CIMS
- Michigan Damage Assessment Handbook, MSP/EMHSD Pub 901
- COOP/COG
- R 30.419 of PA 390 of 1976, as amended
- Incident action planning guidance [ICS 300, Intermediate ICS]
- NFPA 1600 Standard for Disaster/ Emergency Management and Business Continuity

Standard 4.12: Facilities

- Review Guide for Local Emergency Operations Plans and Emergency Action Guidelines, MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a

Standard 4.13: Training

- NIMS Training Program, September 2011, http://www.fema.gov/pdf/emergency/nims/nims_training_program.pdf
- MI-Train, web-based training resource, <https://mi.train.org/DesktopShell.aspx>
- MSP/EMHSD PEM Program,
- EMI ISP, <http://training.fema.gov/IS/crslist.asp>
- State of Michigan, Multi-Year Training and Exercise Plan
- HAZWOPER Training in accordance with State of Michigan promulgated Occupational Health Rules
- Emergency Management Training Curriculum Guide, EMD Pub 701

Standard 4.14: Exercises, Evaluations and Corrective Actions

- HSEEP
- State of Michigan, Multi-Year Training and Exercise Plan
- Disaster Exercise Manual, EMD Pub 702
- National Exercise Program (NEP)

Standard 4.15: Crisis Communications, Public Education and Information

- Review Guide for Local Emergency Operations Plans and Emergency Action Guidelines, MSP/EMHSD Pub 201a
- Emergency Information Procedures Workbook, EMD Pub 401
- NIMS, IS-702 Public Information, course

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION**PRE-DISASTER EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS**

This attachment contains the pre-disaster requirements of county and municipal emergency management programs to be eligible for post-disaster assistance per Section 19 of Act 390 of 1976, as amended. To be eligible for assistance, the Emergency Management Program is responsible for providing evidence to the District Coordinator that these requirements are met.

In accordance to R30.53 *Assistance Eligibility*, an applicant shall maintain an emergency management program or be incorporated into a county emergency management program that is established before an emergency or disaster, as defined in the act, is declared. R30.51 defines what an emergency management program means in the following:

1. A program of a county or a combination of not more than 3 adjoining counties, as provided for in PA 390 of 1976, as amended, that has all of the following:
 - a. An emergency management coordinator who is appointed pursuant to the provisions of section 9 of PA 390, of 1976, as amended.
 - b. An ordinance or resolution that creates an emergency management organization to provide for disaster mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery activities.
 - c. An emergency operations plan which is approved by the division, which is on file with the division, and which is in compliance with the standards set forth in R30.52.
 - d. An exercise that tests the emergency operations plan at least once each fiscal year (October 1 to September 30).
 - e. An annual local emergency management work agreement form that is filed with, and approved by, the division. This agreement shall, at a minimum, identify the actions to be taken to improve the mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery activities of the county.
 - f. Designated personnel to staff the emergency/disaster functions as identified in the emergency operations plan.

2. With respect to a municipality that has a population of 10,000 or more persons, a [separate] program that has all of the following elements:
 - a. An emergency management coordinator who is appointed pursuant to the provision of section 9, of PA 390, of 1976 as amended.
 - b. An ordinance or resolution that creates an emergency management organization to provide for disaster mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery activities.
 - c. An approved emergency operations plan which is on file with the division and which is in compliance with the standards set forth in R30.52.
 - d. An exercise that tests the emergency operations plan at least once each fiscal year (October 1 to September 30).
 - e. An annual local emergency management work agreement form that is filed with, and approved by, the division. This agreement shall, at a minimum, identify the actions to be taken to improve the mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery activities of the municipality.
 - f. Designated personnel to staff the emergency/disaster functions as identified in the emergency operations plan.
3. A municipality which has a population of 10,000 or more persons and which has incorporated into the county emergency management program if the municipality has a support emergency operations plan that meets the following criteria:
 - a. The support emergency operations plan describes the relationship between the county emergency management program and the municipality.
 - b. The support emergency operations plan identifies the municipality's response procedures in relation to the county response procedures.
 - c. The support emergency operations plan shall be maintained in accordance with the standards of currentness of the county's emergency operations plan and shall be consistent with the county plan.
 - d. The support emergency operations plan shall contain the signature of the chief executive official of the municipality and be forwarded to the county.
4. A county emergency management program that incorporates, into the program, a municipality which has a population that is less than 10,000 persons and which does or does not have an emergency management coordinator. If a municipality meets the criteria of this subdivision, the municipality is considered to be incorporated into the county emergency management program.

