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FEMA Map Methodology

In order to identify communities that are vulnerable to disasters, two components were utilized. The first component was the number of disasters by county. The second component was the social vulnerability of each county based on eleven groups of variables.

A list of presidential disaster declarations was obtained from FEMA. The list includes presidential disaster declarations from December of 1964 to January of 2008. For purposes of this study, the period from 1998 to 2008 was considered. A total of 14 hazards were included: tornado, flood, hurricane, freeze, snow, severe storm, earthquake, drought, fire, miscellaneous, volcano, fish loss, ice storm, and coastal storms. The miscellaneous category includes dam/levee break, human cause (includes terrorism), mud/landslide, toxic substances, typhoon, and other.

The SoVI index was created by Cutter et al (2003). This index provides a numeric score per county based on eleven categories. The categories are: personal wealth, age, density of the built environment, single-sector economic dependence, housing stock and tenancy, race (African-American and Asian), ethnicity (Hispanic and Native American), occupation, and infrastructure dependence.

Once the list of disasters was obtained as well as the social vulnerability index score, a quartile analysis was conducted. From the list of disasters, a total number of disasters was obtained as well as the total variety of disasters. A quartile analysis was conducted for both variables and each county in the top quartile was coded a four; each county in the second quartile was coded a 3 and so on. The same coding took place for the social vulnerability index score. Counties in the top quartile were coded a 4 and so on.

Finally, all three variables (total disasters, variety of disasters, and social vulnerability index) were coded as top tier, second tier, and residual. Top tier includes counties which had a four on each of the three variables (top quartile in all three variables); second tier includes counties with any combination of 3’s and 4’s (does not include the combination of all 3’s, at least one 4 had to be present to be ranked as second tier); residual includes all other counties that were not top tier or second tier.

References

Dear XXXX,

I am writing to formally invite you to take part in an important meeting involving about 15 individuals from your community who will be asked to share their insights on how to further address the emergency preparedness and response needs of our area’s vulnerable populations. The meeting is part of an important effort being supported by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the U.S. Department of Agriculture. This project came about as a result of the devastating impacts associated with tornadoes, hurricanes, floods, and droughts that have impacted several communities in [State name here] and other places in the South.

Five states (Arkansas, Florida, Louisiana, Missouri, and Oklahoma) have been invited to take part in “on the ground” roundtable discussions. ____ County is only one of two counties in [State name here] that will be taking part in this valuable activity.

The ultimate goal of our meeting is to gain clarity on how best to provide vulnerable households and communities with the knowledge, tools, and capacity needed to effectively respond to a variety of natural disasters. In the end, the input and advice offered by our meeting participants – along with those collected in meetings being hosted in the other four states – will be provided to FEMA and USDA. Our plan is to offer them a specific set of recommendations on how to assist vulnerable community residents be better prepared to respond to major disasters.

As a member of [Agency name here], your participation is vital to our efforts to organize a group of experts and volunteers who are involved with local disaster preparedness, response, and recovery efforts. We value your opinion and hope to gather insight into the current state of emergency preparedness here in ____ County.

The meeting will be held on (date) at (time) in (building). A meal will be provided prior to the start of the meeting, and will be followed by roundtable discussions that will last about three hours. At the end of the meeting, you and others will be invited to consider taking part in a second meeting about a month later. This second meeting will consist of some of the people taking part in your meeting, as well as representatives from disadvantaged or vulnerable members of the community. The purpose of this meeting will be to share insights and strengthen working ties between the key representatives of both groups. If you are unable to attend the first meeting, please send a representative on your behalf.

We hope you will be able to help us shape the future of emergency preparedness in your community. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions on this matter.

We look forward to seeing you on the XXth!

Sincerely,

(Insert Name)
(Title)
(Phone)
(E-mail)
Is your community ready for a disaster?
¿Tu comunidad está preparada para un desastre?

Let's create a community emergency disaster plan that works for everyone.
Para estar mejor preparados ante futuros desastres, hay que diseñar un plan de emergencia que beneficie a toda la comunidad.

You are invited to join a select group of your neighbors. Come tell your community's story and discuss what is needed to help you and your neighbors be better prepared when natural disasters hit.
Asiste con algunos de tus vecinos a una junta donde se compartirán historias y experiencias relacionadas con desastres para estar mejor preparados en el futuro.

Together we can learn from one another and gain new insights on what steps can be taken to prepare for future natural disasters that might strike our community.
Compartiendo sus historias y experiencias aprenderá más de las necesidades de su comunidad en casos de emergencia.

A meeting of key community members will be held on (Date) (Time) (Location)
La junta se llevará a cabo el día _____ a las _____ en _____(Location: (insert))

Dinner (Lunch) and free child care will be provided.
Habrá comida gratis y servicio de guardería gratuito para los que asistan.

Transportation can be accessed by (calling / insert specifics here)
Transporte gratuito al lugar de la junta podrá solicitarse llamando al número _____

For more information, call me (Insert Name of Contact) at (insert Phone number).
Oral Informed Consent Statement

Welcome to the “Building Resilient Communities” roundtables. My name is (state partner) representing (state partner’s university affiliation). We are working with the Southern Rural Development Center to help identify ways to help communities prepare for and cope with natural disasters more effectively.

You are invited to participate in this research by joining a round table discussion group. During these discussions, you will be given an opportunity to share your ideas about how to help your community respond to disasters better. This discussion session will take about three hours to complete. The responses from the discussion sessions will guide future efforts to help communities be better prepared for disasters. We will discuss three topics:

1. How your community responded to the most recent natural disaster(s)
2. What organizations helped respond to the most recent disasters and what other organizations might be willing to help in the future
3. How some communities are planning for disasters and whether or not you think it is a good approach

Someone in your group will be taking notes of important ideas that are discussed, but will not be recording who said what. No names will be recorded with what was said to protect the confidentiality of your responses. In addition, we ask that you do not share what is said today outside of this meeting so that everyone can feel free to speak candidly.

Your responses are important, but you may choose not to answer any question. Your participation is completely voluntary and you may choose to discontinue your participation at any time without penalty.

We will be discussing the community’s recent natural disasters during our time together. It may be uncomfortable for some of you to recall those memories. If you would like to talk to a counseling professional about your experiences with past disasters, contact information for local services are available at the registration table.

If you have questions about this project, please feel free to contact Dr. Bo Beaulieu at the Southern Rural Development Center at 662-325-3507. For additional information regarding your rights as a participant, please feel free to contact the Mississippi State University Regulatory Compliance Office at 662-325-2238.

If you would like to speak to someone from our state about this project, [add your local university contact information here.]

FOR STATES CHOOSING TO OFFER INCENTIVES, PLEASE ADD:
As a thank you gift for your participation today, we will be giving each of you (incentive description).
Copies of this statement are available at the registration table, if you would like to have a copy to keep.
SECTION A - Project Information

(1) Project Title

Building Resilient Communities

(2) Level of Review

Exempt

(3) On-Site Principal Investigator

Principal Investigator: Mary Simon Leuci

Department/Division: Extension

Telephone #: 882-2937

Address:

232 Gentry Hall
Columbia, MO 65211

E-Mail: leucim@missouri.edu

(4) Key Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Dept.</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Educational Training Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bush Rowe, Shelley</td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>Key Personnel</td>
<td>12-06-2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leuci, Mary Simon</td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>Pri-Investigator</td>
<td>01-04-2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eavy, Barbara Jean</td>
<td>MU Extension - Community Development</td>
<td>Key Personnel</td>
<td>05-10-2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans, Eric S.</td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>Co-Investigator</td>
<td>01-24-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaulieu, Bo</td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>Pri-Investigator</td>
<td>11-22-2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION B - Unanticipated Problem Description

(1) Describe the problem, event, or injury. *

Attach additional documents or supplementary information as necessary.

Patty Santos, reporter from the St. Joseph TV station showed up on March 11 and 12 at the focus group sessions and was persistent about filming the meetings.

According to the facilitators (BJ Eavy and Shelley Bush) local organizer, Bev Maltsberger (MU Extension Community Development Specialist in Buchanan County), she had heard about the meeting and came to check it out. (Here is a link to a piece the station had carried in February. This February piece appears to have been generated by the service providers (such as
the fire department) that deal with emergency management. [http://stjoecchannel.com/content/fulltext/?cid=54202. It is a piece that explains the study is happening and the person speaking is not an extension employee and appears to be with the local fire department or in charge of emergency response. Project PIs and key personnel were not aware of this earlier coverage until searching the web on March 16.)

Despite explanations from the facilitators (key personnel) that the people who came there, did so voluntarily and that the study insured confidentiality, the reporter insisted on filming and insinuated that we were not acting in the best interest of the pubic by refusing her request. She said to the local organizer, "This study is being done using federal tax dollars, right? I believe tax payers have a right to know what is happening. TV is a visual media and I need footage to tell the story." The facilitators and organizer realized that some concession would need to be made to keep the peace, because the reporter had never talked to our local extension faculty (the organizer) in that tone. So, in further discussion, they agreed she would only film the 2 tables with the people she had interviewed prior to the meeting, and that she would not do any close-ups of others. The facilitators then made an announcement about the reporter and encouraged people to leave if they did not want to be filmed. Participants said they did not mind being filmed. The one person who left the room returned immediately after the filming was done.

The final story aired on March 12 with footage shot on March 12 is available at: [http://stjoecchannel.com/content/fulltext/?cid=57152. Shelley Bush, Tish Johnson, Bo Beaulieu and Rachel Welborn (SRDC), and I have viewed it and feel that the reporter honored our request in maintaining confidentiality of participants. The two speakers are 1) a resident whom the reporter had interviewed outside the meeting room and who volunteered to speak inside the meeting and 2) the Spanish interpreter who works for MERIL in St. Joseph. Others whose identity are discernable in the footage are the facilitators. We have also shared this with our colleagues at the SRDC at Mississippi State as well as FEMA (funding sponsor) and they feel that the integrity of the research and the confidentiality and integrity of participants was maintained and that no breach has occurred.

Dr. Beaulieu's (SRDC, MS State) comments:
I am impressed by how well they (Shelley and BJ) were able to work through this in a professional and sound manner. I reviewed the video segments and there was nothing I heard that would cause me any heartburn. In some respects, it is gratifying to know that we are all collectively tackling an issue that your constituents have identified as important.

There were 20 local service providers who participated on March 11 and 16 people in attendance at the "Community" meeting on March 12. The latter were all very eager to see changes made to make things better and felt happy that they were being asked their opinion about things.
Many of the participants from both groups want to participate in the April "bridging" meeting.

The PI learned of the event as part of followup to the event. This information has been gathered through additional discussions as well as an internet search of the St. Joseph media.

(2) Select the date of the problem, event, or injury. *

03-12-2009

(3) Is the problem, event, or injury resolved? *

X Yes __ No

(4) If yes, how was it resolved?

On March 11, at the focus group with the local service providers, the facilitators asked the service providers if they cared and they all said "no problem," so she filmed them at work.

On the second day, she came again as the session began. While the facilitators were not pleased to have the media there and did not expect her to return this day, they explained to her that the people who came here, did so voluntarily and that the study insured confidentiality. The reporter then said to the local organizer, "This study is being done using federal tax dollars, right? I
believe tax payers have a right to know what is happening. TV is a visual media and I need footage to tell the story." The facilitators and organizer realized that some concession would need to be made to keep the peace, because the reporter had never talked to our local extension faculty (the organizer) in that tone. So, in further discussion, the facilitators agreed she would only shoot the 2 tables with the people she had interviewed prior to the meeting, and that she would not do any close-ups of others. The facilitators then made an announcement about the reporter and encouraged people to leave if they did not want to be filmed. Participants said they did not mind being filmed.

From the local organizer:
"The one person who left the room did not leave because of the event; she is a high profile person in the Hispanic community, as is her husband, and they were filmed one time at another event (not related to Extension). She received harassing phone calls after the interview aired; so, she just does not allow anyone in the media to film her or take her photo for any reason. She returned immediately after the filming was done. She is a critical contact in the Hispanic community, and I have worked a long time to get her participation; so, her stepping out of the room was no reflection on our program. I have talked with friends who watched the report and all said it was a short piece and the group footage shots were short and individuals were not easily identifiable."

The reporter honored our request in maintaining confidentiality of participants. The two speakers are 1) a resident whom the reporter had interviewed outside the meeting room and who volunteered to speak inside the meeting and 2) the Spanish interpreter who works for MERIL in St. Joseph. Others whose identity are discernable in the footage are the facilitators. We have also shared this with our colleagues at the SRDC at Mississippi State and they feel that the integrity of the research and the confidentiality and integrity of participants was maintained and that no breach has occurred.

(5) Does the participant(s) remain in the study? *

X Yes __ No

(6) If the participant(s) is no longer in the study, please explain why. *

The participant did remain in the study, returning to complete the session after the TV reporter and camera left.

From the local organizer:
"The one person who left the room did not leave because of the event; she is a high profile person in the Hispanic community, as is her husband, and they were filmed one time at another event (not related to Extension). She received harassing phone calls after the interview aired; so, she just does not allow anyone in the media to film her or take her photo for any reason. She returned immediately after the filming was done. She is a critical contact in the Hispanic community, and I have worked a long time to get her participation; so, her stepping out of the room was no reflection on our program."

(7) If the research is funded, was the sponsor notified?

X Yes __ No

(8) If the sponsor was not notified, please explain why and when you intend to contact the sponsor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION C - In the Judgment of the Principal Investigator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Was the unanticipated problem unforeseen? *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Yes __ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Does this unanticipated problem indicate that the research procedures caused harm to participants or others? *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(3) If yes, please explain.

(4) Does this unanticipated problem indicate that the research procedures now place participants or others at increased risk of harm? *

__Yes  X__ No

(5) If yes, please explain.

(6) Identify and explain any changes or modifications that could impact the board's understanding of the risks and benefits of the research project OR that may affect the board's approval decision. *

Participants being able to tell their story voluntarily was viewed by most of them as a positive indication that they are being listened to when it comes to emergency preparedness that takes into account their often overlooked needs.

In general, Extension meetings are open to all and we are perceived to fall within the Sunshine Law especially when a topic of importance to public safety is concerned. And when the media does show up--uninvited or invited--we create PR risk and a risk of alienation of a key partner locally if we handle the situation inappropriately. From the organizer (Bev Maltsberger) in an email to Mary Leuci last Friday: "As you know, the media shows up when you least expect it and you need to be accommodating. I have worked with Patty Santos several years and she is a trusted friend in the media. I was relieved to see that she was the person who came to the meetings! Patty is Hispanic and is a low key advocate for that community whenever she has the opportunity."

Most participants indicated they plan to participate in the followup "bridge meeting" in April where the two groups of participants will engage in a joint discussion.

(7) Corrective Action Plan

A. Are you implementing changes to the Informed Consent process as a result of the unanticipated problem?*

__X__ Yes __ No

B. State your reasoning here.*

ONLY if the media are present and we cannot prevent filming without causing an inappropriate scene. In that event only, we will indicate the following:

We have a reporter here from XXX who wishes to film for background footage and record a few statements during the next xxx minutes. S/he has agreed to only film those who have voluntarily agreed. IF you are in any way uncomfortable, please leave the room during this time as the filming is not a required for participating in this study.

Alternatively, WHERE INTERVIEWS will be conducted outside the meeting: We have a reporter from XXX who is interested in speaking to several participants during the break (or before or after...). This is voluntary and not required as part of this study. If you are interested, please see (who) (place and when).

C. Are you implementing changes to the protocol as a result of the unanticipated problem?*

__X__ Yes __ No

D. State your reasoning here.*
We wish to avoid having a reporter there first. But we cannot guarantee that. The approach to prevent having a reporter filming or taping in the session laid out in the quality assurance section. However, in addition, should we find ourselves in the situation where we cannot convince a reporter to handle inquiries outside the meeting, we would revisit the focus group discussion highlights after the reporter left and ask participants if there are any other comments they wish to make which they might not have been comfortable making in the presence of a reporter or they they might have since they weren't in the room.

E. Are you notifying currently enrolled participants as a result of the unanticipated problem?*

__ Yes  X  No

F. State your reasoning here.*

We do not anticipate the media will show up in Maries County and do not know that the media will show up for future focus group in April in St. Joseph. We do not intend to notify the media that we are holding these sessions either. As participants generally are aware that media may show up at what is perceived to be a community meeting, advance notice does not seem necessary.

For the St. Joseph meeting in April, we will ask our local organizer (Bev Maltsberger) to help us have a discussion upfront with the media (a week before) and the PIs and key personnel how they can cover the story (if they wish to) without filming. We will explain the legal issues of human subjects research while focusing on the benefits of study and suggesting any story can be covered by interviewing community members separately of the event.

Dr. Beaulieu's (SRDC, MS State) comments:
I am impressed by how well they (Shelley and BJ) were able to work through this in a professional and sound manner. I reviewed the video segments and there was nothing I heard that would cause me any heartburn. In some respects, it is gratifying to know that we are all collectively tackling an issue that your constituents have identified as important.

SECTION D - Quality Assurance Mechanism

(1) Describe the Quality Assurance Mechanism that was in place to safeguard human subjects involved in the research. *

In answering, include a statement of the effectiveness of your mechanism.

The facilitators had been IRB-trained and had participated in preparation of the application to IRB. They also had participated in the face-to-face and followup telephone training conducted by the SRDC with representatives from FEMA and USDA-CSREES. They understand the nature of the media's perceptions and relationships with the University of Missouri in outstate Missouri as each is housed in a county Extension office. They have had training and experience in facilitating difficult groups of people and working with complex issues.

Therefore they explained to the TV reporter that the participants were there voluntarily and that the study insured confidentiality. On March 11, participants from local service agencies said they did not mind being filmed as they are often in front of the media when disasters strike and there are complex and controversial issues arising. They were told they were free to leave if they so desired. It was not anticipated that she would return the next day.

When she did return to the meeting room the next day as the session was starting, the facilitators were adamant about the confidentiality and importance of protecting the participating residents, indicating they didn't feel it appropriate for her to film any of the session. The reporter then said to the local organizer, “This study is being done using federal tax dollars, right? I believe tax payers have a right to know what is happening. TV is a visual media and I need footage to tell the story.” The facilitators and organizer realized that some concession would need to be made to keep the peace, because the reporter had never talked to our local extension faculty and Bev Maltsberger in that tone. So, in further discussion, they agreed she would only shoot the 2 tables with the people she had interviewed outside prior to the meeting, and that she would not do any close-ups of others. The facilitators then made an announcement about the reporter and encouraged people to leave if they did not want to be filmed.
One person volunteered to speak to the reporter as part of the meeting and one person left but did return after the reporter left. The final footage that was used did not divulge identity of any other participants and blurred their faces. No other participants spoke in the media clip.

The media piece used was positive about the study and its benefits and about the university.

(2) Was your Quality Assurance Mechanism effective in minimizing the harm to the subject(s)? Please explain in detail. *

The piece shown by the TV station on March 12 does not reveal the identity nor show the face of any participant except one disabled person who volunteered to talk to the reporter and be filmed (this person had visited with the reporter outside the meeting room). The other speaker is the Spanish interpreter, not a participant. She regularly is called upon for interpretation for health and human services in the St. Joseph area. Other discernable faces are those of the facilitators. In reviewing the footage, the PIs and key personnel (facilitators) do not feel that confidentiality was breached.

From the local organizer (Bev Malsberger) and corroborated by facilitators:

"The one person who left the room did not leave because of the event; she is a high profile person in the Hispanic community, as is her husband, and they were filmed one time at another event (not related to Extension). She received harassing phone calls after the interview aired; so, she just does not allow anyone in the media to film her or take her photo for any reason. She returned immediately after the filming was done. She is a critical contact in the Hispanic community, and I have worked a long time to get her participation; so, her stepping out of the room was no reflection on our program. I have talked with friends who watched the report and all said it was a short piece and the group footage shots were short and individuals were not easily identifiable."

(3) Describe any proposed modifications to your Quality Assurance Mechanism. If you are not proposing modifications, please indicate NONE. *

The fact that the TV media showed up has been discussed with the participating universities, a FEMA representative (funding source for SRDC-MS State), and an USDA-CSREES representative in a regularly scheduled conference call held on March 16, 2009 so that all partners in conducting the focus groups can be better prepared for future meetings to deal with any reporters. The agency reps as well as Dr. Beaulieu did not feel that the study nor the participants' security or confidentiality had been risked. For future meetings, the project faculty will work with local organizers to prepare by doing the following:

1) We will ascertain to the extent possible and informally if there has been any mention in the media ahead of time by local agencies or invitees.
2) The University of Missouri will not publicize the event nor do anything to encourage the media to show up.
3) Should the media show up, direct the local organizer to refer media to the facilitators.
4) We will urge filming and/or interviewing outside the session. We will share the questions we are discussing, intent and benefit of the study, and importance of confidentiality with them (indicating that we have a legal responsibility to provide such confidentiality during the focus group sessions). We will indicate that we will also happily share results of the study with them.
5) We will be prepared with an adapted script should we not be able to handle the situation without causing confrontation with the media and disruption. This script will basically indicate to participants that the media has deemed this meeting newsworthy and is briefly here and ask if anyone is opposed. And should they not wish to be filmed or quoted they are free to leave.
Outline of Emergency Preparedness Demonstration
Project Roundtables

INTRODUCTION:  Welcome and Overview of Today’s Roundtable Sessions
(15 minutes)

SESSION 1:  Examining Recent Experiences with Natural Disasters in Our Community
(45 minutes)

We would like to begin by having you focus on your community’s preparation and response to recent natural disasters.

1. First of all, think about the natural disaster(s) that impacted your community over the past 3-5 years. What type of disaster(s) did your community experience (i.e., hurricane, tornado, flood, earthquake, etc.?). When did this (these) take place?

2. What types of damages did your community suffer? Were there specific neighborhoods or sections of your community that were most impacted by the disaster(s)? If so, which areas?

3. How well did your community respond to this disaster(s)?
   a. Do you feel your community was well prepared? That is, did your community have a good disaster plan in place that it followed in preparing for, and responding to the disaster(s)? How well did the plan work? What were its strengths and where might it have fallen short?

   b. Who in your community was least able to prepare for or respond to the disaster(s)? Why were they unable to prepare or respond, in your view? In what specific ways were they impacted by the disaster(s)?
Facilitator note: Be sure your group considers challenges associated with being:

- Elderly
- Disabled
- Families with young children
- Racial and ethnic minorities
- Low income
- Limited education
- Non-English speaking
- Lack of transportation
- Limited information, education, or communication that was targeted to at risk individuals or neighborhoods.

c. What types of assistance or services were available to assist those at greatest risk of suffering from local disasters? What types of assistance or services were needed but not available for these individuals or neighborhoods?

d. Did you get information about the natural disaster ahead of time? What different sources did you rely upon to get information about the disaster? What sources of information did you trust most?

e. In general, what was done right in preparing for and responding to the disaster? What went wrong that you feel needs to be addressed before another disaster hits your community?

SESSION 2: Assessing the Existing Resources in Our Community

(30 minutes)

1. What local organizations are involved in helping your community prepare, respond, and recover from disasters? Please develop a list of these groups.

2. Are there other local organizations or groups that could be valuable in helping your community prepare for and respond to disasters (but who may not have been involved in these types of activities up to now)? If so, please list these organizations/groups (note: these could be either formal or informal groups). Next, indicate the type of activities or services you feel each of these groups could provide.
3. What organizations and individuals do you believe would serve as the best sources of information about the needs of at risk people and neighborhoods? Which of these individuals and organizations would have the trust and respect of at risk people in your community?

SESSION 3: Assessing the EPD Project (60 minutes)

NOTE TO THE FACILITATOR: Introduce the Emergency Preparedness Demonstration Project and show the PowerPoint at this point.

1. The EPD Project recommends a number of steps that communities might follow if they want to improve the chances that local at risk people will be prepared for and better able to respond to disasters. Do you think the steps recommended in the EPD Project are appropriate? What do you like about the steps being recommended? Are there parts of the EPD process that you feel are not workable? Are there some things missing that you feel should be added to these steps?

2. Do you think it’s a good idea to have a “community coach” who would work side-by-side with local neighborhoods or communities in developing an emergency disaster plan that addresses the unique challenges and needs of local at risk individuals? Why or why not?

3. (A) For Those Attending the Meeting of Emergency Management Type Organizations:

   Does your community currently have an up-to-date emergency disaster plan?

   a. If "YES":
      Does it represent a comprehensive plan that addresses the needs of all residents, or does it tend to focus on specific people, households, or neighborhoods that are most vulnerable in times of major disasters?

      i. If comprehensive, who was involved in developing this community plan? Were representatives from all areas of the community involved in helping develop the plan?

      ii. If the plan identifies specific groups that are most at risk to suffering from major disasters, what individuals or groups were targeted? To what extent were representatives from these at risk populations involved in helping develop the plan? Were any at risk groups overlooked? If so, which ones? Why do you believe they were overlooked?

   b. If "NO" or "DON'T KNOW," skip to question 4

3. (B) For Those Attending the Meeting of Community and At Risk Representatives:

   Does your community currently have an up-to-date emergency disaster plan?
a. If YES:
   i. Would you say it is a comprehensive plan for all groups, or does it focus specifically on people, households, and neighborhoods that are likely to be most vulnerable in times of major disasters?

   ii. To what extent were at risk populations actively involved in developing the emergency disaster plan? Were any at risk groups overlooked? If so, which ones? Why do you believe they were overlooked?

b. If "NO" or "DON'T KNOW," skip to question 4

4. Do you feel the vulnerability assessment process developed as part of the EPD project offers a useful way to identify at risk people and neighborhoods? Is the effort to map out the location of these individuals and neighborhoods in the community a valuable activity? Who do you think should develop the maps that show the location of vulnerable populations and neighborhoods (that is, people living in these areas? Local or state government officials? State universities or colleges?)? Do you think it's a good idea to have local people review the maps to make sure the information on these maps is accurate?

5. Should people living in disadvantaged neighborhoods in the community be encouraged to develop a disaster plan for their neighborhood or community, even if a community-wide disaster plan exists already? What would be the best way to ensure local emergency management and local government leaders would respond in a positive way to the plan developed by residents of disadvantaged neighborhoods? In other words, what would be the best way to build a strong working relationship between emergency management/local government leaders and representatives of at risk and disadvantaged groups?

WRAP-UP SESSION (15 minutes):

Are there any final thoughts that you have about this roundtable session? Is there anything we may have overlooked? Any specific recommendations you want to make sure we consider with regard to the EPD Project?

Invitation to attend the Bridge Meeting: At this time, invite individuals attending your roundtable session to take part in your upcoming "Bridge Meeting." Gather the names and contact information for those who express an interest in taking part in this important event.
On behalf of (your university) and our partner organizations (SRDC, CSREES/USDA, and FEMA) we want to thank you for your valuable contribution to our roundtable meeting.
Building Resilient Communities Agenda

[Location]

[Date]

10:00 Welcome and Overview of Today’s Roundtable Sessions

10:15 SESSION 1: Examining Recent Experiences with Natural Disasters in Our Community

This session will focus on recent disasters your community has faced, exploring what was done right during the preparation and responses stages, and what could be improved for the future.

11:00 SESSION 2: Assessing the Existing Resources in Our Community

During this session, we will consider the types of resources that your community has used in preparation and response to disasters in the past. We will also identify other potential sources that may be interested in helping in the future.

11:30 Break

11:45 SESSION 3: Assessing the EPD Demonstration Project

During this session, we will view a short presentation of the Emergency Demonstration Project, which shows one way communities have designed plans to address the needs of at-risk people during a disaster. When the presentation is complete, we will discuss how useful we think this process would be in other communities.

12:45 Wrap Up

This final session will provide a few moments to add any thoughts or ideas that have not been shared. We will also talk about an opportunity to participate in another session to talk about this issue further.

1:00 Adjourn
**SESSION 1: Recent Experiences with Natural Disasters in Our Community**

1. What type of natural disaster(s) did your community experience? When did this (these) take place?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disaster</th>
<th>Date: (Approximate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>Summer 2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 

2. 

3. 

2. What types of damage did your community suffer? Were there specific neighborhoods or sections of your community that were most impacted by the disaster(s)? If so, which areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Damage</th>
<th>Area of town / Neighborhood / Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof Damage</td>
<td>Red Brick Apartments, Sutter Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 

2. 

3. 

Notes:
3. How well did your community respond to this disaster(s)?

a. Do you feel your community was well prepared? [ ] Yes [ ] No

*Please explain*

Did your community have a good disaster plan in place that it followed in preparing for and responding to the disaster(s)? [ ] Yes [ ] No

*Please explain*

How well did the plan work? (Please describe.)
Session 1, Continued

3 b. Who in your community was least able to prepare for or respond to the disaster(s)?

Why were they unable to prepare or respond, in your view?

In what specific ways were they impacted by the disaster(s)?

3 c. What types of assistance or services were available to assist those at greatest risk of suffering from local disasters?

What types of assistance or services were needed but not available for these individuals or neighborhoods?
Session 1, Continued

3d. Did you get information about the natural disaster ahead of time? [ ] Yes [ ] No

*Please explain*

What different sources did you rely upon to get information about the disaster?

