

AGENDA (Revised)

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE Wednesday, January 3, 2007 9:00 a.m. EOB Room, P- 4 Level, City Hall East

- I. Call to Order, Introductions, Approval of Minutes**
- II. Subcommittee Reports and Planning Teams**
 - Budget – Mayra Puchalski
 - Community Preparedness - Carol Parks
 - Fire / Life Safety - Richard Wuerth / Lourdes Morales
 - Human Resources - Bobbi Jacobsen
 - Information Technology – Robert Fukunaga
 - Logistics - Richard Pineda
 - NIMS / NRP Integration Task Force - Rob Freeman
 - Operations – Rob Freeman
 - Planning - Larry Meyerhofer
 - Recovery and Reconstruction - Rob Freeman
 - Shelter and Welfare - Albert Torres
 - Training – Chris Ipsen
 - Others
- III. New Emergency Operations Center (Prop Q) - Rob Freeman**
- IV. Homeland Security Grant Update - Felipe Perez**
- V. 2006 Emergency Management Workshop After-Action Report - Rob Freeman**
- VI. NIMS Integration 2006 Compliance Report – Rob Freeman**
- VII. Operation Safe Passage After-Action Report – Chris Ipsen**
- VIII. Old / New Business**
- IX. Adjournment**

Refreshments to be provided by the Los Angeles Police Department.

EMC MEETING INFORMATION IS AVAILABLE ON THE EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS DEPARTMENT WEBSITE AT www.lacity.org/epd - CLICK ON Emergency Operations Organization, then EMC.

If you would like to be added to the EMC email distribution list, please send an email to erricka.jordan@lacity.org or contact Erricka Jordan (213) 978-0544.

FORM GEN. 160 (Rev. 6-80)
CITY OF LOS ANGELES
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

Date: December 22, 2006

From: Rob Freeman, Coordinator
2006 Emergency Management Workshop
Emergency Preparedness Department

To: Anna Burton, Chair
Emergency Management Committee

**Subject: 2006 EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT WORKSHOP AFTER ACTION –
CORRECTIVE ACTION REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

As coordinator for the 2006 City of Los Angeles Emergency Management Workshop, it is my pleasure to submit to you this after-action-corrective action report and set of recommendations in accordance with National Incident Management System (NIMS) protocols. The report will address the following:

- I. Achievement of goals and objectives;
- II. Specific recommendations to address gaps in the City's catastrophic event readiness; and
- III. Summarization of participant evaluations.

On behalf of the Emergency Preparedness Department (EPD) and staff from the many Emergency Operations Organization (EOO) departments that assisted with planning and execution of the workshop, we ask that you approve this report and forward it to the Emergency Operations Board (EOB) for approval.

I. Workshop Goals and Objectives

The goal of the 2006 workshop was to review, evaluate and identify gaps in the City of Los Angeles' ability to respond to and recover from an Incident of National Significance as defined in the National Response Plan (NRP). Participants were challenged to develop policy recommendations to address those gaps and a strategic plan for improving the City's readiness to manage catastrophic events from an all hazards perspective. The following specific objectives were identified; this report addresses whether we achieved them.

Objective 1. Review lessons learned from Hurricane Katrina with emphasis on local jurisdictions

Outcome: Local emergency managers from Alabama and Texas gave workshop participants first hand lessons learned information about their specific response and recovery experiences. This was directly relevant to the planning and preparedness efforts underway in Los Angeles. Objective achieved.

Objective 2. Provide City managers with policy direction from the Mayor's Office regarding catastrophic event preparedness and management.

Outcome: The outgoing Deputy Mayor for Homeland Security and Public Safety provided workshop participants with an overview of achievements from the past year and identified his successor. Objective not achieved.

Objective 3. Educate City managers on the risks and impact of a catastrophic earthquake in southern California.

Outcome: Subject matter experts from the scientific community and emergency management provided workshop participants with an honest and sobering assessment of the impact of a catastrophic earthquake on southern California and addressed many of the planning and preparedness gaps the City of Los Angeles needs to bridge. Objective achieved.