What sources of information did you trust most?

3e. In general, what was done right in preparing for and responding to the disaster?

What went wrong that you feel needs to be addressed before another disaster hits your community?
SESSION 2: Assessing the Existing Resources in Our Community

1. What local organizations are involved in helping your community prepare, respond, and recover from disasters? Please develop a list of these groups.

2. Are there other local organizations or groups that could be valuable in helping your community prepare for and respond to disasters (but who may not have been involved in these types of activities up to now)? If so, please list these organizations/groups. Next, indicate the type of activities or services each of these groups could provide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organization</th>
<th>Activity or Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example:</td>
<td>Homeless Shelter, Food, Blankets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macy James Community Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SESSION 3: Assessing the EPD Project

1. The EPD Project recommends a number of steps that communities might follow if they want to improve the chances that local at risk people will be prepared for and better able to respond to disasters.

   Do you think the steps recommended in the EPD Project are appropriate?  
   Please explain.  
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

   What do you like about the steps being recommended?

   Are there parts of the EPD process that you feel are not workable?

   Are there some things missing that you feel should be added to these steps?
Session 3, continued

2. Do you think it's a good idea to have a "community coach" who would work side-by-side with local neighborhoods or communities in developing an emergency disaster plan that addresses the unique challenges and needs of local at risk individuals?  Yes [ ]  No [ ]

Why or why not?

3. Does your community have an up-to-date emergency disaster plan?  Yes [ ]  No [ ]

If yes:

Would you say it is a comprehensive plan for all groups, or does it focus specifically on people, households, and neighborhoods that are likely to be most vulnerable in times of major disasters?

To what extent were at risk populations actively involved in developing the emergency disaster plan?

Were any at risk groups overlooked?  Yes [ ]  No [ ]

If so, which ones?

Why do you believe they were overlooked?
Session 3, continued

4. Do you feel the vulnerability assessment process developed as part of the EPD project offers a useful way to identify at risk people and neighborhoods?

*Please explain*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is the effort to map out the location of these individuals and neighborhoods in the community a valuable activity?

*Please explain*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Who do you think should develop the maps that show the location of vulnerable populations and neighborhoods (that is, people living in these areas? Local or state government officials? State universities or colleges?)?

Do you think it's a good idea to have local people review the maps to make sure the information on these maps is accurate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Should people living in disadvantaged neighborhoods in the community be encouraged to develop a disaster plan for their neighborhood or community, even if a community-wide disaster plan exists already?

*Please explain*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What would be the best way to ensure local emergency management and local government leaders would respond in a positive way to the plan developed by residents of disadvantaged neighborhoods? In other words, what would be the best way to build a strong working relationship between emergency management/local government leaders and representatives of at risk and disadvantaged groups?
Table/Group Number: ________

WRAP UP SESSION

Are there any final thoughts that you have about this roundtable session?

Is there anything we may have overlooked?

Any specific recommendations you want to make sure we consider with regard to the EPD Project?
Emergency Preparedness Demonstration (EPD)

1. Step One: Find a Community
   a. Recent disasters
   b. At risk people
   c. Leaders wanting to help
   d. Others wanting to help

2. Step Two: Talk to Leaders
   a. Explain the steps
   b. Talk about what could be used to help
   c. Set times to meet
   d. Find places to meet
   e. Decide who to invite

3. Step Three: Community Meeting
   a. Tell people about the steps
   b. Get help to:
      i. Learn from the past
      ii. Learn about the community
      iii. Write a plan
      iv. Start the plan

4. Step Four: Learn about the Community
   a. Look at past plans
   b. Talk to people
   c. Put these on a map:
      i. Kinds of disasters
      ii. Areas at risk
      iii. People at risk
      iv. Big job sites
      v. Safe places (hospitals, schools, shelters)
      vi. Dangers
   d. Get help from the community

5. Step Five: Make the Plan
   a. Write the plan
   b. Get help from the community
   c. Finish the plan

6. Step Six: Start the Plan
   a. Raise money
   b. Learn new skills
Building Resilient Communities Agenda

[Location]

[Date]

10:00 Welcome and Overview of Today’s Roundtable Sessions

10:15 SESSION 1: Examining Recent Experiences with Natural Disasters in Our Community

This session will focus on recent disasters your community has faced, exploring what was done right during the preparation and responses stages, and what could be improved for the future.

11:00 SESSION 2: Assessing the Existing Resources in Our Community

During this session, we will consider the types of resources that your community has used in preparation and response to disasters in the past. We will also identify other potential sources that may be interested in helping in the future.

11:30 Break

11:45 SESSION 3: Assessing the EPD Demonstration Project

During this session, we will view a short presentation of the Emergency Demonstration Project, which shows one way communities have designed plans to address the needs of at-risk people during a disaster. When the presentation is complete, we will discuss how useful we think this process would be in other communities.

12:45 Wrap Up

This final session will provide a few moments to add any thoughts or ideas that have not been shared. We will also talk about an opportunity to participate in another session to talk about this issue further.

1:00 Adjourn
SESSION 1: Recent Experiences with Natural Disasters in Our Community

1. What type of natural disaster(s) did your community experience? When did this (these) take place?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disaster</th>
<th>Date: (Approximate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>Summer 2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1.      |                     |
| 2.      |                     |
| 3.      |                     |
| 4.      |                     |

Notes:
2. What types of damage did your community suffer? Were there specific neighborhoods or sections of your community that were most impacted by the disaster(s)? If so, which areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Damage</th>
<th>Area of town / Neighborhood / Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roof Damage</td>
<td>Red Brick Apartments, Sutter Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. ____________________________

2. ____________________________

3. ____________________________

4. ____________________________

Notes:
3. How well did your community respond to this disaster(s)?

a. Do you feel your community was well prepared?        [ ] Yes        [ ] No

   Please explain

Did your community have a good disaster plan in place that it followed in preparing for and responding to the disaster(s)?        [ ] Yes        [ ] No

   Please explain

How well did the plan work? (Please describe.)

What were its strengths?
Session 1, Continued

3 b. Who in your community was least able to prepare for or respond to the disaster(s)?

Why were they unable to prepare or respond, in your view?

In what specific ways were they impacted by the disaster(s)?

3 c. What types of assistance or services were available to assist those at greatest risk of suffering from local disasters?

What types of assistance or services were needed but not available for these individuals or neighborhoods?
Session 2, continued

3. What organizations and individuals do you believe would serve as the best sources of information about the needs of at risk people and neighborhoods? Which of these individuals and organizations would have the trust and respect of at risk people in your community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organization</th>
<th>Level of Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example:

Community Career Center

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.
SESSION 3: Assessing the EPD Project

2. The EPD Project recommends a number of steps that communities might follow if they want to improve the chances that local at risk people will be prepared for and better able to respond to disasters.

Do you think the steps recommended in the EPD Project are appropriate?

*Please explain.*

Yes [ ]

No [ ]

What do you like about the steps being recommended?

Are there parts of the EPD process that you feel are not workable?

Are there some things missing that you feel should be added to these steps?
Session 3, continued

2. Do you think it's a good idea to have a “community coach” who would work side-by-side with local neighborhoods or communities in developing an emergency disaster plan that addresses the unique challenges and needs of local at risk individuals?  
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

   Why or why not?

3. Does your community have an up-to-date emergency disaster plan?  
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

   If yes:
   Does it represent a comprehensive plan that addresses the needs of all residents, or does it tend to focus on specific people, households, or neighborhoods that are most vulnerable in times of major disasters?

   If comprehensive, who was involved in developing this community plan? Were representatives from all areas of the community involved in helping develop the plan?

   If the plan identifies specific groups that are most at risk of suffering from major disasters, what individuals or groups were targeted? To what extent were representatives from these at risk populations involved in helping develop the plan?

   Were any at risk groups overlooked?  
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

   If so, which ones?

   Why do you believe they were overlooked?
Session 3, continued

4. Do you feel the vulnerability assessment process developed as part of the EPD project offers a useful way to identify at risk people and neighborhoods?  

[ ] Yes [ ] No

*Please explain*

Is the effort to map out the location of these individuals and neighborhoods in the community a valuable activity?  

[ ] Yes [ ] No

*Please explain*

Who do you think should develop the maps that show the location of vulnerable populations and neighborhoods (that is, people living in these areas? Local or state government officials? State universities or colleges?)?

Do you think it's a good idea to have local people review the maps to make sure the information on these maps is accurate?  

[ ] Yes [ ] No

*Please explain*

5. Should people living in disadvantaged neighborhoods in the community be encouraged to develop a disaster plan for their neighborhood or community, even if a community-wide disaster plan exists already?  

[ ] Yes [ ] No

*Please explain*

What would be the best way to ensure local emergency management and local government leaders would respond in a positive way to the plan developed by residents of disadvantaged neighborhoods? In other words, what would be the best way to build a strong working relationship between emergency management/local government leaders and representatives of at risk and disadvantaged groups?
WRAP UP SESSION

Are there any final thoughts that you have about this roundtable session?

Is there anything we may have overlooked?

Any specific recommendations you want to make sure we consider with regard to the EPD Project?
Emergency Preparedness Demonstration (EPD)

1. Step One: Site Selection
   a. Recently experienced a disaster
   b. Large numbers of at risk people
   c. Key people willing to help
   d. Supportive community-based organizations
   e. Supportive local Office of Emergency Management

2. Step Two: Community Connections
   a. Clarify the purposes, roles, and responsibilities
   b. Discuss availability of resources
   c. Set community meeting schedule
   d. Identify neutral meeting locations
   e. Decide who should be invited to participate

3. Step Three: Community Orientation
   a. Introduce the community to the project
   b. Recruit volunteers for a community team to:
      i. Conduct the Community Assessment
      ii. Map vulnerable areas of the community
      iii. Develop the plan
      iv. Implement the plan

4. Step Four: Community Assessment
   a. Assess existing plans
   b. Survey community needs
   c. Conduct focus groups
   d. Complete a vulnerability assessment - Mapping important features:
      i. Hazards
      ii. Areas of greatest risk
      iii. People and property that are at risk
      iv. People with special needs
      v. Major employers and critical facilities (hospitals, schools, shelters)
      vi. Environmental threats
   e. Community feedback

5. Step Five: Plan Development
   a. Vision statement
   b. Goals and objectives
   c. Community review
   d. Final plan
   e. Accountability
   f. Sustainability

6. Step Six: Plan Implementation
   a. Fund raising
   b. Technical assistance
Bridge Meeting Outline

We want to thank everyone for joining us again today. Before we get started, we want to remind everyone that this meeting is part of a continuing effort to determine how communities might better prepare for natural and other types of disasters. Your community was chosen to serve as a pilot community – only 1 of 10 in the nation. Our meeting today is to review the important information that emerged from the two roundtable sessions we recently held in your community. We especially want to discuss the EPD (Emergency Preparedness Demonstration) process and how it might be of value in helping focus attention on the needs of “at-risk” people, neighborhoods and communities. We are glad that you have joined us again to be part of this important discussion.

READ ORAL CONSENT FORM

Note to the Meeting Facilitator: The red boxes are designed to provide additional information for you as the facilitator. They are provided as guidelines and facilitators are encouraged to use their best judgment on how to make the various sessions most productive and valuable to the participants.

Meet and Greet: -- Time Needed: Approx. 15 minutes

This time should be very group driven. Each team of facilitators should discuss what they believe would be the best way to get the participants to feel comfortable with one another. The suggested activity listed below is a good icebreaker, but feel free to use another icebreaker technique, if that is your preference.

Setting the Stage for the Icebreaker: Participants form two circles, one inside the other so that the inner circle faces the outer circle forming pairs of people facing each other. Each pair introduces themselves to their partner and answers one question. After a few minutes, the inner circle rotates so that new pairs were formed and another question is answered. Questions could be:

- Why were you interested in attending this meeting today?
- What is the one thing you hope happens today?

More questions could be added and the circle could rotate more to broaden the activity.

Invite the participants to come back to their seats.

Now Conduct a Debriefing:

What is the most interesting thing you heard during this activity?
Session 1: Community Similarities – Timed Needed: Approx. 20 minutes

For this session, you will create a list of items that emerged from the two meetings that appear to be similar; in other words, issues or topics that were pretty consistent in both meetings. You can present the list on a PowerPoint slide or have a handout (or both) that you can review with your bridge meeting participants.

Here are some possible areas for these listings. However, it is important to remember that the list should contain items that you feel are consistent among participants who took part in your two previous roundtable sessions.

- The list of disasters that have impacted the community.
- Damages the community suffered.
- The identification of “at-risk” populations
- The list of services and organization that service “at-risk” groups
- Needed services that are not available to the communities “at-risk” populations.
- Organizations that could be involved but are not
- Identified sources of the best disaster information
- Organizations and individuals identified as the best sources of information about the needs of “at-risk” people and neighborhoods

Setting the Stage for Session 1:

The goal of this section is to briefly share with you some of the feedback we received in our two recent community roundtable meetings. We want to first start by focusing on those topics or issues that were pretty consistent in each of the meetings.

Let me take a few minutes to highlight those areas where the two groups appeared to be were pretty much in agreement.

Present your list at this point

After you have presented the list, ask people at each of your tables to discuss the following questions. Have them compile their input on the worksheet that we have provided for this session.

- What areas of agreement do you feel are most important? Why?
- What areas of agreement seem to be less important? Why?

Now, have the group rotate to a new table.
Session 2: Community Differences – Time Needed: Approx. 30 minutes

For this session you will create a list of items that emerged from the two meetings that appear to be different; in other words, issues or topics where there was inconsistency between the two groups. Please avoid identifying what responses came from what meeting (allowing them to draw their own conclusions). After you have reviewed the responses, ask the group at each of the tables to discuss and report on the questions we have provided to you. As was the case in the first session, you can present this information on a PowerPoint slide or on a handout (or both).

Here is a sample list of areas where differences could emerge between the two meetings. Reminder, this is only provided as a guide and is not intended to reflect your community’s perspectives on these questions:

- Whether the community has an emergency plan or not
- The effectiveness of the current emergency plan work
- The emergency disaster plan’s strengths and weaknesses
- The timeliness of information being provided about approaching disasters
- The information sources that people rely on most
- The sources of information that people trust the most
- Things done right in preparing for and responding to local disasters
- Things that went wrong that people felt needs to be addressed before another disaster hits the community

Setting the Stage for Session 2: Now that we have highlighted areas where input from the two community meetings were closely matched, we’d like to present those areas where participants in the two community meetings had different responses. Let me take a few minutes to highlight some of these differences.

Present your list at this point

After you have presented the list, ask them to discuss the following questions with the people at their tables:

- Which items do you feel are significant and represent important differences? Why?
- Why do you believe the two groups have different opinions about these items?
- Which of these differences do you feel are most important to address?
- What important strategies should the community pursue if they want to tackle these important differences?
- Which individuals and organizations could play valuable roles in helping address these differences?
Now, have the group rotate to a new table.

Session 3: EPD Project Responses – Time Needed: Approx. 45 minutes

For this session, you will create a list of responses that emerged from the two meetings regarding feedback to the EPD process, focusing on responses to the steps and to the concept of a community coach. Again, be sure to present responses in such a way that neither group is identified. You may also want to quickly review the steps of the EPD project. It may be helpful to have copies of the handout outlining the EPD steps from the first roundtable discussions for review.

Setting the Stage for Session 3: We will now take a few moments to discuss how both groups that took part in our previous roundtable meetings felt about the Emergency Preparedness Demonstration (EPD) process.

Show the responses to the EPD Process steps (Use PowerPoint, handout, or both).

Discussion of the EPD Comments: Now, here are some important questions we would like the group at each of the tables to discuss:

- What comments on the EPD process does your group mostly agree with?
- Which items does your group have disagreements about and why?
- Are there any steps in the EPD process that your group remains concerned about? Why?
- Are there other issues or concerns about the EPD process that your group wants to share with us?

NOW, show the responses to the concept of a Community Coach (Use PowerPoint, handout, or both).

Discussion: Now, let’s give you a chance to discuss these comments.

- What do you find most valuable about these responses regarding a community coach and why?
- What comments tend to bother you and why?
- What’s your final verdict on the pluses and/ or minuses of having a community coach to help with the EPD process?
Summary EPD Questions:
- Now that you have seen all the steps of the EPD project and reviewed your community’s feedback, do you think this is a process that should be pursued to assist “at-risk” communities with disaster preparedness and response? Why?
- What is the best way to get communities to buy-in to the EPD process?

Now, have the group rotate to a new table.

Final Discussion - Time Needed: Approx. 30 minutes

Setting the Stage for the Final Discussion: We have explored many avenues relating to disaster preparation and response in our community. During this last session, we will focus the discussion on some of the key issues identified throughout the process.

- **KEY QUESTION (Facilitators, be sure to emphasize the importance of this question):** What do you think are the 3-5 most important things a community can do to help “at-risk” people prepare for and respond to disasters?

- What do you think about these meetings we have held in your community concerning emergency preparedness?

- Did you learn anything new? If so, what did you learn?

- Is there anything you would like us to know about in terms of your experiences being part in these community meetings?

Closing Comments:

On behalf of the Southern Rural Development Center and (Your University), we would like to thank you for participating in this process. The information you have shared with us will be combined with reports from four other states. The five-state report will then be shared with FEMA. Our hope is that the feedback we provide to FEMA will help this agency to develop the types of programs and information resources that “at-risk” groups and their communities will find quite valuable as they work to better prepare for, and respond to, local disasters.
SESSION 1: Community Similarities

Now that you have reviewed lists where both community meetings had similar ideas, use this time to discuss the following topics with your roundtable group. Please record the main points of your discussion here.

A. What areas of agreement do you feel are most important? Why?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

B. What areas of agreement seem to be less important? Why?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Notes or other information:
Now that you have seen highlights of where the community meetings had different responses, please discuss the following questions with your roundtable group. Please record the main points of your discussion here.

### A. Which items do you feel are significant and represent important differences?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Why do you believe the two groups have different opinions about these items?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. Which of these differences do you feel are most important to address?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. What important strategies should the community pursue if they want to tackle these important differences?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E. Which individuals and organizations could play valuable roles in helping address these differences?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


# Session 3: EPD Project Responses – EPD Process

We will now take a few moments to discuss how both groups that took part in our previous roundtable meetings felt about the Emergency Preparedness Demonstration (EPD) process.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. What comments on the EPD process does your group mostly agree with?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Which items does your group have disagreements about and why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Are there any steps in the EPD process that your group remains concerned about?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Are there other issues or concerns about the EPD process that your group wants to share with us?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes or other information:
A. **KEY QUESTION:** What do you think are the 3-5 most important things a community can do to help "at-risk" people prepare for and respond to disasters?


B. What do you think about the meetings we have held in your community concerning emergency preparedness?


C. Did you learn anything new? If so, what did you learn?


D. Is there anything you would like us to know about in terms of your experiences being part in these community meetings?


Thank you on behalf of the Southern Rural Development Center and (Your University), we would like to thank you for participating in this process. The information you have shared with us will be combined with reports from four other states. The five-state report will then be shared with FEMA. Our hope is that the feedback we provide to FEMA will help this agency to develop the types of programs and information resources that "at-risk" groups and their communities will find quite valuable as they work to better prepare for, and respond to, local disasters.
"Bridge" Meeting – Okemah

4/13/09

Community Similarities – areas of agreement
1) Natural disasters experienced
   b. Fires (Nov 2006, Spring 2007)
   c. Droughts / Fires
   d. Floods
   e. Tornadoes
2) Damage suffered by community
   a. Most Common
      i. Loss of electricity
      ii. Fences / hay / livestock lost in fires
   b. Less Frequent
      i. Trees lost
      ii. Paden gymnasium collapsed
      iii. Street / road damage
      iv. Weleetka businesses lost
3) Least able to prepare & why
   a. Elderly
      i. Lack of planning
      ii. Lack of mobility
      iii. Poor communication
   b. Those with small children
      i. Lack of mobility
4) Did you get information ahead of time?
   a. Mostly Yes
      i. But, sources of information used were varied (next section)
      ii. Acknowledged strength of community
   b. Personal contacts
   c. Need for improved outside communication noted
5) What organizations could have been valuable (but may not have been involved)?
   a. Some disagreement about which ones are currently involved (next section)
   b. Those who could help:
      i. Ministerial alliance
      ii. Local businesses
      iii. Fire dept auxiliaries
“Bridge” Meeting – Okemah

4/13/09

Community Dissimilarities – areas of differences

1. How well did your community respond?
   a. Some thought the community responded quite well
      i. Well-trained combination of entire community
      ii. People know their roles
   b. Some felt the community did not respond well
      i. Lack of a plan / lack of generators & equipment
   c. Some knew immediately who to call / where to go, for others the information was not obvious

2. How well did your plan work?
   a. Some were very aware of Emergency Operations Management (EOM) plans, others were not
   b. Some saw the plan as a success for obtaining / staging resources, others knew little about the plan
   c. Most agreed that educating the public about these plans is problematic

3. What sources of information were used?
   a. Some indicated that most of their information came from TV – which had very little coverage for their specific community
   b. Weather radios were also used
   c. Others mentioned contact from the emergency management team within Okfuskee county
   d. Local contacts also seen as very important

4. What local organizations were involved in helping your community?
   a. Some saw very few local organizations that were involved
      i. Red Cross
      ii. Fire Department
      iii. Police
   b. Others saw a lot more
      i. Health Dept
      ii. Department of Human Services
      iii. Schools
      iv. Hospitals
      v. State Gov’t
      vi. Salvation Army

5. What are best sources of information for needs of at-risk people?
   a. Some listed large organizations
      i. DHS
      ii. Health Department
      iii. Schools
   b. Others listed local individuals or organizations
      i. Volunteer Fire Department
      ii. Local leaders
      iii. Church members
“Bridge” Meeting – Okemah

4/13/09
The Emergency Preparedness Demonstration (EPD) Project – thoughts on steps / community coach

6 steps of EPD Project listed on separate handout
Positive feedback on EPD Project
1. Felt it represented a good starting point
2. Having an organized plan would help keep people from panicking
3. Very inclusive
4. Good to look at areas that are at risk
5. Useful for future planning
6. Involvement of new people is useful, but challenging
7. Helps agencies who think about “what if” to be better prepared
8. Will encourage participation from larger community groups

Concerns / problems with project
1. Getting community involvement will be difficult
2. Having enough volunteers to develop and implement the plan would be challenging
3. Would require some technical expertise to implement
4. Education needed before process even begins (particularly for surrounding communities to learn about each other)
5. How does it get updated?
6. Need for person-to-person recruitment will be time consuming

Thoughts on the Community Coach
1. Most generally thought it was a good idea
   a. Must be someone from outside the community, with experience
   b. Would be necessary to have this person
   c. Good for motivation, and experience from other sites
2. But there were a few problems noted
   a. Community coach can’t do it all
   b. Difficult for the coach to relate to community
   c. Trust is an issue
   d. Can’t have an overbearing personality
   e. How would they be funded?!
The State of Arkansas
Arkansas Cooperative Extension Service

Ouachita and Jefferson Counties

Staff:
Deborah Tootle, Bobby Hall and Ryan Francis
### Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>85,487</td>
<td>84,278</td>
<td>78,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Non-Hispanic (%Pop)</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Non-Hispanic (%Pop)</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic (%Pop)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-24 Yrs (%Pop)</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-64 Yrs (%Pop)</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+ Yrs (%Pop)</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than H.S. (%Pop 25+)</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Grad. (%Pop 25+)</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College (% Pop 25+)</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's or more (% Pop 25+)</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Components of Population Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural (Births minus Deaths)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>-170</td>
<td>-1,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Migration</td>
<td>-158</td>
<td>-1,042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>33,311</td>
<td>34,350</td>
<td>35,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeownership Rate</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permits</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Bldg. Permit Value</td>
<td>$26,893</td>
<td>$61,432</td>
<td>$53,608</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Poverty & Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate (Persons)</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Poverty Rate</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian Labor Force</td>
<td>38,035</td>
<td>35,943</td>
<td>35,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>34,655</td>
<td>33,884</td>
<td>32,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Demographics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>30,574</td>
<td>28,790</td>
<td>25,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Non-Hispanic (%Pop)</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Non-Hispanic (%Pop)</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic (%Pop)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-24 Yrs (%Pop)</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-64 Yrs (%Pop)</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+ Yrs (%Pop)</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than H.S. (%Pop 25+)</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Grad. (%Pop 25+)</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College (% Pop 25+)</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's or more (% Pop 25+)</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Components of Population Change**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural (Births minus Deaths)</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>-89</td>
<td>-295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Migration</td>
<td>-87</td>
<td>-289</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Housing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>13,204</td>
<td>13,450</td>
<td>13,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeownership Rate</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permits</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Bldg. Permit Value</td>
<td>$89,600</td>
<td>$119,000</td>
<td>$155,571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Poverty & Employment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate (Persons)</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Poverty Rate</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian Labor Force</td>
<td>14,574</td>
<td>12,401</td>
<td>11,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>12,588</td>
<td>11,677</td>
<td>11,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Updated June, 2000*
FEMA Project Reporting Template
State Report Guidelines for Each County Roundtable Site

Please complete Sections 1-8 for EACH of the two county sites you selected for your study. Section 9, on the other hand, is intended to integrate your insights from both sites. As such, it should represent a summary of your overall project findings and your key insights.

SPECIAL NOTE:

The information being collected as part of our project is helping shape the final report being prepared by FEMA for submission to the U.S. Congressional Appropriations Committee. In order to ensure that our definitions are aligned with those being used by FEMA in its communications with Congress, we are asking you to pay special attention to the two definitions we have provided below. Please make every effort to use the proper term when referring to one of the audiences noted below. At times, you may need to use "at-risk" populations or communities, and at other times it may be more accurate to use the term "disadvantaged."

We recognize that you may not always be able to easily determine which term is the right one to use at various points in your report. Please use your best judgment as to which of these terms is most appropriate given the input you received in your community meetings.

**At-risk** – refers to those individuals or communities physically located in areas at-risk for experiencing hazards (i.e. living in flood plains, living in hurricane vulnerable locations, etc.)

**Disadvantaged** – refers to those individuals or communities that are more likely to suffer from a hazard because of social or economic marginalization (i.e. minority, low income, non-English speaking, etc.). These individuals may be disadvantaged by a lack of resources, services and/or capabilities to take care of themselves.

It is possible that some individuals or communities you discuss are both "at-risk" and "disadvantaged." Please include which of the three groups (at-risk, disadvantaged, or both) you are discussing, whenever possible, in your written report.
State: Arkansas

County Name: Jefferson

County Type (Metro or Non-metro): Metro

State Extension Facilitators: Deborah Tootle, Bobby Hall

County Extension Facilitators: None

1. Provide a Brief Overview of the County Site

Prepare a brief overview of the county in which your Roundtable sessions were held. What are some of the key characteristics of this county that led you to select it as a pilot site for conducting your Roundtable meetings? Briefly describe any *at-risk* or *disadvantaged* group(s) living in the county. [NOTE: We will be developing a comprehensive statistical profile on each of your county sites, but if you think there are key data that you want to highlight in your brief overview of the county, feel free to do so].

We chose the Pine Bluff location (Jefferson County) AR because of its relatively high profile (second tier) on the Social Vulnerability Index, the large minority population (52.5% Black), and its high poverty rate (25.0%). Pine Bluff is a city that has a reputation of being racially divided. Moreover, Jefferson County AR is home to the Pine Bluff Arsenal, which is one of six locations in the nation where chemical weapons are stockpiled. Jefferson County Office of Emergency Management works very closely with the U.S. Army to maintain the Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program in Pine Bluff. Because of CSEPP, Jefferson County OEM is uniquely prepared for disasters. However, their high level of preparedness does not eliminate the problems associated with at-risk and disadvantaged populations living in the area. The Pine Bluff Arsenal is in the process of eliminating the chemical stockpile.

2. Tell Us Who Took Part in Your Roundtable Sessions

Please provide a summary description of the participants who took part in your three Roundtable meetings.

(a) How many attended your "Emergency Management" (EM) Roundtable and what type of organizations did they represent? 16 (Office of Emergency Management, Fire Department, Pine Bluff Arsenal, Jefferson County Health Department, Jefferson County Sheriff’s Office, Food Pantry, Jefferson County Public Schools, Pine Bluff and White Hall Police Departments, Salvation Army, American Red Cross)

(b) How many attended your "Community" (CG) Roundtable and what type of *at-risk* or *disadvantaged* populations did they represent? 11 (Minority – Black and Hispanic, Aging, low income)
(c) How many attended the Bridge meeting and what diversity of organizations or groups did they represent? 7 (Jefferson County Health Department, American Red Cross, local churches, Jefferson County Master Gardeners)

If feasible, provide an overview of the diversity of your participants in terms of gender, age, race and ethnicity. This does not have to be precise, but just some idea of the mix of people who took part in each of your sessions. The groups were somewhat diverse, with a fairly even mix of men and women but participants were predominantly white and middle class. However, several of the city officials attending were Black, we did have a representative of the Hispanic-Latino community attend the Community Meeting, and some of the clergy represented low income and minority populations.

3. Identify and Describe the Recent (Past 3-5 Years) Disasters Agreed or Disagreed upon by the Two Groups
(From Roundtable Session 1: Questions 1 and 2)

What major disasters did both the group of Emergency Management and Community representatives agree took place over the past 3-5 years (or so)? For each disaster agreed upon by the group, please provide the following:
Wind damages 1990, 2008
Hurricane evacuees (Katrina, Gustav and Ike) 2005, 2008

(a) What were the key damages incurred by the county? Power outages, structural damages to homes (roofs) and vehicles, tree and crop damage, increase in fire risk, increase in crime

(b) Were certain neighborhoods or sections of the county impacted more by this disaster and if so, how? Were certain populations impacted more by these disasters? If so, what specific groups and in what ways? Most of damages were county wide. However, residents of the Island Harbor residential and recreational area (mostly white) emphasized flooding.

(c) Were there any disasters and damages on which the two groups did not agree? If so, please highlight these key differences among the two groups. Disagreements hinged more on dates of events than anything else. However, emergency managers were acutely aware of tornadoes in surrounding communities in 2007 and 2008. Community members (who were predominantly white men) focused a great deal on the flooding of Island Harbor.
4. Describe the Nature of the County's Preparation and Response to the Disaster(s)
(Roundtable – Session 1: Question 3 and Session 3: Questions 3a, 3b)

Please provide a description of the following:

(a) Preparedness: How prepared was the county for the disaster(s) from the perspective of the two groups (EM and CG)? Describe areas on which they agree, as well as differences of opinions they had on the county’s level of preparedness. For the most part, participants thought that because of the CESPP, the Pine Bluff area was fairly well prepared for disasters. However, both groups admitted they were not well prepared for sheltering large numbers of people or for reaching the elderly or low income population.

(b) Disaster Plan:
- Did the county have a disaster plan? Yes.
- Did both groups know about the county's disaster plan? Briefly indicate what both groups had to say about the disaster plan (i.e., did they both know about it, did they know what it contained, etc.?). Because of CESPP, the Pine Bluff area is well prepared for emergencies and agencies have a history of working together because of the great potential for disaster. CECPP is widely publicized throughout the area; weekly sirens (with verbal instructions) are sounded and emergency alert radios (like weather radios) have allegedly been widely distributed in the community (this was more likely to be agreed upon by white middle-class residents than minority lower-class residents).
- Was it comprehensive or did it focus more on specific at-risk or disadvantaged populations, neighborhoods, and/or communities? If it focused on specific groups, what specific at-risk or disadvantaged groups were identified? Why? Were vulnerabilities related to being in vulnerable locations, being socially or economically marginalized, or some other factor (or combination of factors)? The plan is rather generic and apparently does not focus on at-risk or disadvantaged groups in particular. However, we have not seen the plan and do not know this for a fact.
- Who and what groups were involved in the development of the disaster plan for the county? Were any at-risk or disadvantaged groups involved in preparing or reviewing the plan? The plan is very top-down and developed primarily by the Army with some coordination on the part of local officials.
- What were some of the conclusions on which the two groups agreed regarding the disaster plan at the Bridge meeting? In general, they all agreed that it was very important to the safety of the community.

(c) At-Risk or Disadvantaged Populations: Who did both groups (EM and CG) identify as being “at-risk” in the county? Did the groups tend to define “at-risk” in terms of vulnerable locations, being socially or economically marginalized, or some other factor (or combination of factors)? Did they agree or disagree on who might be deemed at-risk or disadvantaged these disasters? If so, please describe these differences. Participants viewed elderly, low-income, developmentally or physically challenged, medically dependent and non-English speaking residents as at-risk. The at-risk population was not associated with any one particular geographic area. Rather, the at-risk and disadvantaged populations seem to be distributed throughout the city.
(d) Services Available for At-risk or Disadvantaged Populations: What major types of services and/or assistance were identified as available during the disaster(s) for at-risk or disadvantaged people or places? Were there any key differences in the type of resources identified by the two different groups (EM and CG)? If so, please explain. Transportation, medical, food and housing, financial aid. Services were provided by Red Cross, Salvation Army, Health Department, Department of Human Services, Police, Fire, Sheriff’s Offices, Highway Department and Army.

(e) Information Sources: What resources did both the EM and CG groups identify as being reliable sources of information? What differences, if any, existed in the responses between the two groups? If this was discussed at the Bridge meeting, please provide insights into the differences. Radio, television, Office of Emergency Management bulletins, sirens, tone alerts, NOAA, Internet, friends and family. Most trusted public communications systems and OEM. The representative from the Hispanic-Latino community suggested that friends and family were the best sources of information. Many of the Hispanic-Latino community do not have the language skills to know what is happening.

(f) Positive Responses to the Disaster: Summarize (in bullet form) what both groups (EM and CG) agreed were the things that went right during the course of the recent disaster(s). If any differences surfaced between the two groups on this item, please describe.
- Communications
- Exercises and drills
- Some agencies worked together

(g) Areas of Improvement: Present (in bullet form) the key items that both groups (EM and CG) agreed have to be addressed before a future disaster strikes. Include specific needs of at-risk or disadvantaged groups, neighborhoods and/or communities that need to be addressed. Next, identify any important differences the groups had on these items, including those that surfaced during the Bridge meeting. The elderly and handicapped were reluctant (unable?) to seek help. Language barriers existed. Needed: better communications, transportation services, more generators, more housing (some disagreement here between groups as to the adequacy of housing), access to drinking water. In addition, CERTS were not activated (emergency managers response), churches and sheltering agencies were not coordinated and did not communicate with each other, they were overwhelmed with donations.

(Note discrepancies in the issue of communications. My interpretation is that communications to the public about weather events and their consequences were effective. However, communications and coordination within and among agencies and services were not as effective as they could have been. Some participants reported, in particular, about the divides among churches by denomination and race. This observation is consistent with what is widely repeated about Pine Bluff’s racial divides.)
5. Summarize Existing Community Resources
(Roundtable – Session 2: Questions 1 and 2)

For each pilot site, please provide a summary of the local organizations/resources that were identified as (1) currently involved; and (2) could be involved in helping the county prepare for, respond to and recover from disasters. What services or assets could each organization provide? Were there any key differences in what the EM and CG groups identified as resources? If so, please explain. Currently involved: Army and National Guard, Red Cross, Salvation Army, Health Department, Department of Human Services, police, fire, and sheriff’s offices, local churches and religious organizations, Pine Bluff Convention Center, hospitals and medical community, utility companies, Area Agency of Aging, Wal-Mart, local industries, neighbors. Community members were more likely to report neighbors as sources of assistance than were the emergency managers. Others that should be involved: Neighborhood Watch, Home Health, private and public schools, fraternities (University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff), YMCA. (A number of agencies and organizations that are involved were also mentioned here. This speaks to a lack of information about which organizations are providing services).

6. Identify Trusted & Respected Resources
(Roundtable – Session 2, Question 3)

(a) Who did the EM group identify as trusted sources of information about the needs of at-risk or disadvantaged populations and neighborhoods? Area agencies, health department, Salvation Army, churches, Neighborhood Watch, Department of Homeland Security, Home Health, Sheriff’s Department, Volunteer Fire Departments, hospitals, Red Cross.

(b) Who did the CG group identify as trusted sources of information about the needs of at-risk or disadvantaged populations and neighborhoods? They reported churches, schools, civic groups, family, friends and neighbors as trusted sources of information.

(c) Please describe any key similarities or differences between the two groups’ responses. If this was discussed during the Bridge meeting, please add any insights from that session. Participant observed that each group responded according to what was relevant to them.

7. Development of a Disaster Plan by At-risk and Disadvantaged People
(Roundtable – Session 3: Question 5)

Did the groups (EM & GC) at the Roundtable discussions believe that people living in at-risk or disadvantaged neighborhoods should develop a disaster plan for their neighborhood? Why or why not? In general, yes. However, the emergency manager was a little reluctant to agree with this position. His position was much more along the lines of command and control. What thoughts did they have regarding ways to build a strong working relationship between EM and at-risk or disadvantaged groups? Need to get more information to all people, overcome language barriers, coordinate services better, schools
should be involved in process, bilingual signage and radio broadcasts, identify key contacts within communities, agencies need to get citizens involved in their projects.

8. Assessing the Emergency Preparedness Demonstration (EPD) Project (Roundtable – Session 3, Questions 1, 2, and 4)

(a) **EPD Steps:** Please summarize the group’s responses to the EPD Steps.
   - What did they like about the steps? Necessary, organized, comprehensive and involve the community.
   - What concerns did they express? Fundraising.
   - What steps, if any, did they feel were missing? Coordination with faith based community, plan for disseminating information to community.
   - Were there any key differences between the reactions of the EM and that of the CG to the EPD process? If so, what were they? Emergency Managers stressed the importance of keeping OEM involved in the process.
   - What additional insights, if any, came from the Bridge meeting on this topic? Some of participants did not think mapping was necessary. Others thought that community members would not be interested in being involved. They have always relied on OEM and the CESPP to do this type of activity.

(b) **Vulnerability Assessment:** What reactions did the two groups (EM and CG) have toward the vulnerability assessment step (mapping process)? For example:
   - Who did they consider to be the most appropriate entity/person to develop the maps? The Emergency Managers thought OEM should develop it. The Community Group thought maps should be developed by a combination of agencies and community members.
   - What response did the groups have to the idea of having community members respond to the accuracy of the maps once developed? They all thought it was important.
   - Were there any additional inputs provided during the Bridge meeting on this item? If so, please explain. There were concerns that involving the community in developing a comprehensive plan would result in a plan that is not coordinated (this seemed to reflect the existence of social and political divisions within the city).

(c) **Community Coach:** Please describe the reaction of the two groups (EM and CG) to the concept of a community coach.
   - What did they like or dislike about having this type of resource person? They mostly agreed on the necessity of an impartial outsider to act as a coach.
   - Were there any key differences in how the EM group viewed this role as opposed to how the CG group viewed the role? If so, please explain.
   - What was the county’s “final verdict” during the Bridge Meeting regarding having a community coach? They all agreed they needed one, but feared it would be difficult to find one.

(d) **Final Community Recommendations:** During the Bridge meeting, participants were asked these questions. Please provide a summary of their responses:
• Now that you have seen all the steps of the EPD project and reviewed your community’s feedback, do you think this is a process that should be pursued to assist at-risk or disadvantaged communities with disaster preparedness and response? Yes, but money is an issue.
• What is the best way to get communities to buy-in to the EPD process? Help them to see how vulnerable they are at the present.

Please Provide Your Final Comments and Recommendations on the Entire Project -- This Section Should Be Based on Both of Your County Reports

9. Project Summary

Please share your thoughts on the following items:

(a) Based upon the discussions that took place in the Roundtables and Bridge meetings held in your two counties, what are the 4-5 most important things a community can do to help:

• At-risk people prepare for and respond to disasters?
• Disadvantaged people prepare for and respond to disasters?

(b) What final recommendations would you offer on the EPD process, regarding:

• The concept of a Community Coach?
• The vulnerability assessment for addressing the needs of disadvantaged people?

(c) What specific needs do the counties have with regard to emergency preparedness and response? Then, please share your thoughts on the following:

• Which of these do you think Extension could play a valuable role in addressing?
• Which of these are likely to have special application to those who are also socially and/or economically disadvantaged?

(d) What do you think about the meetings that were held in the county?

• Were they useful to the community? Why or why not?
• Do you feel they helped increase awareness of the special needs of local residents who are socially and/or economically disadvantaged? Please explain.

(e) Did you learn anything new as a result of your involvement in this FEMA/CSREES/SRDC project?

• If so, what did you learn?
• If not, why do you feel this is the case?

(f) Is there anything else you would like to bring to our attention in terms of your experiences taking part in these county meetings and the overall project?
FEMA Project Reporting Template
State Report Guidelines for Each County Roundtable Site

Please complete Sections 1-8 for EACH of the two county sites you selected for your study. Section 9, on the other hand, is intended to integrate your insights from both sites. As such, it should represent a summary of your overall project findings and your key insights.

SPECIAL NOTE:

The information being collected as part of our project is helping shape the final report being prepared by FEMA for submission to the U.S. Congressional Appropriations Committee. In order to ensure that our definitions are aligned with those being used by FEMA in its communications with Congress, we are asking you to pay special attention to the two definitions we have provided below. Please make every effort to use the proper term when referring to one of the audiences noted below. At times, you may need to use "at-risk" populations or communities, and at other times it may be more accurate to use the term “disadvantaged.”

We recognize that you may not always be able to easily determine which term is the right one to use at various points in your report. Please use your best judgment as to which of these terms is most appropriate given the input you received in your community meetings.

At-risk – refers to those individuals or communities physically located in areas at-risk for experiencing hazards (i.e. living in flood plains, living in hurricane vulnerable locations, etc.)

Disadvantaged – refers to those individuals or communities that are more likely to suffer from a hazard because of social or economic marginalization (i.e. minority, low income, non-English speaking, etc.). These individuals may be disadvantaged by a lack of resources, services and/or capabilities to take care of themselves.

It is possible that some individuals or communities you discuss are both “at-risk” and “disadvantaged.” Please include which of the three groups (at-risk, disadvantaged, or both) you are discussing, whenever possible, in your written report.
State: Arkansas

County Name: Ouachita

County Type (Metro or Non-metro): Non-metro

State Extension Facilitators: Deborah Tootle, Bobby Hall

County Extension Facilitators: Ryan Francis

1. Provide a Brief Overview of the County Site

Prepare a brief overview of the county in which your Roundtable sessions were held. What are some of the key characteristics of this county that led you to select it as a pilot site for conducting your Roundtable meetings? Briefly describe any at-risk or disadvantaged group(s) living in the county. [NOTE: We will be developing a comprehensive statistical profile on each of your county sites, but if you think there are key data that you want to highlight in your brief overview of the county, feel free to do so].

The small community of Camden is located in Ouachita County in Southwest Arkansas. Ouachita is a non-metro county and Camden is generally known as a pretty town, rich in Civil War history. A number of historic homes remain and community festivals, such as the Daffodil Festival, draw a large number of tourists into the area. Camden, once a relatively prosperous river port and cotton shipping center, became highly dependent on the railroad in the first part of the twentieth century and on the defense industry toward the end of WWII. Camden was the home of a large ammunition depot until after the Korean War. The facilities were later redeveloped into what became the center for a large military artillery and ordinance industry. During the 1990s and post Cold-War downsizing, a large number of the defense contractors closed down their operations in Camden. That, and the closure of an International Paper Company mill resulted in serious job losses. However, in recent years, some of the defense contractors have resumed their work in Camden. Camden is known among the locals for having a large repository of ordinance and explosive materials. The potential for a man-made disaster related to this repository was on the minds of a number of our participants.

The at-risk population in Camden includes a significant number of the mobile home populations who live in areas prone to flood. The disadvantaged populations with whom we had contact consisted of the elderly, lower income residents, and a relatively large concentration of developmentally challenged residents.

2. Tell Us Who Took Part in Your Roundtable Sessions

Please provide a summary description of the participants who took part in your three Roundtable meetings.
How many attended your “Emergency Management” (EM) Roundtable and what type of organizations did they represent? 27. Participants of the Emergency Managers meeting included both county and city emergency managers, representatives from the sheriff’s office, the fire departments, health services, housing, public schools, local churches, the Red Cross, the Central Arkansas Development Council, Cooperative Extension Service, the food pantry, and the local Boys and Girls Club. This was a relatively diverse group, mostly white but more balanced as to men and women, and with a bias toward older participants. The representatives from the protective services were probably the youngest, ranging from mid-twenties to late thirties. Other participants were more likely to be at least 40 to 60 years old.

How many attended your “Community” (CG) Roundtable and what type of at-risk or disadvantaged populations did they represent? 17. They were all women. One was an elderly black woman who had retired from the CES some years ago. She was accompanied by her elderly sister, who was blind. A number of the participants were developmentally challenged and employed by a local service that assists the handicapped. Many of these participants were also part of the at-risk population, living in areas prone to flooding and in mobile or group homes.

How many attended the Bridge meeting and what diversity of organizations or groups did they represent? 19. Several, but not all, had attended one of the previous meetings. Although there were more women than men attending this meeting, this group was somewhat more racially diverse than the previous two groups. It consisted of more blacks than the previous two meetings. With the exception of the two elderly black women who attended the Community Meeting, most of the participants appeared to be between 40 and 60 years old. Most of the participants represented Emergency Management type organizations and a wide array of local government representatives. Relatively few people from the community roundtables showed up for the Bridge meeting. In general, participants at the Bridge meeting appeared to be better educated than those at the Community meeting.

If feasible, provide an overview of the diversity of your participants in terms of gender, age, race and ethnicity. This does not have to be precise, but just some idea of the mix of people who took part in each of your sessions. See above.
3. Identify and Describe the Recent (Past 3-5 Years) Disasters Agreed or Disagreed upon by the Two Groups
(From Roundtable Session 1: Questions 1 and 2)

What major disasters did both the group of Emergency Management and Community representatives agree took place over the past 3-5 years (or so)? For each disaster agreed upon by the group, please provide the following:

Ice storms (2000-2001)
Tornados (1978,1979)
Hurricanes (Katrina, Rita, and Gustav) (Reported as spring 2005, spring 2006 and fall 2008)
Straightline winds (Winter 2008)

What were the key damages incurred by the county?
(the groups did not separate damages according to each disaster):

Loss of power (county wide, especially in rural areas)
Roof and structural damage (county wide)
Drownings in flash flood (Amy Drive, Harmony Grove)
Loss of supply of drinking water (county wide, boil orders required)
Lack of supplies and resources (county wide, especially in rural areas)
Road damage from washouts (county wide)
Road blockage from downed trees (county wide)
Lost services and wages (county wide)

Were certain neighborhoods or sections of the county impacted more by this disaster and if so, how? Were certain populations impacted more by these disasters? If so, what specific groups and in what ways?

Rural areas tended to be affected more by the disasters. Participants attributed this primarily to the lack of resources in more rural areas, lack of information about rural roads, and difficulty in navigating rural roads. Those living in mobile parks were more often affected by flash floods, primarily due to the locations of the parks along rivers and other low-lying areas. The elderly and people needing medical attention were also more adversely affected by disasters because emergency responders could not get to them nor did they always know who needed assistance. Those on kidney dialysis and the developmentally challenged population were mentioned many times in the round tables.
Were there any disasters and damages on which the two groups did not agree? If so, please highlight these key differences among the two groups.

The two groups tended to be in agreement about the disasters that affected them directly. However, the Emergency Managers were much more likely to consider the hurricane evacuees in 2005 as part of the disasters that affected them. They expressed concerns about the hurricane evacuees using up (or in some cases taking advantage of) resources that were needed for local disaster recovery.

4. Describe the Nature of the County’s Preparation and Response to the Disaster(s)
(Roundtable – Session 1: Question 3 and Session 3: Questions 3a, 3b)

Please provide a description of the following:

Preparedness: How prepared was the county for the disaster(s) from the perspective of the two groups (EM and CG)? Describe areas on which they agree, as well as differences of opinions they had on the county’s level of preparedness.

There was general agreement that the community always responds well to disaster. Emergency managers and residents agreed that local people pull together well during disasters but that they can never be fully prepared for disasters. It is easier to prepare for some disasters than others, with ice storms and flash floods being difficult the most difficult. However, a large number of the participants talked about the inability of getting out to those in need of assistance, especially those people who are disadvantaged. Emergency managers spoke more of reaching disadvantaged than at-risk residents, except for those living in the most rural areas. They attributed a large part of the difficulties in reaching those in need to damages, especially tree damage. As one emergency manager explained it … “most of us live in the county and we first have to get into town before we can get out to help people. Then we start helping those people who are closest in because we have to get the roads cleared.” He described the emergency response in terms of a series of concentric circles emerging from a central source.

Disaster Plan:
Did the county have a disaster plan? Did both groups know about the county’s disaster plan? Briefly indicate what both groups had to say about the disaster plan (i.e., did they both know about it, did they know what it contained, etc.? The existence of a disaster plan was the greatest point of dissonance in the entire process. Most of those who are formally charged with Emergency Preparedness stated that yes, there is (are) disaster plan(s) and that this (these) plan(s) are revised on an annual basis. Yet, others talked about lack of coordination among different jurisdictions and the lack of knowledge about the plan(s) within the local population.
Was it comprehensive or did it focus more on specific at-risk or disadvantaged populations, neighborhoods, and/or communities? If it focused on specific groups, what specific at-risk or disadvantaged groups were identified? Why? Were vulnerabilities related to being in vulnerable locations, being socially or economically marginalized, or some other factor (or combination of factors)? According to some, the plan is
comprehensive, but according to others, there are no specific provisions for at-risk or disadvantaged groups.

It does not appear that the at-risk or disadvantaged populations have played a role in developing the plan(s). In fact, a number of the emergency planners stated that disaster plans need to be crafted by “command and control” and that the local population does not have enough expertise to contribute to a disaster plan. However, in general, most agreed there needs to be a comprehensive plan and that it information about disaster planning needs to be better disseminated throughout the community and via a wide array of sources to reach more people.

**At-Risk or Disadvantaged Populations:** Who did both groups (EM and CG) identify as being “at-risk” in the county? Did the groups tend to define “at-risk” in terms of vulnerable locations, being socially or economically marginalizes, or some other factor (or combination of factors)? Did they agree or disagree on who might be deemed at-risk or disadvantaged these disasters? If so, please describe these differences.

Those defined as at-risk or disadvantaged include those who are:

- homebound, financially distressed, without transportation, elderly, on dialysis,
- handicapped, blind, deaf, single parents, illiterate, and non-English speakers.

**Services Available for At-risk or Disadvantaged Populations:** What major types of services and/or assistance were identified as available during the disaster(s) for at-risk or disadvantaged people or places? Were there any key differences in the type of resources identified by the two different groups (EM and CG)? If so, please explain. There appear to be few services specifically targeted toward at-risk and disadvantaged populations, although the sheriff’s office does make some attempt to know who is on dialysis. Other services that the at-risk and disadvantaged populations seem to take advantage of are the Red Cross, local churches and shelters, neighbors and families, food bank, and protective services (fire, EMS, police).

(h) **Information Sources:** What resources did both the EM and CG groups identify as being reliable sources of information? What differences, if any, existed in the responses between the two groups? If this was discussed at the Bridge meeting, please provide insights into the differences. Most people got information from the media (weather channel, broadcasts from Little Rock, local radio stations, friends and family, the internet, sirens, and cell phones. The biggest differences between the two groups seemed to be the reliance on weather radios. Most of the emergency managers thought that weather radio use was widespread. Most of the community participants reported not having access to weather radios. Many of the community participants also mentioned that they receive more localized weather reports from local radio stations than from the TV stations broadcasting from Little Rock.

**Positive Responses to the Disaster:** Summarize (in bullet form) what both groups (EM and CG) agreed were the things that went right during the course of the recent
disaster(s). If any differences surfaced between the two groups on this item, please describe.

- Notification before storm
- Mock exercises
- Use of necessary resources
- Networking
- Churches providing shelter, food and clothing
- Preplanning on the part of utilities (staging and communications)
- National Guard participation
- City and county plans working

**Areas of Improvement:** Present (in bullet form) the key items that both groups (EM and CG) agreed have to be addressed before a future disaster strikes. Include specific needs of at-risk or disadvantaged groups, neighborhoods and/or communities that need to be addressed. Next, identify any important differences the groups had on these items, including those that surfaced during the Bridge meeting.

- Local centralization (central command and control headquarters needed so efforts could be coordinated)
- Determining who actually needs help (as opposed to those who abuse the system – this comment pertained to the hurricane evacuees and was repeated many times by different people during the roundtables)
- Communications when cell towers go down
- Need clear chain of command
- Plans for assisting the at-risk or disadvantaged population (those on dialysis or developmentally challenged)
- Knowledge about what to do – not enough information for residents about what to do in disasters
- Delayed response in getting assistance (there is a big gap here on part of residents in understanding on how difficult it is for emergency responders to get to people in need)

5. **Summarize Existing Community Resources**  
(Roundtable – Session 2: Questions 1 and 2)

For each pilot site, please provide a summary of the local organizations/resources that were identified as (1) currently involved; and (2) could be involved in helping the county prepare for, respond to and recover from disasters. What services or assets could each organization provide? Were there any key differences in what the EM and CG groups identified as resources? If so, please explain.

Currently involved:
Fire Department
EMT/EMS and hospitals
Police and sheriff
Volunteers
Utilities (Electric, phone, gas, water)
Red Cross
Local churches
Local businesses
Food services and banks
Federal agencies
Game and Fish; Forestry Commission
National Guard
City Works
County Road Department
County OEM
News media
State Health Department
Department of Human Services
State agencies
Local experts and qualified personnel

Could be involved (services and assets): Note that a number of those resources and organizations mentioned as “could be involved” are actually involved. This discrepancy appears to be a consequence of the disconnect between the Emergency Managers and residents. Community members do not appear to know what resources are available and frequently the emergency managers do not understand what resources exist and could be called upon for emergency response and recovery.

General Dynamics Building (shelter)
School districts (transportation, food services, shelter)
Walmart (supplies)
Home Depot (tools, generators)
Fire academy (beds)
Internet service providers (contacting families and agencies)
Civic organizations (transportation to safety)
Neighborhood Watch programs
Community centers (shelter)
Funeral homes
Unaffected communities
Central Arkansas DC (commodities, transportation)
Translators
Medical personnel

6. Identify Trusted & Respected Resources
(Roundtable – Session 2, Question 3)

Who did the EM group identify as trusted sources of information about the needs of at-risk or disadvantaged populations and neighborhoods? Who did the CG group identify as trusted sources of information about the needs of at-risk or disadvantaged populations and neighborhoods? Please describe any key similarities or differences between the two groups' responses. If this was discussed during the Bridge meeting, please add any insights from that session. In general, both groups identified similar sources although the community group tended to rank fire departments and churches higher than others. Trusted resources and sources of information include:

Banks
Office of Emergency Management
Red Cross
Schools
Area of Agency on Aging
Local employers
Central Arkansas DC
Home Health Agencies
Churches and pastors
Housing Authority
Hospitals

Fire Department

7. Development of a Disaster Plan by At-risk and Disadvantaged People (Roundtable – Session 3: Question 5)

Did the groups (EM & GC) at the Roundtable discussions believe that people living in at-risk or disadvantaged neighborhoods should develop a disaster plan for their neighborhood? Why or why not? What thoughts did they have regarding ways to build a strong working relationship between EM and at-risk or disadvantaged groups?

In general, most of our participants thought that at-risk (those living in vulnerable areas) should prepare disaster plans that could be coordinated with larger area disaster plans. Some of the emergency responders thought that at-risk populations do not have the expertise to make disaster plans. There did not seem to be strong feelings about whether or not disadvantaged people should make disaster plans. Whether or not specific groups of people should make disaster plans seemed to be correlated more with where they lived than with specific characteristics pertaining to marginalization.

8. Assessing the Emergency Preparedness Demonstration (EPD) Project (Roundtable – Session 3, Questions 1, 2, and 4)

(e) EPD Steps: Please summarize the group’s responses to the EPD Steps.
   - What did they like about the steps?
   - What concerns did they express?
   - What steps, if any, did they feel were missing?
   - Were there any key differences between the reactions of the EM and that of the CG to the EPD process? If so, what were they?
   - What additional insights, if any, came from the Bridge meeting on this topic?

In general, participants liked the EPD steps although some thought they were too complicated and others thought the process was too lengthy. Most liked the public involvement and stated that the steps were well thought. Some thought the plans did not incorporate existing plans into the process enough.

(f) Vulnerability Assessment: What reactions did the two groups (EM and CG) have toward the vulnerability assessment step (mapping process)? For example:
   - Who did they consider to be the most appropriate entity/person to develop the maps?
   - What response did the groups have to the idea of having community members respond to the accuracy of the maps once developed?
   - Were there any additional inputs provided during the Bridge meeting on this item? If so, please explain.

Most thought the vulnerability assessment was one of the most important parts of the process. They thought local government officials or university and college partners were
the most appropriate entities to develop the maps. They also thought it was very important for locals to ground-truth the maps.

(g) Community Coach: Please describe the reaction of the two groups (EM and CG) to the concept of a community coach.
- What did they like or dislike about having this type of resource person?
- Were there any key differences in how the EM group viewed this role as opposed to how the CG group viewed the role? If so, please explain.
- What was the county's "final verdict" during the Bridge Meeting regarding having a community coach?

In general, most liked the idea of the community coach and many thought that using a community coach was the only way that this process could be coordinated. A few people questioned the ability for the community to hire a community coach.

(h) Final Community Recommendations: During the Bridge meeting, participants were asked these questions. Please provide a summary of their responses:
- Now that you have seen all the steps of the EPD project and reviewed your community's feedback, do you think this is a process that should be pursued to assist at-risk or disadvantaged communities with disaster preparedness and response?
- What is the best way to get communities to buy-in to the EPD process?