Objective 4. Task key City managers to describe initiatives their departments have developed to manage catastrophic events and to identify gaps that need to be addressed.

Outcome: General Managers from eleven City agencies provided workshop participants with concise and insightful overviews of their challenges and initiatives for catastrophic event preparedness. Several of these agencies were first time presenters at the workshop which increased awareness of their roles and responsibilities within the EOO. Objective achieved.

Objective 5. Review the current status of catastrophic event readiness in the areas of: executive policy; transportation; security; public health; public information; special needs populations; and critical infrastructure. Discuss gaps and identify corrective action initiatives.

Outcome: General managers from these disciplines addressed these specific areas and identified gaps and initiatives for corrective action. Objective achieved.

Objective 6. Task key City managers to describe initiatives their departments have developed to address public welfare and shelter needs following a catastrophic event and identify gaps that need to be addressed.

Outcome: General managers from these disciplines addressed these specific areas and identified gaps and initiatives for corrective action. Objective achieved.

Objective 7. Task key City managers to describe initiatives their departments have developed to care for special needs populations following a catastrophic event and identify gaps that need to be addressed.

Outcome: General managers from these disciplines addressed these specific areas and identified gaps and initiatives for corrective action. Objective achieved.

Objective 8. Invite representatives from key private sector agencies to describe their experiences in supporting local government following a catastrophic event and make recommendations for the City of Los Angeles to consider based on their lessons learned.

Outcome: A diverse panel of outside agency representatives shared their experiences with workshop participants and perspective on lessons learned and related recommendations. Objective achieved.

Objective 9. Task key City managers and outside agency representatives to describe initiatives they have developed to manage recovery and reconstruction efforts following a catastrophic event and identify gaps that need to be addressed.

Outcome: General managers from these disciplines addressed these specific areas and identified gaps and initiatives for corrective action. Objective achieved.

Objective 10. Review the current status of public welfare, recovery and reconstruction capabilities following a catastrophic event in the areas of: executive policy; public welfare and shelter; security; public health; public information; special needs populations; and critical infrastructure. Discuss gaps and identify corrective action initiatives.

Outcome: General managers from these disciplines addressed these specific areas and identified gaps and initiatives for corrective action. Objective achieved.

Objective 11. Invite leaders from federal and state Homeland Security and Emergency Management agencies to share their initiatives and strategies for managing catastrophic events.

Outcome: Leaders from the County of Los Angeles, State and Federal agencies provided workshop participants with overviews of their agency perspective and what it means for the City. Objective achieved.

II. Specific Recommendations (Discussion Groups)

This year's workshop featured six discipline/function specific discussion groups that were challenged to review gaps in catastrophic event readiness and identify specific strategic recommendations to bridge those gaps. The following recommendations were suggested.

A. Discussion Group 1 – Executive

Recommendations

- A1. There is not a consistent understanding of what emergency plans are in place. All departments should know and understand their own department emergency plan, and citywide plans that include response by their department. General Managers should become familiar with planning issues, such as alternate work sites and the event specific employee disaster training.
- A2. The role of the City Council during an emergency needs to be clearly defined and they need to be brought into the emergency preparedness planning and training efforts.
- A3. Preparedness plans should consider the following:
 - Sharing of citywide emergency plans
 - Development of catastrophic emergency plans
 - Development of debris removal plan
 - Development of Disaster Management Districts
 - Understanding of new Federal Response Plan
 - City's dependence on Information Technology resources
 - Streamlined departmental funding and reimbursement
 - Rebuilding a community to post-disaster state or better
 - Pre-disaster public education
 - Post disaster public information
 - City/County/State and Federal coordination
 - Employee preparedness with ongoing training
 - Mutual aid coordination
 - Special needs populations
 - Animal care
- A4. Emergency plans should consider the use of mutual aid coming into the area. They also need to include plans for short and long-term housing of visitors, such as in and around the airport(s).
- A5. City plans must include preparedness for dealing with large-scale displaced persons for short-term housing.
- A6. Local agencies must determine the best method of getting recovery supplies into the area and then most appropriately distributed.
- A7. Debris management plans should be developed to address large-scale recovery and reconstruction.