Participants thought this could be used to help at-risk and disadvantaged groups of people to make disaster plans. However, several times during these meetings, the difficulty of managing the politics of developing disaster plans that include the at-risk and disadvantaged groups crept into the discussion. As one of the emergency managers put it at the bridge meeting "You don't have the right people here to make this happen" meaning that administrators who could make this happen weren't involved - they sent someone from their organizations. When we probed on this point, he said it would be difficult to get these people to sit down at the same table, especially those people from different jurisdictions. However, other participants suggested we get representatives from different groups from different strata together to begin the process.
Project Summary - Arkansas

Please share your thoughts on the following items:

(g) Based upon the discussions that took place in the Roundtables and Bridge meetings held in your two counties, what are the 4-5 most important things a community can do to help:

- **At-risk** people prepare for and respond to disasters?
  - Recognize the importance of working together and sharing resources and responsibilities in disaster management.
  - Conduct vulnerability assessments and identify and map at-risk populations.
  - Increase awareness of their level of vulnerability and what they can do to address some of those issues.
  - Do an emergency management asset mapping to identify resources available for increasing awareness and preparedness as well as emergency responses.
  - Provide more information to at risk populations – in a number of formats and in a number of places.

- **Disadvantaged** people prepare for and respond to disasters?
  - Work through agencies to identify and locate disadvantaged population and their caregivers or families.
  - Establish appropriate communications with disadvantaged to increase their awareness and preparedness and so that they can communicate their needs.
  - Work with agencies and organizations to coordinate activities for disadvantaged.
  - Plan for necessary emergency services for those who are disadvantaged.

(h) What final recommendations would you offer on the EPD process, regarding:

- The concept of a Community Coach? Almost everyone responded favorably to the idea of a community coach. However, they were uncertain about the process of finding and funding a community coach. Most communities will not go through this process unless funding is available.

- The vulnerability assessment for addressing the needs of *disadvantaged* people? Again, nearly everyone responded positively to the need for a vulnerability assessment. However, as in the case of the community coach, they do not have the expertise or technology to conduct community assessments. Without funding and technical assistance, most communities will be unable to conduct an in-depth vulnerability assessment.

(i) What specific needs do the counties have with regard to emergency preparedness and response? Most communities appear to need help (1) in developing coordination between those responsible for emergency management (with the state and local levels), (2) engaging community members in the development of emergency management plans that are both specific to their needs and coordinated with the more comprehensive community level disaster plan and (3) disseminating information
about disaster planning with the community. Then, please share your thoughts on the following:

- Which of these do you think Extension could play a valuable role in addressing? CES can help facilitate coordination among different stakeholders and can provide educational assistance to help increase awareness and preparedness. In a disaster situation CES can (and often does) work with emergency responders in rural areas to help identify people in need of assistance. Community development faculty in CES can also help (and has) in the long term community recovery process.
- Which of these are likely to have special application to those who are also socially and/or economically disadvantaged? Coordination of stakeholder efforts and increasing awareness and preparedness in at-risk and disadvantaged populations.

(j) What do you think about the meetings that were held in the county?

- Were they useful to the community? Why or why not? They were useful in helping communities and the emergency managers in these communities sit down across the table and talk with each other about what they do and how they can work together.
- Do you feel they helped increase awareness of the special needs of local residents who are socially and/or economically disadvantaged? Please explain. Yes. In both of our communities, most of the disaster planning processes were very top down and oriented from a “command and control”, “one size fits all” approach. The discussions about the at-risk and disadvantaged populations in their communities helped to increase their awareness of the issues facing these populations and seemed to open minds about new possibilities and techniques for disaster awareness, preparedness and management.

(k) Did you learn anything new as a result of your involvement in this FEMA/CSREES/SRDC project? Absolutely.

- If so, what did you learn? I had not realized (1) the level of the lack of coordination among emergency managers at the local level (including the politics of this lack of coordination), and (2) how little information (or access to information) that people have, especially in rural communities.

- If not, why do you feel this is the case?

(l) Is there anything else you would like to bring to our attention in terms of your experiences taking part in these county meetings and the overall project? In both communities, participants talked about their lack of information about comprehensive disaster plans and the lack of coordination between different jurisdictions and organizations. We were also surprised by the number of community people who told us they did not know what to do and who to call in case of disaster preparations and emergency responses. There is clearly a need for appropriate education and information dissemination.
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# Escambia County, FL

## Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td>262,445</td>
<td>294,410</td>
<td>302,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Non-Hispanic (%Pop)</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Non-Hispanic (%Pop)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic (%Pop)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-24 Yrs (%Pop)</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-64 Yrs (%Pop)</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+ Yrs (%Pop)</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than H.S. (%Pop 25+)</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Grad. (%Pop 25+)</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College (% Pop 25+)</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s or more (% Pop 25+)</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Components of Population Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural (Births minus Deaths)</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>1,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>-122</td>
<td>-2,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Migration</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>-2,343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>112,230</td>
<td>124,647</td>
<td>138,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeownership Rate</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permits</td>
<td>1,093</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>1,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Bidg. Permit Value</td>
<td>$55,706</td>
<td>$93,957</td>
<td>$133,355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Poverty & Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate (Persons)</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Poverty Rate</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian Labor Force</td>
<td>121,591</td>
<td>132,487</td>
<td>139,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>114,397</td>
<td>127,149</td>
<td>134,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Updated June, 2000*
# Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>41,116</td>
<td>45,087</td>
<td>47,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Non-Hispanic (%Pop)</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Non-Hispanic (%Pop)</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic (%Pop)</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-24 Yrs (%Pop)</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-64 Yrs (%Pop)</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+ Yrs (%Pop)</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than H.S. (%Pop 25+)</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Grad. (%Pop 25+)</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College (% Pop 25+)</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's or more (% Pop 25+)</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Components of Population Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural (Births minus Deaths)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>-93</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Migration</td>
<td>-77</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>14,867</td>
<td>17,703</td>
<td>18,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeownership Rate</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permits</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Bldg. Permit Value</td>
<td>$68,238</td>
<td>$127,463</td>
<td>$183,046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Poverty & Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate (Persons)</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Poverty Rate</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian Labor Force</td>
<td>18,095</td>
<td>19,954</td>
<td>20,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>17,167</td>
<td>19,155</td>
<td>19,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Updated June, 2009
FEMA Project Reporting -- Florida
State Report Guidelines for Each County Roundtable Site

COUNTY #1
State: Florida
County Name: Gadsden
County Type (Metro or Non-metro): Non-metro

State and County Extension Facilitators:
   Henry Cothran
   Mark Brennan
   Henry Grant
   Molly Moon
   Bruce Delaney
   Dave Mulkey

1. Provide a Brief Overview of the County Site

Gadsden County has a population of just over 47,000. According to the 2000 census, 60% of the population is non-white (state average non-white is 24%). Just over 20% of the population is identified as disabled (state average is 16%). Like the rest of Florida, Gadsden County is vulnerable to hurricanes and would be considered at-risk. However, Gadsden lists wildfires as a greater threat in its disaster mitigation plans.

2. Tell Us Who Took Part in Your Roundtable Sessions

   Please provide a summary description of the participants who took part in your three roundtable meetings.

   (d) How many attended your "Emergency Management" (EM) roundtable and what type of organizations did they represent?
      16 attendees (majority Caucasian):
      • Emergency medical service
      • Fire Department
      • Utilities
      • School District Transportation
      • Volunteer Fire Department
      • Sheriff
      • Police Department
      (Note: The County Emergency Manager did not participate in the meetings.)
(e) How many attended your “Community” (CG) roundtable and what type of organizations or “at risk” populations did they represent?
16 attendees (2 Caucasian; 14 African American; primarily elderly):
- “At risk” populations:
  - Elderly
  - Disabled
  - No transportation
  - Low income
- Organizations representing “at risk” populations:
  - Department of Health
  - Two elder care centers
  - Meals on Wheels (2 elderly volunteers)
  - Hospice (volunteer)
  - Red Cross
(Note: Non-English speakers were invited but declined to attend)

(f) How many attended the bridge meeting and what diversity of organizations or groups did they represent?
32 attendees:
- Attendees from previous meetings attended the bridge meetings.

3. Identify and Describe the Recent (Past 3-5 Years or so) Disasters the Two Groups Agreed (or disagreed) on?
(From Roundtable Session 1: Questions 1 and 2)

What major disasters did both the group of Emergency Management and Community representatives both agree took place over the past 3-5 years (or so)?
- Tropical storm (1985, 2008)
- Fires (2006, 2007)
- Floods (2009)
- Tornadoes

For each disaster they agreed upon, please provide the following:

(d) What were the key damages incurred by the county?
- Loss of utilities
- Wind damage
- Roads washed out/damaged
- Trees down
- Wildlife/snakes displaced

(e) Were certain neighborhoods or sections of the county impacted more by this disaster and if so, how?
- East side of county hit hardest with flooding
  - Area of financial disadvantage with sub-standard infrastructure; low-lying area with flooding problems
  - Certain parts of the county isolated due to flooding (roads washed out; no access)
• Power outages occurred all over county

(f) Were certain populations impacted most by these disasters and if so, what specific groups and in what ways?
• Special needs people dependent on electricity
• Lots of people without transportation; availability and use of county school busses not adequate to support evacuation needs
• Low income groups more impacted by power loss
• Nursing home residents and evacuation; availability and use of county school busses not adequate to support evacuation needs

(d) Were there any disasters and damages that the two groups did not agree on?
  No

4. The Nature of the County’s Preparation and Response to the Disaster(s)  
(Roundtable – Session 1: Question 3 and Session 3: Questions 3a, 3b)

Please provide a description of the following:

(i) Preparedness: How prepared was the county for the disaster(s) from the perspective of the two groups? Describe areas on which they agree, as well as differences of opinions they had on the county’s level of preparedness.
• Some thought the community responded quite well
  o Well-trained combination of entire community
  o People know their roles
• Some thought the community did not respond well
  o Lack of plans/communication/equipment
• Some were very aware of emergency operations plans; others were not
• Some knew immediately who to call or where to go; for others the information was not obvious

(j) Disaster Plan:
• Did the county have a disaster plan?
  Yes.

• Did both groups know about the county’s disaster plan? Briefly indicate what both groups had to say about the disaster plan (i.e., did they both know about it, did they know what it contained, etc.?).
  Those attending the EM roundtables were aware of the plan. However, there were numerous comments about it not being up-to-date and incomplete.
  It was mentioned that the county paid for someone to write the plan and the plan was nothing more than a duplicate from another county.
  Community members were not sure if there was a plan.

(Note: Those who were involved in providing services are concerned about the lack of a plan and the poor communication. However, those on the receiving end perceived that all went well. The public may think all is well, but those
behind the scenes are really concerned about the plan, including what is in the plan. Since there is not a good overall plan, the responders tend to operate in a completely reactive mode.)

- Was it comprehensive or focused more on "at risk" populations, neighborhoods, and/or communities? If the latter, what specific "at risk" groups were identified? It is not a comprehensive plan nor did it focus on specific "at risk" populations.

- Who and what groups were involved in the development of the disaster plan for the county? Were any at risk groups involved in preparing or reviewing the plan? County government surveyed fire departments, city police, etc. An outsider was hired to write the plan. It was sent out for review but not widely disseminated. No public knowledge.

- What were some of the conclusions on which the two groups agreed regarding the disaster plan at the bridge meeting? Generic plan is a major problem. Informing the public of the plan and what it contains is a problem.

(k) At Risk Populations: Who did both groups identify as being "at risk" in the county?
- Elderly
- Handicapped/disabled
- Non-English speakers (migrant workers)

Did they disagree on who might be deemed "at risk" in these disasters?
No.

(l) Services Available: What major types of services and/or assistance were identified as available during the disaster(s)?
- Sheriff's Office
- Red Cross
- Fire Departments
- Police
- Utilities
- Churches
- Health Department
- Schools
- Emergency management service
- Neighbors and family

Were there any key differences in the type of resources identified by the two different groups (EM and CG)? If so, please explain.

The EM group tended to identify local agencies as providing services. Whereas, the CG mentioned churches, friends, and neighbors. There was also a perception by the CG that issues of race and poverty influenced service delivery.

(m) Information Sources: What resources did both the EM and CG groups identify as reliable sources of information? What differences, if any, existed in the responses between the two groups? If this was discussed at the Bridge meeting, please provide insights into the differences.
As could be expected, the EM group received information through official channels such as State EOC, National Weather Service, Hurricane Center, etc. It was noted that there is an official calling system in place used by the EM organizations to disseminate information.

Conversely, the CG representatives stated that they relied on television, weather radio and neighbors. The Nursing Home representatives noted that they received a call from the EOC.

(n) **Good Things that Happened:** Summarize (in bullet form) what both two groups agreed were the things that went right during the course of the recent disaster(s). If any differences surfaced between the two groups on this item, please describe.

- Good warnings and coordination among county and municipal agencies;
- Sheriff had overall responsibility
- Pre-staging of equipment (fire and utilities) and personnel
- The primary (sole) shelter performed well
- CG representatives noted the phone system worked well (e.g., they were called by the sheriff's office and told where to retrieve sandbags.)

(o) **Things that Need to be Improved:** Present (in bullet form) the key items that both groups agreed needed to be addressed before a future disaster strikes, including specific at risk groups, neighborhoods and/or communities whose needs have to be addressed. Next, identify any important differences the groups had on this item, even after hosting the Bridge meeting.

- Communication of the disaster plan with the public
- Communication interoperability among local agencies
- Pre-disaster planning/coordination
- Education that helps individuals prepare for disasters
- Update the registry for “special needs” population
- Share information about the flood zones
- Nursing home had problems (generator failed; ran out of fuel)
- Do not have a pet-friendly shelter
- Transportation for the elderly

5. **Existing Community Resources**
   **(Roundtable – Session 2: Questions 1 and 2)**

For each pilot site, please provide a summary of the local organizations/resources that were identified as (1) currently involved; and (2) could be involved in helping the county prepare, respond and recover from disasters. What services or assets could each organization provide?

- Currently involved:
  - Sheriff’s Office
  - Red Cross
  - Fire Departments
  - Police
  - Utilities
  - Churches
  - Health Department
  - Schools
  - Emergency management service
Walmart
Florida Dept of Ag
Florida Baptist Disaster Relief
County Ag Center
National Guard

Could be involved:
- Fraternal Organizations (disaster planning/prep communication with members)
- Senior citizen groups (disaster planning/prep communication with members)
- Employers (look after own people; large distribution company within county)
- More churches (disaster planning/prep communication with members)
- Local veterinarians (animal services)
- Local medical services (physicians)
- Law enforcement academy (shelter/feeding for large numbers)
- Parks & Rec (tents, etc)
- Grocery stores (food/water)
- SuperValue Distribution Center (food and refrigerated trucks)

6. Trusted & Respected Resources
(Roundtable – Session 2, Question 3)

(d) Who did the EM group identify as trusted sources of information about the needs of “at risk” populations or neighborhoods?
- Health Dept
- Churches/faith-based organizations
- Senior citizen centers
- Association of Retarded Citizens
- EMS
- Local law enforcement
- Big Bend Transit
- Teachers
- Pharmacies

(e) Who did the CG group identify as trusted sources of information about the needs of “at risk” populations or neighborhoods?
- Churches/faith-based organizations
- Senior citizen centers
- Sheriff's Office
- NHC (Home Care)

(f) Based upon the bridge meeting, what key groups did both the EM and CG groups say have the trust and respect of “at risk” people and/or neighborhoods/communities in the county?
   During the bridge meeting, both groups focused on churches and the assistance they could provide in disseminating disaster preparation information. It was also noted by both the EM and CG representatives that individuals must take more responsibility for preparing and not wait until the last minute.

7. Development of a Disaster Plan by At Risk People
(Roundtable – Session 3: Question 5)
Did the groups (EM & GC) at the site believe that people living in disadvantaged neighborhoods should develop a disaster plan for their neighborhood? Why or Why not? What thoughts did they have regarding ways to build a strong working relationship between EM and "at risk" groups?

There was agreement between the groups that neighborhood plans should be developed. However, it was noted that neighborhood plans should be coordinated with the overall county plan. Several CG representatives agreed that a local plan is a good idea but they don't believe it would happen as people don't want to get involved in the process.

Although “building strong working relationships between EM and at-risk groups” was not a direct point of discussion, it was observed during the bridge meeting that the EM representatives recognize the need to respond for at-risk groups. It was also noted that the CG representatives appeared to appreciate what the EM groups have done for them in the past. One EM rep noted it was nice to hear that some of the local residents felt the EM people have done better than what the EM providers actually thought would be the case.

8. Assessing the EPD Project
(Roundtable – Session 3, Questions 1, 2, and 4)

(i) **EPD Steps:** Please summarize the group’s responses to the EPD Steps.

Overall, reactions to the EPD in Gadsden County were fairly optimistic. Citizens and responders indicated that:

- It represented a good starting point
- Provided a good framework to look at areas that are at risk
- It would be useful for future planning
- Involvement of new people is useful, but challenging
- The EPD would encourage participation from larger community groups

Those who took part in the meeting did indicate a few problems with the program and its methodology. Among these were:

- Getting community involvement might be difficult
- Having enough volunteers to develop and implement and maintain the plan would be challenging
- The plan would require technical expertise and assistance to implement
- Potential conflict between citizens groups and official responders might arise
(j) **Vulnerability Assessment:** What reactions did the two groups (EM and CG) at the site have on the vulnerability assessment step (mapping process)? For example:

Participants in both groups agreed that the mapping process would be helpful. It was thought that local government officials should create the maps with input/review by county residents. Gadsden has a planner with GIS expertise that could assist with the mapping process.

(k) **Community Coach:** Please describe the reaction of the two groups to the concept of a community coach.

Participants were also asked about the usefulness of the planned ‘Community Coach’. Most generally thought it this was a good idea. They indicated that:

- It would be necessary to have this person
- This person would be good for motivation and sharing experience from other sites
- Some participants thought the coach should be someone from outside the community, while others felt it should be someone from the community.

The use of a community coach did however raise a few concerns. Problems noted included:

- The community coach can't do it all
- It might be difficult for the coach to relate to community and understand the viewpoints of the various community groups (especially if the coach is from outside the community)
- Trust will be an issue
- Efforts need to be made to ensure that the coach isn't an overbearing personality
- How would they be funded? Would FEMA or others provide funding for the coach to help ensure sustainability of efforts.

(l) **Final Community Recommendations:** During the Bridge meeting, participants were asked these questions. Please provide a summary of their responses:

Participants acknowledged that this would be a beneficial process for their county. However, they indicated that it would require local commissioners to embrace the process. For this particular county, there would be political entities and issues that would have to be worked through to get the process going.
COUNTY #2

State: Florida

County Name: Escambia

County Type (Metro or Non-metro): Metro

State and County Extension Facilitators:
  Henry Cothran
  Mark Brennan
  Pam Allen
  George Rogers
  Molly Moon
  Dave Mulkey

1. Provide a Brief Overview of the County Site

   The initial metro site selected was Miami-Dade. However, we had to change sites as
   Miami-Dade declined to participate. Miami-Dade indicated they were too busy
   preparing for the upcoming hurricane season.

   Escambia County, Florida was selected as an alternate site for study. Escambia
   County, Florida is the westernmost county in the state. It shares a north and west
   border with Alabama. Escambia County is a vulnerable county as it is located directly
   on the Gulf of Mexico and has experienced numerous hurricanes in the past few years.
   Escambia is a diverse county as there are wealthier residents that live close to the coast
   and an “at-risk” population located in the northern part of the county. Of particular interest, the
   county has approximately 57,000 homebound residents. Of those, 11,000 qualify for a
   major disability.

2. Tell Us Who Took Part in Your Roundtable Sessions

   Please provide a summary description of the participants who took part in your three
   roundtable meetings.

   (a) How many attended your “Emergency Management” (EM) roundtable and what type of
   organizations did they represent?
   ~12 attendees (mix of Caucasian and African American):
      - BRACE (Be Ready Alliance Coordinating for Emergencies) Representatives
      - EscaRosa Coalition on the Homeless Representatives
      - County Emergency Management
      - County Extension (Disaster Preparedness Coordinator)
      - Neighborhoods & Community Services Bureau Representatives

   (b) How many attended your “Community” (CG) roundtable and what type of
   organizations or “at risk” populations did they represent?
   ~12 attendees (mix of Caucasian and African American):
      - BRACE (Be Ready Alliance Coordinating for Emergencies) Representatives:
represented a variety of at-risk populations as BRACE is comprised of organizations that service at-risk populations
EscaRosa Coalition on the Homeless Representatives: homeless population
Neighborhoods & Community Services Bureau Representatives: at-risk populations served by county
Northwest Florida Rebuild
Only 1 at-risk (disabled) community member

(Note: Adverse weather [tornado warnings and severe thunderstorms] in the afternoon may have impacted the attendance by "at-risk" residents. The only "at-risk" attendee was provided transportation to the meeting by a member of BRACE.)

(c) How many attended the bridge meeting and what diversity of organizations or groups did they represent?
~12 attendees (mix of Caucasian and African American):
Same attendees as listed in previous sessions

3. Identify and Describe the Recent (Past 3-5 Years or so) Disasters the Two Groups Agreed (or disagreed) on?
(From Roundtable Session 1: Questions 1 and 2)

What major disasters did both the group of Emergency Management and Community representatives both agree took place over the past 3-5 years (or so)?
- Hurricanes (Opal, Ivan, Dennis, Ike, Gustav, Katrina)
- Flooding
- Tornadoes
- Wildfires

For each disaster they agreed upon, please provide the following:

(a) What were the key damages incurred by the county?
   Total destruction of buildings and homes
   Water damage
   Trees falling on houses
   Loss of utilities
   Bridge damage
   Damage to I-10
   Vegetation damage
   Small business failures related to disaster damage

(b) Were certain neighborhoods or sections of the county impacted more by this disaster and if so, how? Were certain populations impacted most by these disasters and if so, what specific groups and in what ways?
   There was widespread damage across the county.
   There was impact on all populations within the county.
   The riverine area experienced storm surge.

(c) Were there any disasters and damages that the two groups did not agree on?
   No.
4. The Nature of the County’s Preparation and Response to the Disaster(s)
(Roundtable – Session 1: Question 3 and Session 3: Questions 3a, 3b)

Please provide a description of the following:

(a) **Preparedness**: How prepared was the county for the disaster(s) from the perspective of the two groups? Describe areas on which they agree, as well as differences of opinions they had on the county’s level of preparedness.

There was disagreement that the community responded well. Those attending the meetings thought the community responded well. However, it was noted during the bridge meeting that if more of the marginalized population were in attendance, they may have a different view and not agree that the community responded well.

Not as prepared for Ivan but learned from that; now at a better level of preparedness.

There was disagreement concerning services provided to the Northern most community (Century City) in the county. On one side, it was stated that it was 3-4 days after Ivan before this area started to receive support services that were being provided in the southern part of the county. On the other side, it was stated that attempts were made to provide resources to the north end but the resources were declined as the residents were relying on faith-based groups. Faith-based groups didn’t have to follow the same rules so it was portrayed that Century City was forgotten.

Communication outages contributed to the appearance that services weren’t being provided.

(b) **Disaster Plan**:
- Did the county have a disaster plan?
  
  Yes.

- Did both groups know about the county’s disaster plan? Briefly indicate what both groups had to say about the disaster plan (i.e., did they both know about it, did they know what it contained, etc.?)
  
  The EM group definitely knew about the plan. It appeared many of them were involved with the plan either in development or in execution. They stated that Hurricane Ivan response showed areas that needed to be addressed. As a result of Hurricane Ivan, BRACE was created because of a list of things not being done.
  
  The only CG representative indicated that she believed the plan was good. She stated that this was her first hurricane so she was unaware of the need to be registered. However, she was provided additional oxygen tanks to her house prior to the hurricane.

- Was it comprehensive or focused more on “at risk” populations, neighborhoods, and/or communities? If the latter, what specific “at risk” groups were identified?
  
  The plan appears to have been more comprehensive. However, as noted above, the county learned from Hurricane Ivan and has now taken action to address needs of at-risk groups. For example: During
Hurricanes Faye and Hannah (2008), local government was able to work with partner agencies to determine food and water requirements for disadvantaged populations. Additionally, pods were made available for partner agencies to retrieve supplies for their clients. Additionally, a database containing names and addresses of homebound individuals is now in place.

- Who and what groups were involved in the development of the disaster plan for the county? Were any at risk groups involved in preparing or reviewing the plan? No discussion on who actually prepared the plan. However, based on comments, it appears many organizations were or are now involved in the planning process. This would include the standard governmental agencies as well as organizations that service at-risk populations.

- What were some of the conclusions on which the two groups agreed regarding the disaster plan at the bridge meeting? There is recognition of where the plan has shortfalls. However, they are actively working to address those areas.

(c) At Risk Populations: Who did both groups identify as being “at risk” in the county? Did they disagree on who might be deemed “at risk” in these disasters? If so, please describe these differences.
   - Elderly: lack of mobility and hard to persuade
   - Non-English speaking populations
   - Low-wealth communities
   - Homeless
   - Homebound

Did they disagree on who might be deemed “at risk” in these disasters? No.

(d) Services Available: What major types of services and/or assistance were identified as available during the disaster(s)? Were there any key differences in the type of resources identified by the two different groups (EM and CG)? If so, please explain. The standard services were available. However, the groups focused more on what was not available:
   - Child care for first responders
   - Inadequate special needs shelters
   - Power problems (e.g., dialysis centers)
   - Transportation (e.g., ambulances instead of busses would have been better mode of transportation for some.)
   - Availability of oxygen and electricity for some homebound individuals

(e) Information Sources: What resources did both the EM and CG groups identify as reliable sources of information? What differences, if any, existed in the responses between the two groups? If this was discussed at the Bridge meeting, please provide insights into the differences.
   - EOC
   - Hurrevac
   - TV
Weather channel
(No major differences were noted. However, but there were some language
issues with information dissemination.)

(f) **Good Things that Happened:** Summarize (in bullet form) what both groups agreed
were the things that went right during the course of the recent disaster(s). If any
differences surfaced between the two groups on this item, please describe.
- Upfront communication was good
- EOC ramped up way in advance
- County Admin made sure right people in right seats in the emergency
- Info flow was pretty good

(g) **Things that Need to be Improved:** Present (in bullet form) the key items that both
groups agreed needed to be addressed before a future disaster strikes, including
specific at risk groups, neighborhoods and/or communities whose needs have to be
addressed. Next, identify any important differences the groups had on this item, even
after hosting the Bridge meeting.
- The community has recognized areas needing improvement and is taking
  aggressive action to solve those problems. For example, special needs
  individuals have to register. The Health Dept helps with registration;
  working transportation to help those who don’t have transportation; working with
  the homeless coalition to get homeless individuals to shelters. There are 57,000
  homebound residents in Escambia County. Of those, 11,000 qualify for a major
disability. A database has been created containing information on all 57,000
  homebound residents.

5. **Existing Community Resources**
(Roundtable – Session 2: Questions 1 and 2)

For each pilot site, please provide a summary of the local organizations/resources that were
identified as (1) currently involved; and (2) could be involved in helping the county prepare,
respond and recover from disasters. What services or assets could each organization
provide?

(1) Currently involved:
- BRACE
- Government entities
- Faith-based organizations
- Local and national organizations
- Private businesses (shutter companies, generating, home health agencies, elder
care facilities)
- Utility companies
- Lots of individuals
- Education institutions

(2) Could be involved:
- Community Mental Health Organization (case management for special needs)
- Chambers of Commerce (economic recovery)
- African American/Latino/Asian organizations (sit at tables during planning to
  ensure the message is getting out to those communities)
- Military (preparation and response experience and skills could be shared)
- Independence for the Blind (services at-risk populations)
6. Trusted & Respected Resources  
(Roundtable – Session 2, Question 3)

(a) Who did the EM group identify as trusted sources of information about the needs of “at risk” populations or neighborhoods?
   - Faith-based organizations
   - Neighborhood watch organizations
   - Post Office

(b) Who did the CG group identify as trusted sources of information about the needs of “at risk” populations or neighborhoods?
   - None identified.

(c) Based upon the bridge meeting, what key groups did both the EM and CG groups say have the trust and respect of “at risk” people and/or neighborhoods/communities in the county?
   - None identified. However, it was noted that the CG representative has a supportive relationship with a service organization that assists her. Therefore, one might presume that the numerous partner agencies that service at-risk populations and that are part of the BRACE organization might have the trust and respect of the at-risk individuals.

7. Development of a Disaster Plan by At Risk People  
(Roundtable – Session 3: Question 5)

Did the groups (EM & GC) at the site believe that people living in disadvantaged neighborhoods should develop a disaster plan for their neighborhood? Why or Why not?
What thoughts did they have regarding ways to build a strong working relationship between EM and “at risk” groups?

There was agreement that neighborhood plans should be developed to the extent that they can and are individual are willing to create the plans. Emphasis should remain on individuals and neighborhood units. However, it was noted that neighborhood plans should be coordinated with the overall county plan.

8. Assessing the EPD Project  
(Roundtable – Session 3, Questions 1, 2, and 4)

(a) **EPD Steps**: Please summarize the group’s responses to the EPD Steps.

In Escambia County the context and familiarity with disaster mitigation was noticeably different compared to Gadsden County. However the reaction to the EPD was much the same. Overall, most participants were optimistic. Reactions included:

- The EPD represented a good starting point
- It would be useful for future planning
- Volunteers needed, but many people don’t get involved until they have experienced a disaster
The EPD will encourage participation from diverse community groups

As in Gadsden County, some concerns were also raised. These included:

A process is needed for organizing groups under the EPD
There is a need for start up and/or long term funding
Process or outcome measures not defined
Concern over lack of participation by local black ministerial association
HIPAA regulations will make identifying at risk populations difficult
Concern about linking the EPD to higher level plans
Incentives needed for encouraging citizen volunteers
Need for integrated case management and data management systems

(b) **Vulnerability Assessment:** What reactions did the two groups (EM and CG) at the site have on the vulnerability assessment step (mapping process)? For example:

As with Gadsden County, representatives in Escambia believe this is a worthwhile process. They also agreed that local governments should create the maps with input from community members. Escambia County has a mapping process and have identified particular at-risk areas as they relate to disadvantaged populations. However, it was not clear if they request input from residents.

(c) **Community Coach:** Please describe the reaction of the two groups to the concept of a community coach.

Most participants generally thought the Community Coach was a good idea. They did suggest that:

There is a need to define the role/responsibilities of this person

Some thought it should be someone from outside the community; Others felt it should be someone from the community

Trust is an issue

(d) **Final Community Recommendations:** During the Bridge meeting, participants were asked these questions. Please provide a summary of their responses:

Participants agreed that the EPD process is a good idea but expressed concerns as noted in 8a above.
9. Project Summary

a) What can the community do to help?

No one really suggested what their "community" could do to help at risk or disadvantaged people other than the current practices of families helping family members and neighbors looking out for each other. It was pretty clear though that people in these two categories (like all others) did not do much to prepare for disasters. As one participant said, "I had never been through a hurricane before, so I didn’t evacuate. Next time I’ll know to leave."

The obvious actions a community can take include continuous education (the FEMA website has lots of downloadable materials), more active involvement from the institutions most trusted for information (local churches were cited).

Local communities could help identify disadvantaged people in their neighborhoods. However, this would appear to be a one-off activity and there would be no real way to maintain a comprehensive and up to date list without a formal mechanism in place.

b) Community Coach – People generally liked the idea of someone to “guide” them through the planning process. However there was no consensus on whether this person should be from the community or from the outside. In fact there was confusion and concern over the role of this person (facilitator or expert), who would pay for the person, how the process would work, etc. The phrase “community coach” needs to be defined and the role, responsibilities and how such a person would be found and engaged must be clear if the concept is to be used.

Vulnerability Assessment – Participants generally thought this was a good idea and understood that GIS systems could be used in this effort, but there was a concern over who would undertake this effort, who would maintain it, how the original data would be collected and, primarily, who would pay for the development, maintenance and operation of such a system.

c) Specific Needs

At one site the real need was for cooperation and information sharing within the "community." The issue is clearly political with the first responders eager for more information sharing and cooperation. The recipients of services did not see a problem since when asked about their needs being met all were pleased with what had been done for them by the government.

At our other site, the community was very well organized. The one thing they seemed to be concerned with was the lack of shelter space for people with medical needs.

In both these instances there did not seem to be a role for Extension per-se. However, Extension could be the source for either providing coaches or for providing training in the EDP process. Having someone from outside the community encourage broader citizen participation in the planning process would probably work better than having someone from an internal advocacy group (or groups) assume this role.
d) Were the meetings useful to the community?
   Yes. In one site the meetings allowed the first responders to “vent” over the political situation. It may be that from this a commitment to act to change the way the community coordinates its response may come. In our other site the community was extremely proud of its achievements in developing a structure and organization that meshes the work of volunteer and other organizations with the role of first responders. Participants in these meetings used the opportunity to identify gaps that needed to be filled and to get some commitment to seek the involvement of other volunteer organizations.

   Our meetings did not increase the awareness of the special needs of local residents. There are at least two reasons. First the first responders believe they know these needs and have done all they can to address them (address, not respond). Second, there were not enough people from the affected groups present to provide any significant evidence that their needs were not being met. In fact, the people we met with felt that in the situations where they needed help, the need was met. The sole exception to that feeling was where one participant had to deal with FEMA. In that specific instance it was felt that the FEMA rep was only there to “go through the motions.” Overall the locals were pleased with local efforts and critical of “national” organizations that came in after the fact.

e) Did you learn anything new?
f) Yes. Disadvantaged and at-risk people respond to disasters in much the same way as everyone else. They generally don’t prepare and (from our participants) expect that “the government” will take care of them if a disaster strikes. We did however have a relatively small group of disadvantaged or at-risk participants. We learned that the recipients of services do not know the details of first responder plans to deal with disasters. They just want to know that their needs will be addressed after the fact.

g) Anything else
   • Disaster planning has its own language. Making sure that everyone is using a common language as this project moves forward is important (first responder, community, neighborhood, at-risk, disadvantaged, etc.)
   • Not all at-risk people are disadvantaged and not all disadvantaged are at risk. Yet the way the EDP is presented seems to assume that the target audiences are clustered. It will be difficult to implement an EDP targeted solely at a “category” of people who are dispersed within the general population.
   • Terminology during this project changed. Is the focus on communities or neighborhoods?
   • There is a role for Extension (community education), but there will never be a guarantee that everyone will prepare for a disaster. Communities want to do the right thing, but are constrained by resources. Our focus was on disadvantaged and at-risk people. Yet there are counties that are disadvantaged and places that are at-risk.
   • The EDP project does not address how you deal with resource poor communities. And this would appear to be a significant flaw. The EDP process will require education materials and training to implement. Both our sites liked the idea, but were clear in stating that the funding needed to implement, and probably maintain, such an effort would have to come from outside sources. And seeking grants from various agencies was not seen as a viable option.
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## Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>142,191</td>
<td>147,250</td>
<td>150,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Non-Hispanic (%Pop)</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Non-Hispanic (%Pop)</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic (%Pop)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-24 Yrs (%Pop)</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-64 Yrs (%Pop)</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+ Yrs (%Pop)</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than H.S. (%Pop 25+)</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Grad. (%Pop 25+)</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College (% Pop 25+)</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's or more (% Pop 25+)</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Components of Population Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural (Births minus Deaths)</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>-204</td>
<td>-493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Migration</td>
<td>-194</td>
<td>-456</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>56,300</td>
<td>60,154</td>
<td>63,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeownerships Rate</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permits</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Bldg. Permit Value</td>
<td>$88,118</td>
<td>$123,397</td>
<td>$131,317</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Poverty & Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate (Persons)</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Poverty Rate</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian Labor Force</td>
<td>66,139</td>
<td>69,776</td>
<td>71,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>62,704</td>
<td>66,684</td>
<td>68,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Updated June, 2000*
### Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>20,629</td>
<td>20,981</td>
<td>20,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Non-Hispanic (%Pop)</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Non-Hispanic (%Pop)</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic (%Pop)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-24 Yrs (%Pop)</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-64 Yrs (%Pop)</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+ Yrs (%Pop)</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than H.S. (%Pop 25+)</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Grad. (%Pop 25+)</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College (% Pop 25+)</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's or more (% Pop 25+)</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Components of Population Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural (Births minus Deaths)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>-58</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Migration</td>
<td>-58</td>
<td>-29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>8,031</td>
<td>8,335</td>
<td>8,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeownership Rate</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permits</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Bldg. Permit Value</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$125,061</td>
<td>$93,942</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Poverty & Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate (Persons)</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Poverty Rate</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian Labor Force</td>
<td>8,437</td>
<td>8,653</td>
<td>8,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>7,722</td>
<td>8,095</td>
<td>8,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Updated June, 2000  Created by the Southern Rural Development Center
FEMA Project
State Report

State: Louisiana

County Name: Ouachita

County Type: Metro

Extension Facilitators: Dr. Sanford Dooley, Dr. Cynthia Pilcher, Dr. James Barnes, Sheila Haynes, Glenn Dixon, Dora Ann Hatch & Dr. Kay Lynn Tettleton

1. Provide a Brief Overview of the County Site
Ouachita Parish is the most urban area in Northeast Louisiana, yet has a considerable agricultural industry. One of the larger rivers in the state is the Ouachita River which passes through the parish. One side of the river is hill country and the other is flat delta. It has been declared a disaster numerous times, had several different types of disasters, and has a high population of those who are socially vulnerable.

2. Who took part in the meetings?
   a. 17 participated in the Emergency Management roundtable representing health, housing, social services, chambers of commerce, and food banks.
   b. 2 participated in the Community Group roundtable meeting representing socio-economically at-risk and disadvantaged citizens.

3. Recent disasters
   Floods, hurricanes Gustav and Ike, ice storms, west nile virus, and tornado
   a. Road closures, flooding, transportation, roof and water damages, electricity loss, street damage
   b. Whole parish was impacted
   c. All agreed
4. **Nature of the parish’s preparation and response to disasters:**
   a. **Preparedness:**
      - Consensus of citizens was that they were not well prepared. Improvements had been noted since Hurricanes Rita and Katrina and were evidenced after Hurricanes Gustav and Ike.
   b. **Disaster Plan:**
      - The parish does have a disaster plan, but attendees had very little if any knowledge of such a plan. Agencies were more aware of its existence than were community attendees.
        Was the plan comprehensive or specific to certain populations?

      - The groups did not know the answer to this question.
        Who and what groups were involved in development of the plan?

      - Homeland security and parish government officials made the plan. It is not known whether at-risk groups or disadvantaged groups were part of the planning process. At the Bridge meeting the consensus was that representatives from communities as well as government officials should be involved in preparing the plan.
        Once developed, the plan should be explained to all citizens in a clear, easy-to-understand way.
   c. **At-risk or disadvantaged populations:** How did the groups define them? Elderly, physically challenged, developmentally challenged, those without transportation, and those living in isolation.
   d. **Services available:** Sandbags, shelter, cleaning supplies, food supplies, faith-based volunteer resources, local government, law enforcement.
   e. **Information sources:** TV, radio, Public Service Announcements, conversations with family and friends, 211.
   f. **Positive responses:** Increase in sense of feeling of community; acknowledgement of citizens to work together to help each other in times of crisis.
   g. **Areas needing improvement:**
      - Response time for services
      - Need a plan that citizens know about and understand
      - Education for citizens in communities
      - Radios – select a common emergency channel
      - Disaster kits for every citizen in at-risk populations
5. Summarize existing community resources:
   (Currently involved)
   - Red Cross, Churches, Food Bank, Salvation Army, Police, Wildlife and Fisheries, College of Pharmacy, TV and Radio, National Weather Service
   (Could be involved)
   - Police Jury, Clothing Bank, Community Action Agency, Monroe City, Twin City Welfare, United Way, 211
   - Note: National Guard, Ambulance Services and others were involved but the attendees were unaware of this

6. Trusted and Respected Resources:
   a. Emergency Management group identified:
      - State level, mayor and city officials
      - Weather radios, tv, media
   b. Community Group group identified:
      - Churches, Red Cross, neighbors and friends
   c. Describe similarities and differences at the bridge meeting:
      - Bridge meeting stressed the importance of friends and neighbors and communication

7. Development of a disaster plan by at-risk and disadvantaged citizens:
   - The need for at-risk and disadvantaged people to know details about a plan and that the communities were included in a plan was expressed. Regarding who prepares the plan, no definite opinions were voiced.
   - Emergency Management people need to educate people about the plan and implementation procedures. Citizens could be involved in the review process of the plan as prepared.

8. Assessing the Emergency Preparedness Demonstration project:
   a. Emergency Preparedness Demonstration steps
      - Yes, the steps are appropriate.
      - Logical and well explained; concept of coaches
• Nobody knew about these.
• Not sure

b. Vulnerability assessment:
• Both groups thought local input is important.
• Yes, local citizens can assist in checking for accuracy and ease of use
• N/A

c. Community Coach:
• How coaches are identified was an issue.

d. Final community recommendations:
• Improve communications.
• Increase education in the communities.
• Outreach efforts regarding the plan should be intensified.
• These efforts should be pursued.
• Best ways to get communities to buy-in to EPD process is to make sure representatives are involved in the planning process and that the final plans are presented at meetings held in the communities.

9. Project Summary:

a. How communities can help:

• Both groups indicated that citizens should be involved in plan development
• Improve communications between citizens and leaders
• Increase education and understanding
• Create resource contact list
• Create awareness of emergency assistance plan

b. Recommendations on the Emergency Preparedness Demonstration process:

• Need more information about community coach concept
- Emergency Management and Community Groups both felt it was important to have local input into developing the maps and that the maps should be checked for accuracy by community members once developed.

c. Specific needs for emergency preparedness and response:
   - Communication improvement between citizens and first responders.
   - Education regarding the existence and implementation of the plan.
   - Awareness of how to find contact information.
   - All of these apply to socially and economically disadvantaged.

d. Usefulness of these meetings in the parishes:
   - Yes, they were useful to the communities.
   - Identified issues pertinent to at-risk and disadvantaged populations.
   - Provided disadvantaged citizens the opportunity to meet and have open dialogue with elected officials and first responders.
   - People who are geographically isolated and have medical, physical, developmental challenges had their special needs recognized.

e. Anything new learned as a result of this project?
   - Yes
   - Learned more about the special needs of at-risk and disadvantaged populations within the parish.
   - Learned that plans may exist, but the population does not know about them.
   - Learned that at-risk and disadvantaged populations depend greatly upon each other for help and information.
   - Most first responders were aware of a plan, but in some cases the content remained “in-house”.

f. Anything else?
   - Simplify and streamline grants/contracts procedures so that more lead time is available for preparing for and conducting the project.
FEMA Project
State Report

State: Louisiana
County Name: Richland
County Type: Non-metro

Extension Facilitators: Dr. Sanford Dooley, Dr. Cynthia Pilcher, Dr. James Barnes, Dora Ann Hatch, Sheila Haynes, Glenn Dixon, and Dr. Kay Lynn Tettleton

1. Provide a Brief Overview of the County Site

   This sparsely populated rural parish is very dependent upon the agricultural industry for employment and tax base. It is adjacent to Ouachita Parish, which is considered a metro area, and meets all of the criteria for participating in this project. The general terrain is very flat to gently undulating in nature and this fact greatly contributes to the problems encountered with drainage and flooding in low lying areas. The problem is exacerbated by older drainage systems that are in need of repair and cleaning.

2. Tell Us Who Took Part in Your Roundtable Sessions

   a. Emergency Management Response

   b. The four attendees represented both the disadvantaged and at-risk populations. All of the attendees were African American women ranging in age from young adult to elderly.

   c. Sixteen people attended the bridge meeting in Rayville. Four represented city or parish government and the rest were members of the at-risk and disadvantaged populations. One person could not read or write and one was educationally disadvantaged.

3. Identify and Describe the Recent (Past 3-5 Years or so) Disasters on which the Two Groups Agreed (or Disagreed)

   a. Both groups agreed that the area had suffered from Hurricanes Gustav and Ike, spring floods and a 2009 Mother’s Day Weekend hail storm during the period in question.
b. Both hurricanes caused flooded homes, loss of electricity and transportation and drainage problems. Cypress Creek in Mangham and Camille and Tiffany Streets in Rayville sustained most of the flooding damage from the hurricanes. Most residents of these neighborhoods could be considered both at-risk and disadvantaged. The hail storm mainly damaged roofs, broke windows and dented vehicles.

c. There were no disasters or damages upon which the two groups did not agree.

4. The Nature of the County’s Preparation and Response to the Disaster(s)

a. Preparedness: The groups seemed to feel that the parish was not prepared and that there was a late response from Emergency Management personnel.

b. Disaster Plan: The parish does in fact have a disaster plan but the attendees had very little if any knowledge of such a plan.

- Those representing local government knew such a plan existed but were unsure of the details. The majority of the attendees were not sure that such a plan even existed, let alone what it contained.
- Those who knew of the plan reported that it was general in nature and did not specifically address the needs of disadvantaged or at-risk groups.
- Very little information was forth coming about who or what group had actually put the plan together.

- At the Bridge Meeting, the groups agreed that residents should be made aware of the contents of the plan and that special attention needed to be given to the needs of the at-risk and disadvantaged populations.

c. At Risk or Disadvantaged Populations: Both groups identified those without transportation, the disabled, the elderly and those who had nobody to help them or no place to go as being part of the at-risk or disadvantaged populations.

d. Services Available to At Risk or Disadvantaged Populations: It was reported that no assistance was available for clothing and food. The Red
Cross did distribute cleaning supplies at the courthouse. The Housing Authority came in to remove damaged walls to control mold and mildew but those walls have never been replaced.

e. **Information Sources:** Both groups reported getting information from the TV (especially PSA’s) and Radio. At the Bridge Meeting, the at-risk and disadvantaged participants indicated they received much of their information from family, friends and neighbors.

f. **Good Things that Happened:**

The disasters have resulted in an increase in the sense or feeling of community and willingness of neighbors to work together for the common good.

g. **Things that Need to be Improved:**

- Response times for service providers
- More awareness of services available and their contact information numbers.
- “Disaster Kits” should be prepared and made available to at-risk and disadvantaged populations in the parish

5. **Summarize Existing Community Resources**

a. Local organizations/resources that were identified as currently involved:

- The Red Cross and local churches provided shelter, cleaning supplies, and some food supplies
- The sheriff’s office, fire department and wildlife & fisheries also responded on an as-needed basis.

b. Local organizations/resources that could have been involved:

- Nursing homes, Dept. of Health & Hospitals, National Guard, parish government, Salvation Army and the Louisiana Municipal Association could have been better utilized in terms of shelter, supplies and sandbagging and clean-up operations.
6. Identify Trusted & Respected Resources

   a. The Emergency Management group identified the mayor, police, town employees, and FEMA as trusted sources of information about the needs of at-risk and disadvantaged populations and neighborhoods.

   b. The Community Group added to the above list—family, friends, churches and the Salvation Army as trusted sources of information.

   c. At the bridge meeting it was stressed the important part that friends and neighbors played in getting through and recovering from the natural disasters.

7. Development of a Disaster Plan by At-risk and Disadvantaged People

   The Community Group felt that they needed to develop a disaster plan for their neighborhoods to make sure they were included in the overall plans and so that they would have more buy-in to the overall plan. Emergency Managers and Community Groups seemed to feel that it was very important to talk it over with each other so that both plans are truly shared.

8. Assessing the Emergency Preparedness Demonstration (EDP) Project

   a. Emergency Preparedness Demonstration Steps:

      • Community Groups thought the Emergency Preparedness Demonstration project was very detailed and logical. They thought that the steps should be implemented in the entire parish, leaving no one out of the conversation. They also thought there should be a plan B.

      • The groups felt that the state with help from persons in the community should create the resource map and that every family should have a copy of the map. They also wanted to make sure that those who could not read or write were considered when making the information public.

      • Both groups thought more local involvement was important in creating the maps.
9. **Project Summary:**

a. How communities can help:
   - Improve communications between citizens and leaders
   - Increase education and understanding
   - Create resource contact list
   - Create awareness of emergency assistance plan

b. Recommendations on the EPD process:
   - Need more information about community coach concept
   - EM and CG both felt it was important to have local input in developing the resource maps and that the maps once developed should be checked for accuracy by community members.

c. **Specific needs for emergency preparedness and response:**
   - Communication
   - Education
   - Awareness
   - All of these apply to socially and economically disadvantaged

d. **Usefulness of these meetings in the parishes:**
   - Yes, they were useful to the communities.
   - Identified issues pertinent to at-risk and disadvantaged populations
   - Provided disadvantaged citizens the opportunity to meet and have open dialogue with elected officials and first responders
   - People who are geographically isolated and have medical, physical, developmental challenges had their special needs recognized.

e. **Anything new learned as a result of this project?**
   - Yes
   - Learned more about the special needs of at-risk and disadvantaged populations within the parish
   - Learned that plans may exist, but the population does not know about them.
   - Learned that at-risk and disadvantaged populations depend greatly upon each other for help and information which sometimes may be incorrect.
f. Anything else?

- Simplify and streamline grants/contracts procedures so that more lead time is available for preparing for and conducting the project.
- Simplify and streamline the reporting forms to eliminate duplication of questions.
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### Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>83,083</td>
<td>85,998</td>
<td>89,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Non-Hispanic (%Pop)</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>92.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Non-Hispanic (%Pop)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic (%Pop)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-24 Yrs (%Pop)</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-64 Yrs (%Pop)</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+ Yrs (%Pop)</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than H.S. (%Pop 25+)</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Grad. (%Pop 25+)</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College (% Pop 25+)</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's or more (% Pop 25+)</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Components of Population Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural (Births minus Deaths)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Migration</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>35,652</td>
<td>36,574</td>
<td>37,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeownership Rate</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>67.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permits</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Bldg. Permit Value</td>
<td>$73,680</td>
<td>$102,377</td>
<td>$161,561</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Poverty & Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate (Persons)</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Poverty Rate</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian Labor Force</td>
<td>40,769</td>
<td>42,954</td>
<td>48,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>37,995</td>
<td>41,510</td>
<td>45,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>7,976</td>
<td>8,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Non-Hispanic (%Pop)</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>97.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Non-Hispanic (%Pop)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic (%Pop)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-24 Yrs (%Pop)</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-64 Yrs (%Pop)</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+ Yrs (%Pop)</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than H.S. (%Pop 25+)</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Grad. (%Pop 25+)</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College (% Pop 25+)</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's or more (% Pop 25+)</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Components of Population Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural (Births minus Deaths)</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Migration</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>3,715</td>
<td>4,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeownership Rate</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>81.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Bldg. Permit Value</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Poverty & Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate (Persons)</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Poverty Rate</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian Labor Force</td>
<td>4,022</td>
<td>4,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>3,738</td>
<td>4,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Please complete Sections 1-8 for EACH of the two county sites you selected for your study. Section 9, on the other hand, is intended to integrate your insights from both sites. As such, it should represent a summary of your overall project findings and your key insights.

SPECIAL NOTE:

The information being collected as part of our project is helping shape the final report being prepared by FEMA for submission to the U.S. Congressional Appropriations Committee. In order to ensure that our definitions are aligned with those being used by FEMA in its communications with Congress, we are asking you to pay special attention to the two definitions we have provided below. Please make every effort to use the proper term when referring to one of the audiences noted below. At times, you may need to use “at-risk” populations or communities, and at other times it may be more accurate to use the term “disadvantaged.”

We recognize that you may not always be able to easily determine which term is the right one to use at various points in your report. Please use your best judgment as to which of these terms is most appropriate given the input you received in your community meetings.

At-risk – refers to those individuals or communities physically located in areas at-risk for experiencing hazards (i.e. living in flood plains, living in hurricane vulnerable locations, etc.)

Disadvantaged – refers to those individuals or communities that are more likely to suffer from a hazard because of social or economic marginalization (i.e. minority, low income, non-English speaking, etc.). These individuals may be disadvantaged by a lack of resources, services and/or capabilities to take care of themselves.

It is possible that some individuals or communities you discuss are both “at-risk” and “disadvantaged.” Please include which of the three groups (at-risk, disadvantaged, or both) you are discussing, whenever possible, in your written report.
State: Missouri

County Name: Maries

County Type: Rural

State Extension Facilitators: Mary Leuci & Eric Evans

County Extension Facilitators: Shelley Bush-Rowe & BJ Eavy

1. Provide a Brief Overview of the County Site

Prepare a brief overview of the county in which your Roundtable sessions were held. What are some of the key characteristics of this county that led you to select it as a pilot site for conducting your Roundtable meetings? Briefly describe any at-risk or disadvantaged group(s) living in the county. [NOTE: We will be developing a comprehensive statistical profile on each of your county sites, but if you think there are key data that you want to highlight in your brief overview of the county, feel free to do so].

Maries County is southwest of St. Louis, Missouri with an estimated population in 2008 of 9,045. Maries County is very rural, with the closest town of any size being Rolla in Phelps County, 20 miles to the north. Therefore, access to accommodations and transportation is somewhat of a challenge, especially for the disadvantaged of the community. Maries County was chosen for this project, because it has many challenges pertaining to both at-risk and disadvantaged populations. Maries County has had many weather-related events in the last 5 years, which have caused difficulties for everyone, especially those who do not have the ability or the means to prepare and respond. The Extension Specialist in Maries County with whom we worked is very well regarded by the community and did everything possible to make the project a success. This Specialist is actively involved with the farmers, many of whom are aging in place and have little or no help. Most of the people attending the meeting were between 40 & 70 years of age. Many concerns have to do with aging in place, living alone after the death of a spouse, feeling isolated, being unable to get around easily, and having no help.

2. Tell Us Who Took Part in Your Roundtable Sessions

Please provide a summary description of the participants who took part in your three Roundtable meetings.

(g) How many attended your “Emergency Management” (EM) Roundtable and what type of organizations did they represent?

(h) How many attended your “Community” (CG) Roundtable and what type of at-risk or disadvantaged populations did they represent?
(i) How many attended the Bridge meeting and what diversity of organizations or groups did they represent?

If feasible, provide an overview of the diversity of your participants in terms of gender, age, race and ethnicity. This does not have to be precise, but just some idea of the mix of people who took part in each of your sessions.

In the Maries County “Emergency Management” and “Community” roundtables there were mostly people whose outside jobs were part time and farming was their livelihood. Many people who are not on farms commute to other places for work.

a) There were 9 people who attended the March 25 “Emergency Management” roundtable, from 6 organizations and agencies. Many of the safety services are voluntary positions in Maries County. The roundtable meeting represented emergency management, police, sheriff, fire, and ambulance services. The diversity of the group was primarily white, average age about 55 years, with 6 men and 3 women.

b) There were 16 people in attendance at the March 26 “Community” roundtable and 10 of them were senior citizens. We met at the neighborhood restaurant/meeting place where everyone seemed very much “at home” and knew everyone else. Everyone was white and over 60, with there being 9 men and 7 women in attendance. The group spoke of being at risk depending on the kind of disaster; some had first-hand experience from flooding and being trapped in their homes due to the water being over the roads, while others talked about the damage to their homes and businesses from tornadoes. Everyone talked about being at-risk for injury, loss of power, isolation and resulting illness due to freezing and/or excess heat events. Their primary disadvantage is the fact that they are older and in some instances alone and isolated at the end of the road having “aged in place” on their farms. Fear that they will be hurt or become ill as a result of an event and will have no way to communicate their plight is their main concern.

c) There were 13 people who attended the April 20 “Bridging” roundtable. Ten of them were the community representatives spoken of in item “b” and one person came who is a volunteer emergency manager assistant; two people were from MU Extension. There were eight men and five women in attendance, all of them white and the average age was about 60.

3. Identify and Describe the Recent (Past 3-5 Years) Disasters Agreed or Disagreed upon by the Two Groups
(From Roundtable Session 1: Questions 1 and 2)

What major disasters did both the group of Emergency Management and Community representatives agree took place over the past 3-5 years (or so)? For each disaster agreed upon by the group, please provide the following:

(g) What were the key damages incurred by the county?
(h) Were certain neighborhoods or sections of the county impacted more by this disaster and if so, how? Were certain populations impacted more by these disasters? If so, what specific groups and in what ways?
(i) Were there any disasters and damages on which the two groups *did not* agree? If so, please highlight these key differences among the two groups.

a) What were the key damages incurred by the county?

In Maries County:
- Fire: 2009
- Flood: March, June and August 2008
- Destroyed a business
- Highways destroyed
- Cut off parts of the county
- Tornado in Vichy: January 2008
- Tornado: Spring 2008
- Tornado: December 2007
- Tornado: February 2002
- High winds: March 2009
- Ice storms: January 2007 and Late 2007 and early 2008

(The entire county was damaged mostly on the western side)

b) Were certain neighborhoods or sections of the county impacted more by this disaster and if so, how? Were certain populations impacted more by these disasters? If so, what specific groups and in what ways?

Both groups indicated that damage occurred throughout the county. No area was noted as one that was impacted more by the disasters. There was no population identified as impacted more by the disasters.

c) Were there any disasters and damages on which the two groups *did not* agree? If so, please highlight these key differences among the two groups.

There was agreement between both groups about the disasters. The CG did note a number of storms that occurred before 2005, dating back to the early 1990’s.

4. **Describe the Nature of the County’s Preparation and Response to the Disaster(s)**
   
   *(Roundtable – Session 1: Question 3 and Session 3: Questions 3a, 3b)*

   Please provide a description of the following:

   (p) **Preparedness:** How prepared was the county for the disaster(s) from the perspective of the two groups (EM and CG)? Describe areas on which they agree, as well as differences of opinions they had on the county’s level of preparedness.

    Both groups felt that the community was well prepared. The citizen group felt the fire departments did an excellent job and had a great response time.
The CG felt the community was prepared, because neighbors took care of neighbors and families took care of their own needs.

One comment from the EM group was that “These questions must have been developed for a bigger city. We call the dentist or the nursing home if there is a problem coming.”