- A8. Recovery and reconstruction plans should include rebuilding damaged areas, moving victims out of state where appropriate, providing security to impacted areas and developing detailed mutual aid plans for housing.
- A9. The Executive Group supports implementation of the Los Angeles Fire Department's Disaster Management District (DMD) concept.
- A10. Develop a one or two day comprehensive emergency management training program for all City Emergency Preparedness Coordinators or staff assigned to emergency management duties.

B. Discussion Group 2 – Public Welfare and Shelter/Special Needs Populations

Recommendations

- B1. All facets of emergency management should address persons with specific needs.
- B2. Development of a management information system (MIS) with a specific needs component accessible by emergency response agencies.
- B3. Outreach events, exercises and other emergency management planning processes should address specific needs issues.
- B4. Include resources for specific disabilities needs in the NIMS resource lists.
- B5. Designate a seat for the Department on Disability in the EOC.
- B6. Involve the Department on Disability as a resource in emergency planning, training, response and recovery.
- B7. The City should maintain a common database at the Disaster Recovery Center for tracking and documentation of disaster victims.
- B8. Emphasize the need for policy decisions on public welfare and sheltering issues. There is a need for additional resources to enhance planning, response and recovery coordination among all agencies.
- B9. Increase the amount of field exercises among responding departments.
- B10. Involve the Department on Disability in emergency planning, training and exercises.
- B11. Emergency responders should take available courses on dealing with specific needs victims. Courses are available for emergency response personnel.

C. **Discussion Group 3 – Public Safety and Transportation**

Recommendations

- C1. Review, revise and update the Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) to reflect a coordination of actions among all public safety and transportation entities within the City. Consider establishing a subcommittee of the Emergency Management Committee (EMC) to accomplish this task. Lead: LAPD/Emergency Preparedness Department
- C2. Develop an annex to the City's Emergency Plan for evacuation and or shelter, which would include an analysis and best practices from other cities and or jurisdictions with successful evacuation and shelter plans. Standardize manageable boundaries and equivalent mapping through a task force that would include Geographical Information Systems (GIS) personnel and all other City agencies. Look at some of the best practices of other jurisdictions to see what they did. Lead: LAPD and LAFD through the EMC.
- C3. Develop an annex to the Emergency Operations Plan detailing sustainability for first responders and other essential personnel. Lead: Emergency Preparedness Department
- C4. Complete COOP/COG plans. Orient and exercise essential personnel to understand the overall goal of their departments plan as well as to identify individual responsibilities encompassed within the plan. Departments must plan for sustainability of public safety and other essential personnel during the recovery period. Plans should cover 30 day periods and include recommendations for logistical support for periods longer than 30 days, and should reference the Personnel Department's support plans for first responder and essential personnel's family members. Lead: Emergency Preparedness Department (EPD), and all City Agencies
- C5. EPD shall be tasked to bring together miscellaneous local government agencies as well as the private sector to develop comprehensive transportation recovery plan including air, sea and land. Lead: EPD.
- C6. Emergency Plans should be collocated, indexed and searchable and include hard copies located throughout the City at key facilities. Lead: EPD.

D. **Discussion Group 4 – Public Health/Emergency Medical**

Recommendations

- D1. Conduct training and exercises on a more systematic and regular basis.
- D2. Training and exercise programs need to be multi-agency and include private sector and non-profit sector partners.
- D3. All EOC responders should receive mandatory initial and recurring training to insure they are qualified.
- D4. Develop a comprehensive set of policies and procedures regarding animal care during emergencies.
- D5. Develop policies and procedures and related training and exercises for City employees assigned by the Mayor to support medical and health authorities during an emergency.
- D6. Undertake an active program to inform and train neighborhood groups, non-governmental organizations and individuals on what to expect in a catastrophic event and how to prepare and respond.

E. **Discussion Group 5 - Public Information**

Recommendations

- E1. Review the capabilities of the PIER software application for managing emergency public information.
- E2. Customize WebEOC to better address emergency public information functions and train department PIOs on its use.
- E3. Establish a media fax and email distribution capability in the EOC.
- E4. Provide City News Service capability for the EOC Information and Public Affairs Section staff.
- E5. Reconvene the Emergency Management Committee Media Task Force and ask them to meet regularly.