(q) **Disaster Plan:**
- Did the county have a disaster plan?
- Did both groups know about the county’s disaster plan? Briefly indicate what both groups had to say about the disaster plan (i.e., did they both know about it, did they know what it contained, etc.?).
- Was it comprehensive or did it focus more on specific at-risk or disadvantaged populations, neighborhoods, and/or communities? If it focused on specific groups, what specific at-risk or disadvantaged groups were identified? Why? Were vulnerabilities related to being in vulnerable locations, being socially or economically marginalized, or some other factor (or combination of factors)?
- Who and what groups were involved in the development of the disaster plan for the county? Were any at-risk or disadvantaged groups involved in preparing or reviewing the plan?
- What were some of the conclusions on which the two groups agreed regarding the disaster plan at the Bridge meeting?

The emergency management group knew that there was a plan and felt the plan covered the needs of the entire county.

Only one person in the citizen group knew there was a disaster plan. The rest of the group had no idea that a plan even existed.

At the Bridging meeting, the following was agreed upon:

A. **Knowledge of the Plan** is not consistent throughout the county
   the knowledge base is significantly different between responder and general public.
   
   a. County has a plan and everyone needs to know what’s in it.
   b. Those who know about the plan did not take the time to read it.
   c. The County needs to coordinate with neighboring counties.
   d. Neighborhoods need to plan too.

B. **Organizations/businesses** need to be prepared and willing to help in the event of a disaster.
   a. Fire departments have equipment available to assist.
   b. Neighbors can and will call each other.
   c. Churches can and should open shelters during loss of electricity.
   d. We need shelter for pets.

C. **We need a county-wide system** to get word out about pending disaster – very important.
   a. Reverse 911 – it is expensive and not currently available in county.
   b. Text or email alerts should be implemented.
   c. We need to develop a phone chain-type response system to get the word out.
D. We also need to get the word out to families about being prepared.
   a. Mass mailings
   b. Flyers at fairs
   c. Emergency drills at school
   d. Newspaper articles - Media needs to get more information to the community.

E. Preparation for the future should include:
   a. We need neighborhood watch for emergency management as well as theft.
   b. We need more involvement of churches. They would do more if they had more
      information or were asked to help.
   c. Faith-based community needs disaster training.
   d. More people need to do Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) training.

F. Final Thought
   We are a small county – we need to take care of our families and our neighbors because
   it will be days or weeks before we get help from the state or federal government.

(r) **At-risk or Disadvantaged Populations**: Who did both groups (EM and CG) identify
   as being "at-risk" in the county? Did the groups tend to define "at-risk" in
   terms of vulnerable locations, being socially or economically marginalized, or
   some other factor (or combination of factors)? Did they agree or disagree on
   who might be deemed *at-risk or disadvantaged* these disasters? If so, please
   describe these differences.

Both groups identified the elderly and low income as "at-risk" in Maries County. They
especially focused on seniors that have special needs for medical care, those in the nursing home,
and the low income that do not have funds to plan and prepare. In addition, these people do not
have access to generators and some do not have access to phones.

(s) **Services Available for At-risk or Disadvantaged Populations**: What major types
   of services and/or assistance were identified as available during the disaster(s)
   for *at-risk or disadvantaged* people or places? Were there any key differences
   in the type of resources identified by the two different groups (EM and CG)? If
   so, please explain.

Both the EM and CG groups felt that larger organizations such as the fire departments, churches,
senior center, the Red Cross and community volunteers were trusted services available to assist
in a disaster. Both groups also mentioned the city and county resources like emergency
management personnel, the sheriff's department, local law enforcement, and city and county
employees were resources and trusted.

The primary difference between the EM and the CG groups was that the community group kept
stating that people in the community were self sufficient, that they took care of themselves and
their neighbors.

(t) **Information Sources**: What resources did both the EM and CG groups identify
   as being reliable sources of information? What differences, if any, existed in
the responses between the two groups? If this was discussed at the Bridge meeting, please provide insights into the differences.

Both the EM and CG groups felt that the local news on television and radio were trusted sources of information. They also felt the computer provided useful information on river/flood stages. Both groups also indicated that they trusted and used weather radios.

The primary difference between the groups was that the EM personnel used and trusted State Emergency Management Agency (SEMA) and the national weather service. They felt that many of the disasters they experienced were slow moving, they had time to communicate with other communities in the area and stay on top of the needed information. They also felt that because the storms were slow moving they had adequate time to prepare and evacuate the affected areas before the disaster occurred.

(u) **Positive Responses to the Disaster:** Summarize (in bullet form) what both groups (EM and CG) agreed were the things that went right during the course of the recent disaster(s). If any differences surfaced between the two groups on this item, please describe.

- People worked together; there was community cooperation.
- The county responded well – especially with road cleanup.
- Local fire and police departments responded well.
- The elderly were taken care of.
- There was no loss of life.
- Neighbors helped neighbors.

(v) **Areas of Improvement:** Present (in bullet form) the key items that both groups (EM and CG) agreed have to be addressed before a future disaster strikes. Include specific needs of at-risk or disadvantaged groups, neighborhoods and/or communities that need to be addressed. Next, identify any important differences the groups had on these items, including those that surfaced during the Bridge meeting.

- The nursing home had no generator.
- The community needs an early warning system.
- Not enough people took the time to prepare for the disaster.
- More people need to attend Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) training.

5. **Summarize Existing Community Resources**  
(Roundtable – Session 2: Questions 1 and 2)

For each pilot site, please provide a summary of the local organizations/resources that were identified as (1) currently involved; and (2) could be involved in helping the county prepare for, respond to and recover from disasters. What services or assets could each organization provide?
Were there any key differences in what the EM and CG groups identified as resources? If so, please explain.

Are involved:
Churches
Sheriff’s department
Local fire departments
County – road and electric crews
Water patrol
Ambulance districts
Local service clubs (Masonic, Eagles, Lions, etc)

Could be involved:
More service clubs
   For lodging, shelter, food, water, raise money, volunteers
Vet clinics
   For animal shelter
Extension center
   For local center that can answer questions, organize meetings, prepare newsletters

There were no differences in the responses from the groups.

6. Identify Trusted & Respected Resources
(Roundtable – Session 2, Question 3)

(g) Who did the EM group identify as trusted sources of information about the needs of at-risk or disadvantaged populations and neighborhoods?

- Churches
- Fire and law enforcement
- Division of Family Services
- City employees

(h) Who did the CG group identify as trusted sources of information about the needs of at-risk or disadvantaged populations and neighborhoods?

- Community volunteers
- Sheriff’s department
- Missouri Department of Transportation – Road Closures
- Highway Patrol
- Fire Department
- National Guard
- Red Cross
(i) Please describe any key similarities or differences between the two groups’ responses. If this was discussed during the Bridge meeting, please add any insights from that session.

The primary similarity between the EM and CG groups is that the same “trusted sources of information” appear throughout the conversation. This could be attributed to the fact that this is a very small, very rural community. There are not many resources available to local residents. Those resources that are available are called upon time and time again.

This question was not discussed during the Bridge meeting.

7. Development of a Disaster Plan by At-risk and Disadvantaged People
   (Roundtable – Session 3: Question 5)

Did the groups (EM & GC) at the Roundtable discussions believe that people living in at-risk or disadvantaged neighborhoods should develop a disaster plan for their neighborhood? Why or why not? What thoughts did they have regarding ways to build a strong working relationship between EM and at-risk or disadvantaged groups?

In Maries County, the emergency management personnel felt that the current county plan supported all segments of the population and was sufficient to cover the needs of all county residents.

The community group also felt that the community needed one plan. However, they felt that neighborhoods and all citizens should be involved in creating a plan.

The citizen group felt that there should be local meetings and a discussion of the issue with all groups. However, they also stated that most citizens typically do not participate in community meetings. One idea to get the community involved was to feed them chicken and catfish and have music and fun at a meeting to discuss the emergency plan.

It also seemed to be a general consensus that the county contracted with the regional planning commission to create the plan. There was minimal community input and participation in its development.

8. Assessing the Emergency Preparedness Demonstration (EPD) Project
   (Roundtable – Session 3, Questions 1, 2, and 4)

(m) **EPD Steps**: Please summarize the group’s responses to the EPD Steps.
   - What did they like about the steps?
   - What concerns did they express?
   - What steps, if any, did they feel were missing?
   - Were there any key differences between the reactions of the EM and that of the CG to the EPD process? If so, what were they?
   - What additional insights, if any, came from the Bridge meeting on this topic?
Both groups liked the EPD process. They felt it was useful because there was a process and it had structure. Many also liked the mapping portion of the process because it provided a visual to locate vulnerable areas of the county. However, they also felt that the process required a lot of community participation. The groups did not believe that individuals would participate. They stated that it is a widespread problem in their community because many people (approximately 60% of the population) work outside of the county and could not/would not attend meetings.

Other advice from the group included the need to keep the process simple.

During the Bridging meeting, the group concluded that the EPD process would be helpful. They felt the county commission would have to oversee the process. Participants stated that they liked the process and thought it would be helpful if there could be a summary of the plan, perhaps something that were 3-5 pages and included maps. They felt that there should be representatives from each area to review the plan on a quarterly basis. The groups also felt that there should be an “auditor” that could debrief the community after a disaster and incorporate the “lessons learned” in the plan.

Those at the Bridging meeting felt that the sheriff and all law enforcement departments are a critical piece of the puzzle and are critical in making the process work. There was also a lot of conversation about the political nature of this type of process. They asked questions like:

- Who would be in charge?
- Who would be responsible for the process?
- The county commission has tight control of county funds, how would we pay for the process?

(n) **Vulnerability Assessment:** What reactions did the two groups (EM and CG) have toward the vulnerability assessment step (mapping process)? For example:

- Who did they consider to be the most appropriate entity/person to develop the maps?
- What response did the groups have to the idea of having community members respond to the accuracy of the maps once developed?
- Were there any additional inputs provided during the Bridge meeting on this item? If so, please explain.

The general consensus from both groups is that “yes”, the vulnerability assessment process is useful. Statements from participants included: it encourages all local communities to have a specific plan and that all local residents need to plan and prepare together.

The main comments centered on the need to educate the public. The public needs to be a part of developing the plan and be prepared for disasters.

Other comments from the EM group included that it would be helpful to have a map where all homes are marked.

Both groups felt that local first responders or local citizens should develop the map and local citizens should review the map.
(o) **Community Coach:** Please describe the reaction of the two groups (EM and CG) to the concept of a community coach.

- What did they like or dislike about having this type of resource person?
- Were there any key differences in how the EM group viewed this role as opposed to how the CG group viewed the role? If so, please explain.
- What was the county's "final verdict" during the Bridge Meeting regarding having a community coach?

Both groups like the concept of the community coach. The CG group stated that it was a good idea, but not feasible because the community is large (geographically) and one person could not do the entire job. In addition, there are not enough resources to support this person.

When asked if it was a good idea to have a coach from outside the community, the CG stated that they already have the emergency manager and his plans, but a coach is a good idea.

During the Bridge meeting, concerns stated about the Community Coach included:

- How would the community coach be selected?
- Who would the community coach report to
- Who will help communities cope with disasters?
- Who will organize this process?
- Will there be a community advisory committee?
- Will they live in the community?
  - Some of the participants felt very strongly that the coach should live in the community and thus would know the community better.
  - Some of the participants thought that an outside person could eliminate the problems of local politics.

They also stated that the pluses of a community coach would be:

- Sometimes you need a ramrod to get things going.
- The right person could have more ability to get the job done and work with people.
- A coach could help keep rumors in check.

Some felt that a negative of having a community coach would be that it could complicate the many issues involved in emergency management.

A general consensus from the group was that regardless of how the community coach is selected and who they are, there will be a lot of politics, and the person would have to manage those issues.

(p) **Final Community Recommendations:** During the Bridge meeting, participants were asked these questions. Please provide a summary of their responses:

- Now that you have seen all the steps of the EPD project and reviewed your community's feedback, do you think this is a process that should be pursued to assist at-risk or disadvantaged communities with disaster preparedness and response?
- What is the best way to get communities to buy-in to the EPD process?
The biggest revelation from the meeting was that all citizens need to be involved in preparing for disasters and the EPD process is good. During the Bridging meeting, the group generated several ideas about getting all people involved in the process. They included:

- Locating and identifying people who were at risk.
- Develop strategies to increase awareness and participation.
  - Making personal contact with people and help them better prepare for disasters
  - Newspaper articles
  - Radio programs
    - Programs in the schools
  - Flyers at the county fair and other public events
  - Asking churches to make disaster education a part of their ministry – possibly “Disaster Sunday”.
  - Since there are no community sirens, developing a phone-chain to alert people of a pending disaster.
- Getting people to attend meetings by providing food and music.
- Offering workshops on the topic and lots of advanced public notice to get people there.

Remarks concluded with the recognition that the group does not necessarily know who in their community is at-risk; even when they are identified, the group is unsure how to reach them.

---

**State:** Missouri  
**County Name:** Buchanan  
**County Type:** Metro  
**State Extension Facilitators:** Mary Leuci & Eric Evans  
**County Extension Facilitators:** Shelley Bush-Rowe & BJ Eavy

1. **Provide a Brief Overview of the County Site**

   i. Prepare a brief overview of the county in which your Roundtable sessions were held. What are some of the key characteristics of this county that led you to select it as a pilot site for conducting your Roundtable meetings? Briefly describe any at-risk or disadvantaged group(s) living in the county. [NOTE: We will be developing a comprehensive statistical profile on each of your county sites, but if you think there are key data that you want to highlight in your brief overview of the county, feel free to do so].

   Buchanan County, with an estimated population in 2008 of 89,408, is approximately 35 miles from Kansas City, Missouri. This is both a benefit and a deterrent to the prosperity of the
community. Access to accommodations and transportation found in a metropolis like Kansas City is a definite benefit, but the crowding and crime spillover can be a detriment. Buchanan County was chosen for this project because it is metropolitan enough to offer the diversity we are looking for, and it has many opportunities for access to assistance from others when necessary. In addition, the Extension Specialist in Buchanan County, with whom we were working, is outstanding and did everything possible to make the project a success. This Specialist is actively involved in her community with emergency management, the disabilities organizations, social services, and the local government agencies, which was of tremendous benefit to this project. There are many at-risk and disadvantaged people in Buchanan County, as there are in most large cities, but the advantage of having someone involved in the project, who is actively involved in the lives of all these people, has been most valuable. We had a variety of disadvantaged people involved in the roundtables - some deaf, in a wheel chair, or mentally challenged. There were Spanish-speaking people invited and a few came, but we did provide sign interpretation and Spanish translation. Those Spanish-speakers who came were able to communicate in English. At any given time everyone in the room felt they are at risk, because there are so many disaster events in this area - whether it is storms, flooding, heat or cold.

2. Tell Us Who Took Part in Your Roundtable Sessions

Please provide a summary description of the participants who took part in your three Roundtable meetings.

(a) How many attended your “Emergency Management” (EM) Roundtable and what type of organizations did they represent?
(b) How many attended your “Community” (CG) Roundtable and what type of at-risk or disadvantaged populations did they represent?
(c) How many attended the Bridge meeting and what diversity of organizations or groups did they represent?

If feasible, provide an overview of the diversity of your participants in terms of gender, age, race and ethnicity. This does not have to be precise, but just some idea of the mix of people who took part in each of your sessions.

In Buchanan County, we had a variety of people from all walks of life at both the “Emergency Management” and “Community” Roundtables.

There were 21 people who attended the “Emergency Management” roundtable, from 16 organizations and agencies. They represented the city government, disability organizations, food banks, health departments, the local television station, social services, multicultural education organization, St. Joseph School District, fire department, police department, and the emergency management department. The diversity of the group was primarily white with one African American. The average age of attendees was about 40, with 11 men and 10 women. The “Community” Roundtable was not as well attended as anticipated, even though many more people had verified that they would be there. There were nine people in attendance, three of whom were deaf, one in a wheel chair, one person mentally challenged and one who was blind. There were two interpreters performing sign-language. There were three people representing the Spanish-speaking community and one person representing the senior citizen community. This group definitely felt they were at-risk when there is a tornado or when the power goes out,
because they feel vulnerable. However, the infrastructure of the emergency services is pretty good in St. Joseph and the service providers seem to have a plan and use it. It seems some people living in public housing are on the cheaper top floors and should not be there because they cannot walk down the steps to evacuate as they are in wheelchairs or otherwise incapacitated. This situation puts these people in both the at-risk and the disadvantaged categories.

There were 18 people at the “Bridge” meeting with 5 from the community, 10 from emergency management (with most of those being emergency management office, fire and sheriff departments), Midland Empire Resources for Independent Living (MERIL), senior and Hispanic advocacy groups, and social services. Also in attendance was 1 person from Southern Regional Development Center (SRDC), and 2 people were interpreting with Sign Language. There were 2 English-speaking people of Hispanic/Latino descent, although the translator was available if she had been needed; 7 women and 11 men; the average age was about 40 and 2 military veterans were in attendance.

3. Identify and Describe the Recent (Past 3-5 Years) Disasters Agreed or Disagreed upon by the Two Groups
(From Roundtable Session 1: Questions 1 and 2)

What major disasters did both the group of Emergency Management and Community representatives agree took place over the past 3-5 years (or so)? For each disaster agreed upon by the group, please provide the following:

(j) What were the key damages incurred by the county?
(k) Were certain neighborhoods or sections of the county impacted more by this disaster and if so, how? Were certain populations impacted more by these disasters? If so, what specific groups and in what ways?
(l) Were there any disasters and damages on which the two groups did not agree? If so, please highlight these key differences among the two groups.

Both groups agreed that the following disasters occurred in the past 3-5 years:
- Flooding: annually
- Wind: 2008
- Tornadoes: 2008

While the CG also included:
- Fires: Annually
- Heat: Annually
- Lightening storms: Not specified
- Straight winds: Not specified

And the EM included:
- House fires: Not specified
- Snow storms: Not specified
- Hurricane (Gustav): Not specified
The following were damages that both groups agreed have occurred in the community:

Flooding
Power outages
Downed power lines / loss of power
Crop damage
Infrastructure damage
Loss of heat
Loss of water
Tree damage - limbs down
Roads closed/driveways blocked
Cell and land phone lines down
Tornado damage
Loss of income/tax revenue &
Businesses were closed
Inability for adequate rescue or recovery services &
Responders and hospitals were overloaded

The groups differed in that the CG indicated:
The lack of heat caused loss of life of elderly/children/animals.
Loss of homes
Loss of water
Homes were damaged
Debris everywhere
Loss of perishable food
Lack of transportation
Inability of rescuers to get to at-risk people
Highway accidents
Not enough clothes or blankets
Mold
High bacterial infection rate
Damage was everywhere
The EM differed in their response with the following:
Shelters set up but not used
Lack of transportation
CO₂ poisoning
Mosquitoes

4. Describe the Nature of the County's Preparation and Response to the Disaster(s)
   (Roundtable – Session 1: Question 3 and Session 3: Questions 3a, 3b)

Please provide a description of the following:

(w) Preparedness: How prepared was the county for the disaster(s) from the perspective of the two groups (EM and CG)? Describe areas on which they agree, as well as differences of opinions they had on the county's level of preparedness.
The chart below highlights the information shared at each meeting. The left side represents the thoughts of the EM group, while the right column represents the comments from the CG group.

As you can see, there are a few glaring differences of opinion between the groups. The first is with the community plan. The EM group felt the plan worked well, they had practiced and except for the need for a little better coordination, everything worked as expected. The CG group stated that there was no plan and they need neighborhood assessments to prepare for disasters.

Another area of disagreement regards individual preparation. The EM group felt that individuals were not prepared, while the CG group stated that you could “never really be prepared and that people needed more information and education about how to prepare for a disaster”.

When it came to the issue of shelters, the EM group stated that shelters were available. The CG group felt that the shelters filled up quickly. In addition, there was great concern from the CG group that the elderly could not descend stairs to get from their apartments and there were some in wheelchairs that could not get from their high-rise apartments to shelters because the power was out and the elevators did not work.

There was also disagreement about the disposal of debris. The EM group felt that debris removal was immediate. However, the CG group stated that there were too many changes in the rules to dispose of debris. An additional issue was that individuals must take the debris to the landfill and in many cases, this was not possible, especially for those who are elderly or disabled.

The EM group also indicated that they need help communicating with citizens that speak English as a second language, or don’t speak English at all.

Both groups recognized that the deaf population was especially vulnerable and hard to reach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In the mind of the EM group</th>
<th>In the mind of the CG group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Plan &amp; organizations worked very well.</td>
<td>• There is no plan for the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plan had been practiced.</td>
<td>• We need neighborhood assessments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need a coordinator.</td>
<td>• You are never really prepared for disasters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Individuals were not well prepared.</td>
<td>• People need more education about how to respond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need more communication from public.</td>
<td>• Where does information come from?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Audio only, no visual message to the public.</td>
<td>• Need for weather radios (wind up with text for deaf in case of power loss).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• We were lacking communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• e-mail or text message on phone would help.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Deaf population was unreachable. | • Deaf people are especially vulnerable.  
| | • Need TTY warnings – flashing lights.  
| | • Need pagers for the deaf.  
| | • English as a Second Language (ESL) is an issue.  
| • Shelters were available.  
| | • Shelters filled up quickly.  
| | • Wheelchair-bound were stranded in their apartments when high rise elevators don’t work.  
| | • Elderly can’t climb or descend 12 flights of stairs.  
| | • Need better maps with shelter locations clearly marked.  
| • Good response from outside communities. | • Interagency cooperation was very good.  
| | • Mutual aid good, but needs some work.  
| | • Help came from National Guard.  
| | • Received additional help with power & cleanup.  
| | • It would be helpful if neighbors worked disaster preparation together.  
| | • Need more help and communication between neighbors.  
| | • Need neighborhood watches for areas south, east, north ends.  
| | • Other crews came in to help.  
| | • Red Cross and faith community responded with food and shelter.  
| | • During the power outages, people from all over the country came to help and donated money.  
| • Debris removal was immediate. | • There were too many changes on how to dispose of debris.  
| | • Individuals must take debris to the landfill. That is not possible for many.  
| | • Shortage of generators and batteries.  
| | • When checked on by EM, there was no opportunity to share needs - just “are you okay” then they left.  
| | • Concern for elderly and disabled – they had no help.  
| | • Street signage is poor, many unmarked. Need to be higher and show at night.  

(x) **Disaster Plan:**  
• Did the county have a disaster plan?
• Did both groups know about the county’s disaster plan? Briefly indicate what both groups had to say about the disaster plan (i.e., did they both know about it, did they know what it contained, etc.?).
• Was it comprehensive or did it focus more on specific at-risk or disadvantaged populations, neighborhoods, and/or communities? If it focused on specific groups, what specific at-risk or disadvantaged groups were identified? Why? Were vulnerabilities related to being in vulnerable locations, being socially or economically marginalized, or some other factor (or combination of factors)?
• Who and what groups were involved in the development of the disaster plan for the county? Were any at-risk or disadvantaged groups involved in preparing or reviewing the plan?
• What were some of the conclusions on which the two groups agreed regarding the disaster plan at the Bridge meeting?

As noted in the response above, the EM group felt there was a good plan in place. It worked when tested. However, the CG group did not feel there was a plan in place and it certainly did not address the needs of at-risk or disadvantaged groups.

(y) **At-risk or Disadvantaged Populations:** Who did both groups (EM and CG) identify as being “at-risk” in the county? Did the groups tend to define “at-risk” in terms of vulnerable locations, being socially or economically marginalized, or some other factor (or combination of factors)? Did they agree or disagree on who might be deemed at-risk or disadvantaged these disasters? If so, please describe these differences.

It appears that both groups are fairly inclusive when looking at the at-risk or disadvantaged. When asked, “Who in your community is least able to prepare or respond to disasters?” both the EM and CG groups indicated:

• Elderly
• Physically disabled
• Low income / poor
• Non English speakers / immigrants (language barrier)

The EM group also included:
• Those with special needs
• Homeless
• Those who did not receive information
• Under educated
• Those unable or unwilling to leave their home
• Those who panicked
• Those without support/disconnected
• Socially isolated
• Those with no transportation

The CG group added:
• Mentally disabled
• Deaf (major problem)
• Illegal aliens

(2) **Services Available for At-risk or Disadvantaged Populations:** What major types of services and/or assistance were identified as available during the disaster(s) for at-risk or disadvantaged people or places? Were there any key differences in the type of resources identified by the two different groups (EM and CG)? If so, please explain.

Both groups felt the following were available to at-risk or disadvantaged people in their community:

• Food/food pantries/food banks/food kitchens
• Red Cross (education/food/shelter/blankets/smoke alarms)
• Health Department
• Local churches
• Social service agencies
  • Midland Empire Resources for Independent Living (MERIL)
  • Family Services
  • Community Action Partners (CAP)

The CG group included:
• Emergency crews (utility)
• Fire department
• National Guard
• Neighborhoods
• The media

The EM group added:
• Shelters were set up.
• Care providers helped their clients.
• Businesses provided food and supplies.
• Evacuation was done.

The major difference that can be noted is that the CG group felt the media provided a great source of service or assistance to people who are at-risk or disadvantaged. Perhaps that can be attributed to earlier statements from the group indicating that many felt isolated. The media, television and radio could provide a link to information about the world outside of their homes, assuming the power stays on.

(aa) **Information Sources:** What resources did both the EM and CG groups identify as being reliable sources of information? What differences, if any, existed in the responses between the two groups? If this was discussed at the Bridge meeting, please provide insights into the differences.
When it comes to reliable sources of information, the CG group trusted most the word of mouth from friends and neighbors, city sirens, the internet and local media. The EM group also indicated friends and co-workers, alerts, the internet and local media. However, they also included National Oceanic and Aeronautical Administration (NOAA), Emergency Operations Command (EOC), weather radios, State Emergency Management Agency (SEMA), the Ham weather network, first responders and their personal disaster plan. It seems that the differences between the groups might be that the EM group knew of more sources of information.

(bb) **Positive Responses to the Disaster:** Summarize (in bullet form) what both groups (EM and CG) agreed were the things that went right during the course of the recent disaster(s). If any differences surfaced between the two groups on this item, please describe.

In answering this question, you can see from the following chart that the EM and the CG group did not agree on much. The EM group focused most heavily on the plan and advance preparation while the CG group focused on neighbors coming together.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thoughts from the EM group</th>
<th>Thoughts from the CG group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning in advance.</td>
<td>One disaster prepares you for another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The plan was successful.</td>
<td>Community gathered together from the beginning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As part of the plan, agreements in advance with Red Cross,</td>
<td>Many from the community volunteered to help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the hospital, Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Operations Command (EOC).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation and teamwork of agencies.</td>
<td>Rural area brought help (water trucks).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication between agencies was good.</td>
<td>Ross Perot sent water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The response was well managed.</td>
<td>National Guard distributed water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick response.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter for at-risk set up quickly &amp; went well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debris removal from streets went well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(cc) **Areas of Improvement:** Present (in bullet form) the key items that both groups (EM and CG) agreed have to be addressed before a future disaster strikes. Include specific needs of at-risk or disadvantaged groups, neighborhoods and/or communities that need to be addressed. Next, identify any important differences the groups had on these items, including those that surfaced during the Bridge meeting.

Both the EM and CG group felt the following were important needs that could be addressed before the next disaster.
• Educate the public – be proactive.
• Coordinate the volunteers.
  o Difficult to track staff, volunteers and sheltered individuals.
  o Faith-based communities did not have a collaborative effort.
• Improve communication
  o Difficult to communicate with community members and agencies,
  o Especially in outlying areas of the community.
  o Work with media to report an accurate story.
• Trim limbs over power lines – need underground utilities.
• Work with group homes and high-rise living centers.
  o Educate/train the staff.
  o Provide resources for preparation.
  o Check and evaluate locations to prepare for disasters.
  o Noted concern – there are no fire trucks that can reach higher than 8 floors.
    There needs to be a plan for evacuation of elderly and disabled who live in taller
    buildings. Recommend these vulnerable people be housed on lower floors.

The EM group included the need to improve the special needs sheltering plan.

The CG group included the need for neighborhood planning with neighborhood groups to
implement the plan.

5. Summarize Existing Community Resources
   (Roundtable – Session 2: Questions 1 and 2)

   For each pilot site, please provide a summary of the local organizations/resources
   that were identified as (1) currently involved; and (2) could be involved in helping the
   county prepare for, respond to and recover from disasters. What services or assets
   could each organization provide? Were there any key differences in what the EM
   and CG groups identified as resources? If so, please explain.

Again, the key differences centered around the EM group identifying public institutions, while
the CG group focused on the media and Unmet Needs Committee.

Both groups identified those local organizations/resources that are currently involved in
Buchanan County, including:
• Nonprofit service organizations like Red Cross, Community Action Agency, Older
  Adults Transportation Service (OATS), Young Men’s Christian Association
  (YMCA), Salvation Army, Midland Empire Resources for Independent Living
  (MERIL), United Way, food pantries
• Health department
• Hospitals
• Police/ Fire/ Emergency Medical Services (EMS) / Highway Patrol
• State Emergency Management Agency (SEMA)
• Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) (limited involvement)
• Faith-based groups
• National Guard/military
• Volunteer organizations

The EM group also included:
• City and county government
• Utilities & public works
• Family services
• School districts
• Missouri Department of Transportation (MoDOT)
• Private industry

The CG group included
• Media
• The Unmet Needs Committee

When looking at those groups that could be involved, both the EM and CG agreed on:

• More Community organizations
  • 4-H, Future Farmers of America (FFA), fraternities and sororities, Shriners’

• More organizations
  • University of Missouri Extension (MU Extension)— education coordination
  • Colleges/universities
  • Churches

• Community Emergency Response Team (CERT)/disaster training
  • Civil defense
  • Train-the-trainer programs

• Area businesses
  • Food
  • Water
  • Volunteers
  • Money
  • Generators
  • Pharmacy- medication
  • Transportation

• Pet service providers
  • Veterinarians
  • Critter clubs – LIONS, ELKS, MOOSE, etc.

(2) What other organizations could be involved in helping the county prepare for, respond to and recover from disasters

The EM group also identified the following:
• Immigrant services (communication)
• Trash companies – extra routes and days for trash pickup
• Inmate population – work crews
• Trash companies – debris removal
• Media – communication for better awareness

There did not seem to be much difference in the response from the EM and CG groups.

6. Identify Trusted & Respected Resources
   (Roundtable – Session 2, Question 3)

(j) Who did the EM group identify as trusted sources of information about the needs of at-risk or disadvantaged populations and neighborhoods?

The EM group identified the following as trusted sources of information:

• Churches
• Interserve (Local collaborative organization of service providers)
• Community organizations
  o Midland Empire Resources for Independent Living (MERIL)
  o Mid–city Excellence (Local resource provider)
  o Senior Center
  o Emergency Management Agency (EMA)
  o Food kitchens
  o Senior meals
  o Service clubs
• Fire and police
• Utilities
• Media

(k) Who did the CG group identify as trusted sources of information about the needs of at-risk or disadvantaged populations and neighborhoods?

The CG group identified the following as trusted sources of information about the needs of at-risk or disadvantaged populations and neighborhoods.

• Red Cross
• Social Services
• Community agencies
  o Community Action Partners (CAP)
  o Midland Empire Resources for Independent Living (MERIL)
• Emergency responders
• Fire
• AFL/CIO (labor unions)
• Community services
• Catholic Charities
• The police and media were listed as organizations that were trusted “sometimes”.
(l) Please describe any key similarities or differences between the two groups’ responses. If this was discussed during the Bridge meeting, please add any insights from that session.

The major similarities that were identified by both groups were the trust in the community service organizations and some church organizations.

The differences lie in the “sometimes” trust of the local media and police by the CG group. This could possibly indicate that the CG group has had interaction with these two organizations in the past that has not been positive.

7. Development of a Disaster Plan by At-risk and Disadvantaged People
(Roundtable – Session 3: Question 5)

Did the groups (EM & GC) at the Roundtable discussions believe that people living in at-risk or disadvantaged neighborhoods should develop a disaster plan for their neighborhood? Why or why not? What thoughts did they have regarding ways to build a strong working relationship between EM and at-risk or disadvantaged groups?

The CG group felt that at-risk and disadvantaged neighborhoods should have a disaster plan. They believe that one way to build the relationship between the two groups would be to bring in someone from outside the community to work on building trust and understanding between all entities. They felt that there needed to be a lot of talking, relationship building and awareness training. They also felt it would help if members of the at-risk and disadvantaged communities could be a part of the planning, training and decision-making process. Worst case scenario, they also felt that if the EM group did not cooperate, they should be fined.

The EM group felt that the current community plan was comprehensive but conceded that it was helpful to identify at-risk populations in the community. They also felt that the at-risk and disadvantaged communities should be encouraged to develop their own plans. They felt one way to achieve this goal would be interaction and networking with these groups. The EM group also thought that a neighborhood CERT program might be helpful and that EM staff could provide tools, support, and follow up for this program.

While the EM and CG groups disagreed about the plan currently in place, both agreed that open communication, relationship building, participation and training could help at-risk and disadvantaged communities better prepare and recover from a disaster.

8. Assessing the Emergency Preparedness Demonstration (EPD) Project
(Roundtable – Session 3, Questions 1, 2, and 4)

(q) EPD Steps: Please summarize the group’s responses to the EPD Steps.
   - What did they like about the steps?
• What concerns did they express?
• What steps, if any, did they feel were missing?
• Were there any key differences between the reactions of the EM and that of the CG to the EPD process? If so, what were they?
• What additional insights, if any, came from the Bridge meeting on this topic?

The CG group really liked the EPD project. They felt it provided a way for all community meetings to include representatives of ALL in the at-risk or disadvantaged community. They wanted to be sure that groups were represented, including Hispanic, disabled and elderly.

The CG group also liked the fact that the EPD project was well detailed and in well defined steps.

The EM group also liked the steps of the EPD program. They felt that the steps were efficient and manageable and that the community is the focus of the effort. In addition, the community has ownership in the plan when they are involved. This group also liked the fact that this model has been tried and found workable; they would not have to re-create the wheel.

However, they were concerned that this project would require a lot of fund-raising and wondered who would provide technical expertise.

During the Bridge meeting, the group continued to be concerned about funding this type of project. They really liked the mapping tool and felt it was one of the most beneficial of the project. There was also expressed desire to keep any process simple.

Disagreement during the Bridge meeting came when discussion centered on the fact that the EPD project:
• May not be any more accessible than what they are doing now, and
• Minority needs must be tempered against the greater needs of the community.

(r) **Vulnerability Assessment**: What reactions did the two groups (EM and CG) have toward the vulnerability assessment step (mapping process)? For example:
• Who did they consider to be the most appropriate entity/person to develop the maps?
• What response did the groups have to the idea of having community members respond to the accuracy of the maps once developed?
• Were there any additional inputs provided during the Bridge meeting on this item? If so, please explain.

The CG group felt that the vulnerability assessment was a positive step. The only comment made regarding “who” would do the map was that one table felt the city planners should create the map, and all of the community should have the opportunity to review the final map.
In the EM group, the concern centered around who created the map and who and what was the source of information used to create the map. There was also concern about the fact that the at-risk and disadvantaged populations tend to move their households more frequently and how difficult that made any mapping project. However, they did feel that is was valuable as long as it was reviewed locally.

There were no additional inputs provided during the Bridge meeting.

(s) Community Coach: Please describe the reaction of the two groups (EM and CG) to the concept of a community coach.
  - What did they like or dislike about having this type of resource person?
  - Were there any key differences in how the EM group viewed this role as opposed to how the CG group viewed the role? If so, please explain.
  - What was the county’s “final verdict” during the Bridge Meeting regarding having a community coach?

The CG group liked the idea of a community coach, if the person was qualified and accountable. They felt that this person could bring the groups together.

The EM group liked the idea of a community coach. They felt this person might provide an outside perspective and should be neutral to community issues. They felt that the coach would have to have a broad knowledge base and skill set including facilitator knowledge, emergency response, technical knowledge and community knowledge.

They were concerned about who would pay for the coach and if the coach could simply become an advocate for a particular group of citizens and not look at the community as a whole.

During the Bridge meeting, the group was asked, “What do you find most valuable about these responses regarding a community coach?” Their responses included:

- The coach will have to be a professional mediator, because of power struggles and turf issues in local government.
- The coach can maintain focus and push the process.
- The coach needs to be a real communicator and a professionally qualified person who can get people working together.

Why?

- There is a local perception that community leaders bicker quite a bit and do not value community input.
- Every organization needs a good director.

What comments tend to bother you and why?
- Accountable - coach needs to answers back to community.
- Qualified- what are the qualifications?
• Coach being part of the community - needs to be a neutral party without bias; no arm twisting.
• Professional mediator (choice of words/semantics).

What is your final verdict on the pluses and/or minuses of having a community coach to help with the EPD process?

• Good idea if coach can connect and keep the community engaged. Coach would have to be aware of local turfs/cliques.
• Not from community - he or she needs to be neutral; making sure people from all of the community are respected.
• Pluses: Keep lines of communication open and direct the effort.
• Minuses: The cost, and it may be difficult gaining consensus about who the coach should be.
• Pluses: Could serve in a liaison role to city and county EMA.
• Funding - who would pay?

(t) Final Community Recommendations: During the Bridge meeting, participants were asked these questions. Please provide a summary of their responses:

• Now that you have seen all the steps of the EPD project and reviewed your community’s feedback, do you think this is a process that should be pursued to assist at-risk or disadvantaged communities with disaster preparedness and response?
• What is the best way to get communities to buy-in to the EPD process?

During the Bridge meeting participants agreed the EPD project should be pursued to assist communities with disaster preparedness and response.

One group suggested checking the current community plan to see if this process could be used to fill in any “gaps” that exist in the plan.

Another group felt that this process should be made available to communities, but not required.

When asked what the best way to get communities to buy-in to the EPD process, they responded:

• Get them involved - get communities to buy-in to the process by owning the idea.
• Schedule meetings at a convenient time and place. Provide childcare and transportation. Personal recruitment with media support. Booth at local events. Involve churches in recruiting, send notes home from school. Booths outside grocery stores.
• Somehow help citizens understand that they have a responsibility to prepare themselves. Tell them that decisions will be made with or without their help.
9. Project Summary

Please share your thoughts on the following items:

(m) Based upon the discussions that took place in the Roundtables and Bridge meetings held in your two counties, what are the 4-5 most important things a community can do to help:
- At-risk people prepare for and respond to disasters?
- Disadvantaged people prepare for and respond to disasters?

Summary from the Bridge meetings in Buchanan and Maries Counties:

1. Identify the location of at-risk and disadvantaged populations.
2. Identify the needs of at-risk and disadvantaged populations.
3. Develop a community plan to address special needs and concerns.
4. Develop a communication and education plan to help individuals.
   - Help people understand the issue and empower them to help themselves.
5. Execute – do not go back to business as usual.

Summary of important things a community can do - from the project facilitators:

1. Engage people in dialogue - exactly what we were doing in these roundtables - getting leaders and residents together to talk about the needs. Discuss the needs and assets of the community. Determine what everyone understands, what is taken for granted, and what can be done to make communication clearer.

2. Create a plan that is inclusive of all people in the community, but has annexes to it that specify particular populations that need extra attention, or are the exception to the rule.

3. Include people in the writing of the emergency plan who represent all walks of life and all areas of the community, so that you have the perspective of everyone and don’t find out later that you left some part of the population out of the plan.

4. Practice the plan, so people know what to expect when an emergency happens.

5. Include in the plan either a budget or means for fundraising, so that those people who are unable to provide the basic supplies for survival in a disaster will have access to those supplies when the time comes; whether it is through regional caches, or some local organizations.
6. Those organizations that work regularly with people who are non-English speakers, physically or mentally handicapped, low-income, poorly educated, elderly, or otherwise disadvantaged need to make emergency preparedness part of their mission of care and concern for their special populations. In addition, they need to keep track of their clients, make sure the clients are as ready as possible for the disaster, that they survive it, and that they are given the help they need to recover as soon as everyone else. An example of this mission is the person on oxygen—the provider makes sure an ample supply is available for the client and makes it their business to check on the client regularly to determine that everything is working as it should and the client is okay.

(n) What final recommendations would you offer on the EPD process, regarding:
   - The concept of a Community Coach?
   - The vulnerability assessment for addressing the needs of disadvantaged people?

The EPD Project is a good idea for any community, especially those in remote communities where other options are not wide-spread. The vulnerability assessment is needed, because people think they understand and know what the situation is in their community, but often do not. Interestingly they are very surprised by this revelation of not knowing. It is apparent from our experience with Buchanan & Maries Counties that this assessment is needed, and people are willing to try to make it happen.

The community coach would be very beneficial because it would be one person working as a coordinator for all the organizations who should be involved and helping them determine what needs to be done. People liked the idea, but had several reservations about it, primarily that the person would have to be someone from the community in order to be seen as a trusted and valuable player in the scheme of things. In fact, they thought it should be one of the emergency management office people, or someone already involved in emergency management. On the other hand, when they decided what the qualifications should be for this position they began to rethink their ideas about who that should be. However, when they looked at the qualifications they had established and what that salary would look like, they began to rethink it again, leaning back to a local person - concluding they could just lower the expectations for qualification. Another line of thought was that the community coach should come from outside of the community, so they would have a "fresh" perspective and not be tied with the politics and could "think outside the box." We think EPD & Coach are possibilities, but like any successful project, would need to be adapted to the community they are meant to serve.

(o) What specific needs do the counties have with regard to emergency preparedness and response? Then, please share your thoughts on the following:
   - Which of these do you think Extension could play a valuable role in addressing?
   - Which of these are likely to have special application to those who are also socially and/or economically disadvantaged?

These counties, more than anything else right now, need to continue the dialogue started by these Roundtables, so that they will continue to keep the enthusiasm and interest in emergency preparedness
and response a priority. They need to review and/or write their emergency plan using community representatives as part of the committee to do the writing. They need to make sure the at-risk and disadvantaged populations are represented and that an annex to the plan is established for those special populations. There needs to be a way for the community organizations to come together around their clients to make emergency preparedness and response part of their mission. These points have to do with all the population, including at-risk and disadvantaged people, as identified in question a - 6. Extension could and should play a leadership role in all these aspects of emergency management, especially specialists in Community Development, whose profession it is to work with groups and communities to help them accomplish their goals. Community Development professionals facilitate such efforts as gaining community input and participation, writing plans, organizing the community to do things, helping organizations determine their mission and how to accomplish their goals, and anything else the community needs.

(p) **What do you think about the meetings that were held in the county?**

- Were they useful to the community? Why or why not?
- Do you feel they helped increase awareness of the special needs of local residents who are socially and/or economically disadvantaged? Please explain.

The meetings in the counties met our expectations and beyond. We thought they would be meetings much like others where people think they have to be there and would rather be somewhere else, but this was not the case in either county. The people in attendance were very enthused, took it seriously and were open to suggestion. We thought the meetings were well attended, even though several more people had been invited. Much was accomplished, especially the idea that these gatherings need to continue in order to make progress toward solving the problems. The professionals actually heard the residents say that they did not know there is a plan. Hearing some of the horror stories people had to tell really made the professionals sit up and take notice. They had no idea. On the other hand, when the residents heard the emergency people talk about how well they thought things went, how hard they worked to get to people, and the stories of incidents where they put themselves in jeopardy for the community, it made a difference. There was instant willingness to work together toward common ground and to make the community a safer place to live. In both counties, it was truly an awakening moment.

(q) **Did you learn anything new as a result of your involvement in this FEMA/CSREES/SRDC project?**

- If so, what did you learn?
- If not, why do you feel this is the case?

Primarily we, the facilitators, had reinforced for us that the system works. We experience these kinds of “ah-ha” moments all the time in our work with groups, but this scripted process for dialogue in the community did not feel as open to such possibilities as when we let the group dynamics dictate the agenda. However, in the end we had very much the same results. People embraced the questions (primarily because they were very important to THEM) and got very involved in the dynamics of what those questions implied. It was a learning experience for us, because we tend to resist the scripted process for fear we will lose that edge; maybe there is room for both, depending on the situation.
(r) Is there anything else you would like to bring to our attention in terms of your experiences taking part in these county meetings and the overall project?

It was such a good experience all around. The two facilitators have never worked so closely on a project together, so did not really know the style of the other; therefore, we had to have a couple of “discussions” to come to an understanding of how we would do this. We also had to rearrange so much in our individual schedules in order to be available not only for the program and those groups, but for each other. We are so eternally grateful to our colleagues in the counties for doing such a stellar job of preparing for our arrival; we could not have asked for more. We knew things are difficult in the world of emergency management, because of funding inadequacies, apathy in many realms, ignorance of what should be done, and inability to do what needs to be done, but there were examples that we had not even thought about. Aging in place and then having the spouse die and leave you to your own resources is difficult on so many levels, yet these people are becoming a larger and larger part of our population. They live daily on their farm, isolated from everyone, with no support; then when an ice storm hits and the only road is blocked by downed trees, the power goes off and they can’t even call for help! This is becoming more like the normal story these days and it is frightening. These Roundtables would be of benefit all over the country for so many communities (maybe even all communities) if for no other reason than to call attention to the situation and cause people to start talking to each other about what they can do together to make a difference. We think Extension could be very instrumental in making this happen, with the help of the Regional Rural Development Centers (RDC), Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and other such interested organizations and agencies.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to bring this program to two of our counties. It has been our pleasure and the residents were so appreciative. It was a good experience for us all and in addition, we got to meet all of the people who are involved in the project, which has been a great honor.
The State of Oklahoma
Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Service

Comanche and Okfuskee Counties

Staff:
Brian Whitacre, Claude Bess, Ron Vick and Marty New
## Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>111,486</td>
<td>114,996</td>
<td>111,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Non-Hispanic (%Pop)</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Non-Hispanic (%Pop)</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic (%Pop)</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-24 Yrs (%Pop)</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-64 Yrs (%Pop)</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+ Yrs (%Pop)</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than H.S. (%Pop 25+)</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Grad. (%Pop 25+)</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College (%Pop 25+)</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's or more (%Pop 25+)</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Components of Population Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural (Births minus Deaths)</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>1,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>-775</td>
<td>-3,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Migration</td>
<td>-591</td>
<td>-3,368</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>43,589</td>
<td>45,416</td>
<td>47,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeownership Rate</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permits</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Bldg. Permit Value</td>
<td>$104,541</td>
<td>$109,862</td>
<td>$89,910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Poverty & Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate (Persons)</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Poverty Rate</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian Labor Force</td>
<td>42,452</td>
<td>43,323</td>
<td>45,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>39,527</td>
<td>41,736</td>
<td>43,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>11,551</td>
<td>11,814</td>
<td>11,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Non-Hispanic (%Pop)</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Non-Hispanic (%Pop)</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic (%Pop)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-24 Yrs (%Pop)</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-64 Yrs (%Pop)</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+ Yrs (%Pop)</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than H.S. (%Pop 25+)</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Grad. (%Pop 25+)</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College (%Pop 25+)</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's or more (%Pop 25+)</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Components of Population Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural (Births minus Deaths)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Migration</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>4,894</td>
<td>5,114</td>
<td>5,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeownership Rate</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>76.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Bldg. Permit Value</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Poverty & Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate (Persons)</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Poverty Rate</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian Labor Force</td>
<td>4,413</td>
<td>4,539</td>
<td>4,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>4,084</td>
<td>4,361</td>
<td>4,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please complete Sections 1-8 for EACH of the two county sites you selected for your study. Section 9, on the other hand, is intended to integrate your insights from both sites. As such, it should represent a summary of your overall project findings and your key insights.

**SPECIAL NOTE:**

The information being collected as part of our project is helping shape the final report being prepared by FEMA for submission to the U.S. Congressional Appropriations Committee. In order to ensure that our definitions are aligned with those being used by FEMA in its communications with Congress, we are asking you to pay special attention to the two definitions we have provided below. Please make every effort to use the proper term when referring to one of the audiences noted below. At times, you may need to use “at-risk” populations or communities, and at other times it may be more accurate to use the term “disadvantaged.”

We recognize that you may not always be able to easily determine which term is the right one to use at various points in your report. Please use your best judgment as to which of these terms is most appropriate given the input you received in your community meetings.

**At-risk** – refers to those individuals or communities physically located in areas at-risk for experiencing hazards (i.e. living in flood plains, living in hurricane vulnerable locations, etc.)

**Disadvantaged** – refers to those individuals or communities that are more likely to suffer from a hazard because of social or economic marginalization (i.e. minority, low income, non-English speaking, etc.). These individuals may be disadvantaged by a lack of resources, services and/or capabilities to take care of themselves.

It is possible that some individuals or communities you discuss are both "at-risk" and "disadvantaged." Please include which of the three groups (at-risk, disadvantaged, or both) you are discussing, whenever possible, in your written report.
State: Oklahoma

County Name: Comanche

County Type (Metro or Non-metro): Metro

State Extension Facilitators: Brian Whitacre, Stan Ralstin

County Extension Facilitators: Marty New

1. Provide a Brief Overview of the County Site

Comanche County is an urban location (pop. 113,000 as of 2007 Census estimate) in the southwestern part of Oklahoma. The county seat and dominant population center is in Lawton (pop. 90,000), which is located next to Fort Sill military reservation. The proximity of the military base is an important part of Lawton’s economy and its emergency preparedness readiness. Lawton itself is economically disadvantaged, with a median family income of $44,300 in 2007 (compared to $60,374 nationally) and approximately 20% of individuals below the poverty line (compared to 13.3% nationally). Further, there are a significant number of African-Americans (22%, vs. 12% nationally) and slightly higher than average disabled residents (18% vs. 15% nationally).

2. Tell Us Who Took Part in Your Roundtable Sessions

The participants who took part in the three roundtable meetings included:

(a) Emergency Management (EM) Roundtable: 10 people, including individuals from:
   a. City & County Emergency Management
   b. Police
   c. Department of Human Services (DHS)
   d. School system
   e. Health Department
   f. Hospitals
   g. Tribal organizations

Diversity of this group: 80% Caucasian, age ranged from late 20s to mid 50s (mostly in the 40s), roughly 40% female.

(b) Community Group (CG) Roundtable: 8 people, including the following
   a. Low income (in poverty)
   b. Mother with disabled child
   c. Hispanic
   d. African American

Diversity of this group: 50% African – American, 10% Hispanic, age ranged from early 20s – early 60s, roughly 40% female.
(c) Bridge Meeting: 14 people, mostly from the CG participants (65%). From the EM meeting, representatives from the health and fire departments were present. Diversity of this group: 40% African - American, 30% Hispanic, age ranged from late teens to early 60s, roughly 50% female.

3. Identify and Describe the Recent (Past 3-5 Years) Disasters Agreed or Disagreed upon by the Two Groups
(From Roundtable Session 1: Questions 1 and 2)

Disasters agreed upon:
(1) Floods (2007 – 2009)
   a. Heavy rains are common in this area, and can quickly cause flooding. Areas that are prone to flooding are well-known to local emergency management personnel.
   b. Key damages – property damage (mostly focused on residential flooding), road damage, business flooding.
   c. The elderly are highly impacted by these storms – they lack mobility and cannot quickly leave if their location is in danger of flooding.

(2) Wildfires
   a. Key damages – Trailers destroyed / farm equipment lost.
   b. Rural areas suffered more.

(3) Wind storms (2004, 2007)
   a. Key damages – Trees / property lost (particularly trailers).
   b. Trailer parks suffered disproportionately.

(4) Hail damage

Disasters NOT agreed upon
(1) Rural floods – most of discussion of EM group concerned flooding in urban areas, while several CM participants discussed their experiences with flooding in more rural areas.

4. Describe the Nature of the County's Preparation and Response to the Disaster(s)
(Roundtable – Session 1: Question 3 and Session 3: Questions 3a, 3b)

Please provide a description of the following:

5. Preparedness: Both EM and CG participants felt the community was relatively well prepared. The EM group discussed the usefulness of the Emergency Operating Plan (EOP) while the CG indicated that they thought that a plan existed, but they simply didn’t know what it was. However, as discussed below, the CG felt that they had good advance warning for most of the disasters.

6. Disaster Plan:
   a. EM personnel were aware of the EOP for the city / county, and indicated it was updated annually.
   b. CG members knew little about the plan – they felt that one likely existed, but did not know what was in it.
c. The disaster plan was comprehensive in nature, meaning it did not focus specifically on at-risk or disadvantaged groups. The plans do not provide any detailed focus for any single group, they are more general in nature.

d. There was no direct involvement from the at-risk or disadvantaged community in developing the emergency disaster plan. However, the EM group did indicate that they had conversations with individuals who provided service to at-risk groups, such as nursing home administrators.

e. The EM group also acknowledged that it was possible for at-risk or disadvantaged groups to be overlooked, since this population changes regularly.

f. The need for incorporating how to handle pets into the disaster plan was acknowledged by the EM group.

7. **At-Risk or Disadvantaged Populations:** The dominant disasters mentioned by these groups included floods, wildfires, wind storms, and hail. The only at-risk population that was identified were those living in neighborhoods that were consistently damaged by floods (within the city of Lawton). When heavy rains occur, both EM and CG members knew exactly which portion of the town would flood. Both groups generally agreed that the disadvantaged populations included the elderly and individuals with low income.

8. **Services Available for At-risk or Disadvantaged Populations:** The EM group felt that significant resources were available for the disadvantaged populations, such as shelters if floods or wind storms hit, the Red Cross, Salvation Army, County Health Department, and church volunteers. The CG identified some of these same sources, such as the Red Cross, Salvation Army, and churches. They also discussed several not included by the EM group, including hospitals, local food banks, Fort Sill (if necessary), United Way, and mental health groups. Both groups generally agreed that a significant number of resources existed for at-risk or disadvantaged groups.

9. **Information Sources:** The dominant source of information for both the EM and CG was the TV, which was used heavily during flood watches and tornado warnings. Both groups agreed that the TV coverage was generally good. Radio, Code Red (an automated callback service that calls your cell or home phone when bad weather is imminent) and 211 were all mentioned as important sources of information for the community in general.

10. **Positive Responses to the Disaster:** Both groups agreed that the availability of early warnings was crucial to being prepared for a disaster, and felt that the provision of early warnings was well done and represented a positive for the community. The EM personnel felt that the following things were done correctly:

a. Good job working together to respond to floods / fires, including: city - fire departments, county – sheriff’s office, and volunteer fire departments.

b. Felt the emergency personnel were well trained

c. Felt communication between organizations was good

d. Low turnover among emergency management personnel helps (same people addressing multiple disasters – get to know faces, etc.)

The CG members had a few different opinions of what went right (in addition to the quick response noted earlier):

e. Police responded quickly

f. Information quickly available on TV / radio telling people what to do
11. **Areas of Improvement**: The EM personnel felt that the areas that needed to be addressed were:
   a. Response of the public needs to be improved (multiple stories of people driving around “street closed” signs).
   b. The at-risk community will continually complain about infrastructure problems, but complete overhaul is not likely.
   The CG members mentioned:
   c. Louder or more sirens for tornadoes – some cannot hear (particularly at night)

**Summarize Existing Community Resources**
(Roundtable – Session 2: Questions 1 and 2)

1. Local organizations/resources currently involved in helping the county prepare for, respond to, and recover from disasters:
   a. Red Cross
   b. Salvation Army
   c. Police (city / county)
   d. Fire departments
   e. Health Department
   f. City / County Emergency Management
   g. DHS
   h. Schools
   i. Hospitals
   j. Media (TV / Radio)
   k. Churches
   l. Fort Sill (military)
   m. Food banks
   n. OSU Extension
   o. Public Works
   p. Utilities
   NOTE: While the EM group compiled the large list shown above, the CG was fairly coherent with that list. The CG did not list a few resources, such as public works or utilities, but generally both groups were very similar.

2. Local organizations/resources that could be involved in helping the county prepare for, respond to and recover from disasters:
   a. FEMA / OEM – mentioned by EM group (didn’t see as much involvement from state / national level as some might have liked)
   b. Businesses / Wal-Mart
   c. DHS not overly involved. Mentioned by CG: most felt they could provide relief
   d. Cable / satellite / Dish

6. Identify Trusted & Respected Resources
(Roundtable – Session 2, Question 3)

(m) The EM group identified the following resources as trusted sources of information about the needs of at-risk or disadvantaged populations and neighborhoods:
a. Salvation Army  
b. DHS  
c. Social Security  
d. Ministerial Alliance  
e. Eldercare Organizations (Nutrition Project)  
f. Schools  
g. Battered Wife shelters  
h. Police / Fire

(n) The CG group identified the following resources as trusted sources of information about the needs of at-risk or disadvantaged populations and neighborhoods:  
a. Red Cross  
b. United Way – have some pamphlets already  
c. Police  
d. Churches (particularly due to language barrier)

(o) Primary differences: CG noted more personal resources, such as churches and Red Cross. Some of the resources were listed by both groups. The EM group displayed some reservation about how trusted the DHS / Social security were by disadvantaged community members.

7. Development of a Disaster Plan by At-risk and Disadvantaged People
(Roundtable – Session 3: Question 5)

Both the EM and CG group members generally believed that people living in disadvantaged neighborhoods should develop a separate disaster plan for their neighborhood, even if a community-wide disaster plan already exists. The EM participants, in particular, thought that giving the community some ownership of the plan would encourage participation – something that they felt was lacking in the current EOP. The CG members generally agreed, mentioning that these types of plans could fall somewhere between the county-wide plan that the EOP addresses and the individual family plan that most families have, such as where to meet after a fire. The EM group did indicate that the local plans need to be realistic, and developed in conjunction with the community-wide plan. Including representatives from various groups (at-risk, disadvantaged, EM) was seen as a good way to ensure that the EM people respond in a positive way to these plans.

8. Assessing the Emergency Preparedness Demonstration (EPD) Project
(Roundtable – Session 3, Questions 1, 2, and 4)

(u) **EPD Steps**: A summary of the group’s responses to the EPD Steps. Most were optimistic about the process:  
- Seems to be a reasonable approach  
- Identifying and covering the needs of the community is important  
- Focus on entire community is good  
- Good to look at areas that are at risk  
- Getting community involvement will be crucial
Using maps to get them involved is a good idea

- Involvement of new people is useful, but challenging

But some had reservations:

- Getting community involvement will be difficult
  - Are there other ways? Website / public broadcasting?
- Having enough volunteers to develop and implement the plan would be challenging
- Would require some technical expertise to implement
- How does it get updated?
- How do pets fit in?

In the bridge meeting, the question of who raises the money and who handles the funds came up several times.

(v) **Vulnerability Assessment**: The general reaction of both the EM and CG groups to the vulnerability assessment step (mapping process) was positive.

- Construction of the maps was viewed as best performed by some type of committee representing the local government and the university. The CG was particularly high on having university involvement, feeling that the university should lead the effort.
- Having community members “ground-truth” the accuracy of the maps was well-received by both the EM and CG groups. This was seen as an integral part of the overall process – getting meaningful feedback from the disadvantaged or at-risk community is crucial to the success of the project. It was also seen as a way of ensuring the map was accurate and prevents the excuse of “I didn’t know that was there” following an emergency.
- At the bridge meeting, the challenge of getting all appropriate people to the table was noted repeatedly.

(w) **Community Coach**:

Most generally thought the community coach was a good idea:

- Would be necessary to have this person (with expertise for maps / holding meetings)
- Good for motivation, and experience from other sites

But others noted a few problems:

- Some were okay with an outside person, others wanted a local person to be the coach
- If the coach is from another community:
  - Difficult for the coach to relate to the community
  - Trust is an issue
  - Can't have an overbearing personality
- How would they be funded?!

The CG was “okay” with someone from the outside coming in to be the coach. The EM group, however, were adamant that the coach needs to be someone from within – a known face. Further, most of the local people who could fulfill this role are already fully employed, leading to time management issues. At the bridge meeting, several people (including the EM individuals present) were receptive to the idea of an outside coach partnering with a local EM leader to form a “co-coach” team. The cost of paying for the coach was also brought up several times.

(x) **Final Community Recommendations**:
- The general consensus from this community is that yes, the EPD is a valuable project and should be pursued to help communities with disaster preparedness.
- The program needs to be seen as a full-on, long-term solution and NOT a "band-aid" to an existing problem.
- The mapping process was noted as particularly useful, and a "must-have" for getting involvement from the targeted groups.
- Keeping the process relatively simple was stressed – it should not be elaborate.
- Getting involvement from all levels of the community (particularly the disadvantaged) was acknowledged as crucial, and also seen as very difficult to accomplish.
- Addressing the pets issue needs to be a part of this program.
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State: Oklahoma

County Name: Okfuskee

County Type (Metro or Non-metro): Non-metro

State Extension Facilitators: Brian Whitacre, Claude Bess

County Extension Facilitators: Ron Vick

1. Provide a Brief Overview of the County Site

Okfuskee County is a relatively rural location (pop. 11,800 as of 2000 Census) in the mid-eastern part of the state. The county seat is in Okemah (pop. 3,000) which is where the majority of the county emergency management personnel are located. Okemah is economically disadvantaged, with a median income of $21,300 in 1999 (compared to $42,000 nationally) and approximately 25% of individuals below the poverty line (compared to 12.5% nationally). Further, there are several nearby towns in Okfuskee County that are disadvantaged both economically and socially, including the town of Boley (pop. 1,100) with 40% of individuals living in poverty and 55% African-American.

2. Tell Us Who Took Part in Your Roundtable Sessions

The participants who took part in the three roundtable meetings included:

(d) Emergency Management (EM) Roundtable: 18 people (mostly from Okemah), including individuals from:
   a. City & County Emergency Management
   b. Police
   c. Fire
   d. Department of Human Services (DHS)
   e. School system
   f. Health Department
   g. Hospitals
   h. Religious organizations
   i. Tribal organizations
   Diversity of this group: 100% Caucasian, age ranged from early 20s to mid 50s (mostly in the 40s), roughly 40% female.

(e) Community Group (CG) Roundtable: 22 people (mostly from the town of Boley), including the following at-risk populations:
   a. Vulnerable to tornadoes
   And the following disadvantaged populations:
   b. Low income (in poverty)
   c. Elderly
d. African American
Diversity of this group: 95% African – American, age ranged from mid 30s – early 70s, roughly 25% female.

(f) Bridge Meeting: 18 people, mostly from the EM group (90%). These included most of the same types of organizations as the initial EM meeting, although no religious leaders or tribal organizations were present.
Diversity of this group: 90% Caucasian, age ranged from mid 30s to early 60s, roughly 35% female.

3. Identify and Describe the Recent (Past 3-5 Years) Disasters Agreed or Disagreed upon by the Two Groups
(From Roundtable Session 1: Questions 1 and 2)

Disasters agreed upon:
   a. Key damages – Loss of electricity
   b. The elderly are impacted more by these storms – they lack mobility, and can suffer worse consequences when going outside. The lack of planning (obtaining enough food for several days, in advance) and poor communication (not letting people know their location) of elderly citizens were also noted.

   a. Key damages – Fences / hay / livestock lost.
   b. Rural areas suffered from these disasters more – fires are generally controlled fairly quickly once they hit a city / town.

(7) Tornadoses
   b. Elderly and those with small children suffered more – lack of mobility.

Disasters NOT agreed upon
(2) Floods – EM personnel were surprised to see this had been listed by some of the people in the CM group.

4. Describe the Nature of the County’s Preparation and Response to the Disaster(s)
(Roundtable – Session 1: Question 3 and Session 3: Questions 3a, 3b)

Please provide a description of the following:

(dd) Preparedness: EM personnel felt that they were relatively well prepared, while the CG indicated that the community did not respond well.

(ee) Disaster Plan:
   • EM personnel were aware of the disaster plan that exists within the county. Some even had copies of it with them, and said that it was renewed quite frequently (a minimum of once per year). Most knew generally what it
contained, but others indicated it was something they looked at once or twice and never opened again.

- CG members knew little about the plan – if one existed, they did not know what it contained or how it pertained to them.
- The disaster plan was comprehensive in nature, meaning it did not focus specifically on at-risk or disadvantaged groups. The plans do not provide any detailed focus for any single group, as they are more general in nature and provide a list of “appropriate steps” that can be performed regardless of location.
- The only personnel involved in the development of the disaster plan for the county were from the EM group. No at-risk or disadvantaged individuals were part of the planning effort.
- The EM group did indicate that they would like additional feedback from the CG personnel, and acknowledged the importance of “local emergency planning committees” which could potentially feed into the development of such a plan. However, such committees are not currently formed.

(ff) **At-Risk or Disadvantaged Populations:** Since the dominant disasters the groups mentioned included ice storms, fires, and tornadoes, neither group specifically identified at-risk populations. The CG felt that they may be more prone to tornadoes due to their location in a “valley” compared to the county seat. Both groups generally agreed that the disadvantaged populations included the elderly and those with small children.

(gg) **Services Available for At-risk or Disadvantaged Populations:** The EM group felt that significant resources were available for the disadvantaged populations, namely: Red Cross, individual volunteers offering services such as generators, churches setting up food banks, the Health Department, and schools. On the other hand, the CG did not feel as if many resources were set aside specifically for the disadvantaged group. The general consensus of the CG members were that people in their city “take care of their own,” meaning that residents would check on other neighbors in times of need, but few outside resources existed or were used.

(hh) **Information Sources:** The dominant source of information for both the EM and CG was the TV, which was used heavily during tornado watches and also after ice storms. TV stations in Oklahoma have good reputations for following potential tornadoes and letting towns know when to expect the storm front to hit them. Other responses included radio and personal contact (which was focused on more heavily by the CG members). The CG expressed concern that sometimes the TV coverage did not focus enough on their specific town.

(ii) **Positive Responses to the Disaster:** The EM personnel felt that the following things were done correctly:
- EOP was in place and used (particularly for list of available inventory such as generators)
- Good communication between OSU / DHS / Emg. Preparedness personnel
- Knowledge level of local EMS and political entities was good.

The CG members generally had different opinions of what went right:
- Good local contacts – once someone gets word about the forecoming disaster, it spreads quickly
- TV report allowed for limited preparation
- Community pulled together – local fire departments checked on people.
(jj) **Areas of Improvement**: The EM personnel felt that the areas that needed to be addressed were:

- Development of a list of alternative power sources for disadvantaged communities
- Development of a list of water sources
- Creation of an organized core of volunteers / contacts
- Capacity for helping with mental health
- Ability to assess whether shelters were up to health codes

The CG members agreed with some of those, particularly power sources and water sources. They also mentioned:

- Improving communication from the outside
- Faster service by road crews (clearing roads necessary for ice storms / some tornadoes)
- Need for a safe room / food pantry specifically for disadvantaged members

5. **Summarize Existing Community Resources** (Roundtable – Session 2: Questions 1 and 2)

1. Local organizations/resources currently involved in helping the county prepare for, respond to, and recover from disasters:
   a. Health Department
   b. City / County Emergency Management
   c. DHS
   d. Schools
   e. Hospitals
   f. Churches
   g. Fire Department
   h. Police
   i. County Sheriff
   j. Community Action
   k. Red Cross
   l. Salvation Army
   m. Correctional Facilities
   n. National Guard
   o. Utilities
   p. OSU Extension

   NOTE: The above list was mostly compiled by the EM group. The CG personnel primarily listed the Red Cross and Fire Departments, indicating that they did not see nearly as much involvement from other organizations as the EM group did.

2. Local organizations/resources that could be involved in helping the county prepare for, respond to and recover from disasters:
   a. Private Sector (shelter, food, equipment, supplies)
   b. Creek Nation (equipment, generators, food)
   c. Military (manpower, equipment)
   d. Ministerial Alliance (food, clothes)
6. Identify Trusted & Respected Resources
   (Roundtable – Session 2, Question 3)

   (p) The EM group identified the following resources as trusted sources of information about the needs of at-risk or disadvantaged populations and neighborhoods:
   a. DHS (some disagreement about how trusted the DHS is by these populations)
   b. Rural Fire Departments
   c. Senior Citizens Centers or Nutrition sites
   d. Health Department
   e. Schools
   f. Police
   g. Pharmaceutical / medical suppliers
   h. Home health agencies

   (q) The CG group identified the following resources as trusted sources of information about the needs of at-risk or disadvantaged populations and neighborhoods:
   a. TV – still the most dominant source of information
   b. Individual community contacts (specific names of people living in community given) / kinfolk
   c. Churches
   d. DHS / Red Cross (only listed by 1 group out of 3)

   (r) The primary difference between the EM and CG members were that EM saw a wide variety of resources as trusted information sources for these populations. In contrast, CG saw only a much smaller, more personalized listing of resources as being the best way to get information across to disadvantaged individuals.

7. Development of a Disaster Plan by At-risk and Disadvantaged People
   (Roundtable – Session 3: Question 5)

Both the EM and CG group members believed that people living in disadvantaged neighborhoods should develop a separate disaster plan specifically for their neighborhood, even if a community-wide disaster plan already exists. The EM group stressed the importance of this plan not conflicting with any community-wide plan, and also indicated it would be tough to get involvement from many of the disadvantaged communities. The CG members also felt it would be beneficial to set up such a plan, adding that it would be useful to share the results of their plan with the more centralized county emergency management personnel, who are not as familiar with their particular living situations and geographic location of their residents. The need for improved communication between emergency management personnel and leaders / community members in disadvantaged locations was noted by both groups. This includes the disadvantaged members gaining an understanding that the EM group is here to help. Some members of the EM group indicated that the disadvantaged groups should have a distinct few spokespeople, as listening to 100+ people is not realistic.
8. Assessing the Emergency Preparedness Demonstration (EPD) Project
   (Roundtable – Session 3, Questions 1, 2, and 4)

(y) EPD Steps: A summary of the group’s responses to the EPD Steps.
   Most were fairly optimistic:
   • Felt it represented a good starting point
   • Having an organized plan would help keep people from panicking
   • Very inclusive
   • Good to look at areas that are at risk
   • Useful for future planning
   • Involvement of new people is useful, but challenging
   • Helps agencies who think about “what if” to be better prepared
   • Will encourage participation from larger community groups
   But some had some reservations:
   • Getting community involvement will be difficult
   • Having enough volunteers to develop and implement the plan would be challenging
   • Would require some technical expertise to implement
   • Education needed before process even begins (particularly for surrounding communities to learn about each other)
   • How does it get updated?
   • Need for person-to-person recruitment will be time consuming
   In the bridge meeting, the question of who raises the money and who handles the funds came up. Additionally, it was unclear whether the mapping would be done for each potential community in the county.

(z) Vulnerability Assessment: The general reaction of both the EM and CG groups to the vulnerability assessment step (mapping process) was positive.
   • The most appropriate entity for constructing the maps varied from community leaders / city council / county government to students from local schools / universities / faculty members.
   • Having community members “ground-truth” the accuracy of the maps was well-received by both the EM and CG groups. This was seen as an integral part of the overall process – getting meaningful feedback from the disadvantaged or at-risk community is crucial to the success of the project.
   • At the bridge meeting, the challenge of getting all appropriate people to the table was again noted, along with the time commitments of these individuals. Also, the discussion of whether the map should include points of interest for all cities in the county was raised again (it was felt that the map should include all cities, but noted that this would increase timeline / complexity of the project).

(aa) Community Coach:
   Most generally thought the community coach was a good idea:
   • Must be someone from outside the community, with experience (this was recognized by both the EM and CG groups)
   • Would be necessary to have this person
   • Good for motivation, and experience from other sites
   But others noted a few problems:
   • Community coach can’t do it all
• Difficult for the coach to relate to community
• Trust is an issue
• Can’t have an overbearing personality
• How would they be funded?!

Not many notable differences between groups here – both EM and CG personnel were “okay” with someone from the outside coming in to be the coach, as long as they were not overbearing. At the bridge meeting, most acknowledged that bringing in an outsider would be necessary, but thought that (if possible) they should come from a similar (i.e. rural) community. The ability to draw people in is critical to this position, and someone without an understanding of how a rural community runs would not be able to do it. Developing a local support group to help the coach was mentioned. The cost of paying for the coach was also brought up several times.

(bb) **Final Community Recommendations:**

• The general consensus from this community is that yes, the EPD is a valuable project and should be pursued to help communities with disaster preparedness.

• The mapping process was noted as particularly useful, although some question remains about which level they will be developed for (can it provide maps for 8-10 communities in a county?)

• Getting involvement from all levels of the community (particularly the disadvantaged) was acknowledged as crucial, and also seen as very difficult to accomplish.

• The best ways to get community buy-in involve starting at the community level (get the target audience hooked in early), asking “what-if” scenarios to disadvantaged groups, and general education about what the process entails.
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State: Oklahoma
County Name: Comanche, Okfuskee
County Type (Metro or Non-metro): Metro (Comanche), Non-metro (Okfuskee)
State Extension Facilitators: Brian Whitacre, Claude Bess, Stan Ralstin
County Extension Facilitators: Marty New (Comanche), Ron Vick (Okfuskee)

Please Provide Your Final Comments and Recommendations on the Entire Project -- This Section Should Be Based on Both of Your County Reports

10. Project Summary

Please share your thoughts on the following items:

(s) Based upon the discussions that took place in the Roundtables and Bridge meetings held in your two counties, what are the 4-5 most important things a community can do to help:

- At-risk or Disadvantaged people prepare for and respond to disasters?
  o Education. This was a highly repetitive response – nearly everyone had it somewhere on their list. Informing the “at-risk” or “disadvantaged” individuals about the dangers they faced was seen as a very high priority.
  o Identify the locations of the “at-risk” or “disadvantaged” people (mapping process as part of EPD would help).
  o Identify the most commonly faced disasters for these individuals
  o Obtain local buy-in from the community
  o Produce a usable, simple product (flyer / map / handout?) for these individuals to take away and be able to be use when necessary.

- NOTE: Neither of our communities broke the responses to this question out into at-risk vs. disadvantaged categories.

(t) What final recommendations would you offer on the EPD process, regarding:

- The concept of a Community Coach?
  o There are mixed opinions here. There is some resistance to bringing in outsiders to serve in this role, particularly noted by urban EM personnel. Rural communities were somewhat open to an outsider serving in this position, but stressed that they need to understand how rural areas operate. The technical expertise and experience with
other communities that the coach would bring was seen as VITAL for
the project to be successful.
  o A good suggestion was to form “co-coaches”: one from outside the
    community, the other from the local emergency management scene.
  o The coach CANNOT come in and dictate the entire process or be
    overbearing – community needs to feel ownership.
  o The coach needs a magnetic personality – the ability to get others
    involved in the project.
- The vulnerability assessment for addressing the needs of disadvantaged
  people?
  o Definitely a key feature of the EPD process.
  o Getting the disadvantaged community to participate will be a
    challenge. The vulnerability assessment is great for demonstrating
    exactly what the project can do for them, but getting continual
    involvement is not easy. Even for our small, introductory level
    meetings we had difficulty bringing this demographic in. It will be
    challenging to get them involved (and keep them involved for a period
    of time), specifically when most don’t consider emergency
    preparedness a priority.

(u) What specific needs do the counties have with regard to emergency
preparedness and response?
  1. Bringing together EM personnel and everyday citizens
  2. Helping everyday citizens understand the dangers they face and what they
     should do in the case of specific emergencies
  3. EM personnel need to develop specific plans for disadvantaged individuals

- Extension can play a role in the first 2 responses above – bringing people
  together (facilitating meetings) and educating the general public about
  what they need to do in specific emergencies.
- Developing plans specifically for disadvantaged individuals or groups
  should definitely be a part of the EM planning process. The EPD process is
  a good example of how this could happen. As noted elsewhere, getting
  feedback from and participation from these disadvantaged communities is
  difficult.

(v) What do you think about the meetings that were held in the county?
- The meetings were helpful to the members of the community, if for no other
  reason than the fact that they opened up lines of communication between
  emergency management personnel and everyday citizens. In particular,
  specific contacts in different communities were identified, when they did not
  exist prior to these meetings. Emergency management personnel noted that
  they would now spend more time considering the needs of other, more rural
  communities in their future plans.
- The meetings did help increase awareness of the special needs of
  disadvantaged residents. Both the EM and CG participants indicated that
  they had not fully considered what various types of disadvantaged
  individuals faced during crises.
(w) Did you learn anything new as a result of your involvement in this FEMA/CSREES/SRDC project?
- EM personnel indicated that they learned that others in the community are not aware of the EOP for the county
- EM personnel learned about the need for improved communication between agencies – some jobs are being duplicated
- CG personnel learned that not very many individuals were as prepared as they needed to be, particularly in disadvantaged segments of the population.
- Both groups learned a new perspective on emergency management issues by listening to concerns that they had not considered
- New ideas about the EPD process itself – seems to be a good concept for starting change

(x) Is there anything else you would like to bring to our attention in terms of your experiences taking part in these county meetings and the overall project?
- Usefulness of the project in increasing awareness of issues facing disadvantaged individuals
- Increasing awareness of 211 / Emergency call-back numbers
- EPD is a very educational program, premise is good
- Pets are ALWAYS an issue – some will not leave without them
- Talking to people about this issue outside of the program meetings is important, that is how you raise awareness in some communities (having socially active participants is helpful)
- EM personnel are generally bombarded with preparedness training, but getting input from actual citizens is a very effective way to get them to think outside the box. However, multiple meetings may not be feasible as EM personnel are already stretched pretty thin.
Monday, June 29th

1:00 p.m. Welcome, Introductions, and Overview
           Bo Beaulieu and Deborah Tootle

1:15 p.m. Comments by our Federal Partners
           Joe Wysocki, CSREES
           Ralph Swisher, FEMA/DHA

1:30 p.m. SESSION ONE: Setting the Stage: Reflecting on Your Communities' Disadvantaged Populations

We would like to begin our meeting by conducting a rapid assessment of some of valuable information you collected during your interactions with a variety of community members.

We'd like to ask you to consider the following two questions and to briefly provide your responses on the flip charts we have distributed around this room. We'll be taking each question one at a time, and once you've completed a response to that question, we'll discuss your collective inputs and then move on to the next question.

Here are key questions we want you to address and then discuss:

Question 1: What individuals groups or neighborhoods were most negatively impacted by the disasters that were experienced by your communities? How were they impacted?

See Matrix One: Who the Groups Identified as “At-Risk” or “Disadvantaged”
Using the definitions below, which of these individuals, groups and/or neighborhoods would you designate as "at risk" versus those that you would you classify as "disadvantaged?"

**At-risk:** refers to those individuals or communities physically located in areas at-risk for experiencing hazards (i.e. living in flood plains, living in hurricane vulnerable locations, etc.)

**Disadvantaged:** refers to those individuals or communities that are more likely to suffer from a hazard because of social or economic marginalization (i.e. minority, low income, non-English speaking, etc.). These individuals may be disadvantaged by a lack of resources, services and/or capabilities to take care of themselves.

**Question 2:** Let's focus on the specific disadvantaged populations that you just described. To what extent were each of these groups successful or unsuccessful with regard to the following and why?

- Their Disaster Awareness
- Their Disaster Preparation
- Their Disaster Response
- Their Disaster Recovery

**Question 3:** To what extent was the success or failure of your disadvantaged groups to carry out the activities described in Question 2 affected by their urban or rural location? Be as specific as possible.

**Question 4:** What were the identified strengths and failures of the disaster planning and response process?

**Matrix Five: Disaster Response – What Worked Well**

**Matrix Six: Disaster Response – What Needs Improvement**

**Question 5:** What are the implications for future community disaster planning?

2:30 p.m. **Debriefing: Key Points Emerging from SESSION ONE**

2:45 p.m. **Break**

3:15 p.m. **SESSION TWO: Key Community Assets/Resources**

The following questions will be addressed in teams of 4-5 persons. Questions 4 – 6 are answered within Matrix # XX, review the Matrix carefully and make sure it is reflective of your communities responses. Each team will be asked to share its insights at the end of this session.
Question 4: What groups or individuals were identified as key resources in your communities in terms of responding to the local disasters? What assistance/resources did they provide?

Matrix Two: Resources & Organizations Currently Involved

Question 5: What groups and/or individuals did your communities feel should have been used, but were not? What assistance/resources could they have provided?

Matrix Three: Resources That Should Be Involved, But Are Not Currently Being Used

Question 6: What individuals and/or groups were identified by your communities as most trustworthy and why? What individuals/groups would be viewed as trustworthy by the disadvantaged groups in your communities and why?

Matrix Four: Trusted Sources of Information

Question 7: After reviewing Matrix # XX, What common themes appear in this information? Are there resources that are consistently overlooked or underused? How well do trusted resources match resources used?

What are the implications for future community disaster planning?

3:45 p.m. Sharing Session Two Team Reports

4:15 p.m. SESSION THREE: Examining the EPD Process

Please form into teams of 4-5 persons again, but please ensure that new people are included on your team. Session three will be designed to gather the collective thoughts of your group regarding the major strengths and limitations of the EPD process. Each small group will be asked to report out to the entire group at the end of this session.

Question 7: What did roundtable participants identify as strengths of the EPD process? What did they identify as weaknesses and/or limitations of the EPD process?
Question 8: Did the view of the EPD process differ between your Emergency Management and Community-Based Groups? If so, in what specific ways?

Coaching

Question 9: What did roundtable participants think of using coaches to guide them through a disaster planning process? What did they like and dislike (or what strengths or weaknesses did they see with having a coach)?

Question 10: Who did the roundtable participants think would be good candidates to serve as a coach in their community? How did this vary between your Emergency Management and Community-Based participants?

Urban/Rural Differences

Question 11: Did your rural and urban communities differ in terms of their receptivity to the EPD process and to the notion of coaching? If so, in what ways?

5:15 p.m. Sharing Session Three Team Reports

6:30 p.m. Dinner with Team

Tuesday, June 30th

8:00 a.m. Reviewing Monday’s Discussion; Additional Comments/Insights

8:15 a.m. SESSION FOUR: Developing Recommendations to FEMA and CSREES

In preparation for writing the final report to FEMA and CSREES, it is important to gain the input and insights of our entire Extension team regarding the major recommendations we want to share with these key federal agencies. We will begin the process with the individual, move into small team discussions, gather as an entire group to hear each team’s report, and then work as an entire group to finalize the list of recommendations.
Question 12:

**Each Person:** Jot down on a piece of paper the major recommendations that you would offer to FEMA and CSREES in terms advancing the emergency awareness, preparedness and response capabilities of communities (be they urban or rural in nature), as well as those who are part of the community’s disadvantage population. Prepare whatever additional recommendations that you feel would be critical to share with FEMA/CSREES.

**Small Group:** Organize into teams of 4-5 individuals and share and discuss your recommendations. The team should then develop a consensus on the key recommendations.

**Entire Group:** We will meet as an entire group and each team will be asked to share their recommendations. Once this process is completed, we will attempt to arrive at some agreement regarding the key recommendations that we want to prepare and submit to FEMA/CSREES.

9:45 a.m. Break/Check out of Hotel

10:15 a.m. **SESSION FIVE: Examining Extension’s Role**

The 30 roundtables sessions that were completed as part of this project offer valuable insights and ideas on how Extension might play a valuable part in advancing the EPD-type efforts in communities.

**Question 13:** What are some of the important opportunities that exist for the CES in light of your community roundtables? Are they specific things we can do in the areas of awareness, preparation, response and recovery? Please specify.

**Question 14:** Are there specific efforts that you would like to pursue as a team in the coming months? If so, what?
11:15 a.m.  Closing Session

- Other issues/concerns/recommendations that we need to capture that have not been addressed to this point

- Final comments/thoughts by our FEMA and CSREES Representatives
Disadvantaged Groups

Commonly identified “disadvantaged” groups:
- Elderly, especially in rural areas*
- Non-English speaking
- Those with Physical and or mental disabilities*, including those with medical dependence (i.e. on oxygen, dialysis, etc.)
- Homeless
- Lacking transportation
- Low education / illiterate
- Low income*
- Isolation*: social, cultural, and or physical/geographical**
- Families with small children, especially single parents
- Those that refuse to take action
- Homebound
- Illegal immigrants

*Indicates groups most often identified as “disadvantaged.”

** For purposes of this meeting “social isolation” referred to individuals that did not have many connections to community (i.e. not part of churches, clubs, etc. that would connect them to the outside world). “Cultural isolation” referred to individuals or groups that were separated by some aspect such as language, customs, etc. These individuals may be well connected as a group, but not to the outside world. “Physical/geographical isolation” referred to individuals that lived in remote locations that may cause a hindrance in a disaster.

Notes:
- Sometimes separating “at risk” and “disadvantaged” is challenging.
- Levels of disadvantage is an important consideration (i.e. How low is the income? How severe the handicap? How old / young or how dependent is the person? 
- Multiple layers of disadvantaged factors magnified the problem (i.e. low income, illiterate, homebound all rolled into one person puts them at a greater disadvantage than a single factor.
### Coaching Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liked having a guide to keep the process on track, motivate, and take responsibility.</td>
<td>Need clear definition of the role and necessary qualifications. (skills, personality traits, education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator/Mediator is good.</td>
<td>Concern for selecting a local coach vs. an outsider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate education and experience is a strength: must understand both technical and process aspects.</td>
<td>Funding – bigger concern in rural settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassion to understand community concerns.</td>
<td>May be a need to provide coach training (skills, process, education, technical aspects)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral – the lack of political “baggage” allows for appropriate mediation and impartial intervention if needed.</td>
<td>Some Emergency Managers may be hesitant – feel threatened (responsibility, hypersensitivity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal would be to team an outside coach with an inside facilitator.</td>
<td>Concern for political agendas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust is essential to success.</td>
<td>Must be able to establish trust within the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban: more receptive to coach as an outsider, but expressed concern that there was already a plans in place</td>
<td>Can’t be expected to do it all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural: Helpful because of limited resources and the ability to draw people together.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SESSION FOUR: DEVELOPING RECOMMENDATIONS TO FEMA AND CSREES

- Emergency Preparedness Demonstration Project is valuable and should be pursued:
  - Develop comprehensive training curricula for process and for coaches.
  - Clearly define the role of the coach and the core competencies needed to be successful.
  - Implement a competitive grants process to encourage community “buy-in” upfront.
  - Invest in an outside evaluation of the original pilot sites from EPD – look at both readiness to respond as well as capacity building/leadership development.
  - Catalogue available resources to assist with GIS mapping and coaching needs. (i.e. universities, community colleges, etc.)
  - Refine vulnerability assessments; explore low tech options.
  - Address ways to involve and encourage local buy-in and participation
- Provide feedback to states and communities that participated in this project (i.e. next steps, future opportunities)
- FEMA to explore partnerships with other like-minded entities – Seek to partner as opposed to being the “final authority”:
  - Partner FEMA’s Regional Catastrophic Preparedness centers with the RRDC’s and EDEN
  - Work with philanthropies for funding for planning.
  - Formal and informal relationships with other organizations. (ESFs especially)