F. Discussion Group 6 – Critical Infrastructure

Recommendations

- F1. An accurate damage assessment report before prioritizing what is critical infrastructure is needed.
- F2. Communications and intelligence is first priority. The transportation Windshield assessment by LAPD and LAFD needs to orient those surveys towards first responder communications systems in place, i.e., GETS cards for landlines and WEPS cards for cell phones, need to be shared and stressed to all agency employees that they are available during catastrophic incidents
- F3. Helicopters in DWP/LAFD/LAPD are available for damage assessment intelligence and should be accessed for this use during a catastrophic incident.
- F4. Information known at high level needs to be brought down to the field level. Arch Angel intelligence needs to be shared with all other City agencies. EPD should be tasked with bringing all agencies together to discuss the Arch Angel intelligence and possibly share the information with other city agencies – A Critical Infrastructure (CI) Taskforce may need to be formed. Arch Angel identified list of C I needs to be taken one-step further – how do we recover when a facility is impaired – how do we prioritize what CI to fix first?
- F5. Guidance policies need to be established in the pre-planning stage in order to prioritize CI that require repair first.
- F6. Integrate City agency (DWP) communication system devices in order to talk with LAPD and LAFD regarding CI life/safety incidents.
- F7. Update and review the COOP and COG for each City Department.
- F8. Conduct Department self-assessments.
- F9. Include the private sector in our CI committees.

III. Summarization of Participant Evaluations

Workshop participants were invited to complete an evaluation of their experience at the 2006 Arrowhead event. The evaluation consisted of five specific questions/statements where response were gauged 1 – 5, with a score of 5 representing “strongly agree,” and a score of 1 representing “strongly disagree.” The following is a summary of the results.

Question 1. The workshop provided me a better understanding of the City’s level of catastrophic event preparedness, response and recovery and gaps that need to be addressed.

Response: Agree (4)

Question 2. The workshop provided me a better understanding of lesson learned from Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

Response: Agree (4)

Question 3. The small discussion groups were productive sessions for identifying solutions to address gaps in the City's catastrophic event readiness.

Response: Neutral - Agree (3.8)

Question 4. The presentations by outside agency speakers were informative and useful.

Response: Agree – Strong Agree (4.5)

Question 5. The networking opportunities provided good resources for future events.

Response: Agree – Strong Agree (4.5)

Additional Comments:

Several evaluations included comments and suggestions on the workshop. The following represents some of the most useful comments:

"I found the conference to be extremely beneficial. This is the first year I have attended and hope to be invited in the future. It was especially important to me to attend because I had an opportunity to interact with other Department PIOs."

The Executive Breakout Group lacked structure. Give definitions and explain the plan. Don't make new execs guess."

"The big picture has been well framed; our work is ahead. Great workshop!"

As a member of the private sector, I felt privileged and honored to attend this event and hope to participate in the future. Job well done!"

"While still highly useful to emergency preparedness, this year's Arrowhead had less focus on mission, less unity of message than in past years."

"It would have been nice to fill some of the empty chairs by reaching down into staff with roles particularly relevant to earthquake planning, response and recovery."

"The General Manager's breakout session on Wednesday was useless. Next year tell everyone to be sure to read their own department's emergency preparedness plan prior to the retreat. The material which the GMs were supposed to go through was much too vague. The Fire facilitators were extremely pleasant and courteous but were clearly not experts at facilitating. I suggest that you bring in a professional facilitator to deal with this strong willed group."

"Excellent as usual. These workshops are the best courses I have attended in terms of productivity, information and networking."

"Well organized, good speakers and relevant topics."

"The discussion group that I was assigned to combined Special Need and Employee Welfare resulted in little attention paid to first responder welfare."

"The workshop was a wonderful experience. The presentations from outside agencies and their information were quite helpful to see different aspects than what was discussed in the media."

"I really enjoyed the format. It was helpful to have the GM input at one of the discussion groups. Good guest speakers, good pace, good workshop."

"It would be more productive to give an actual disaster scenario for the afternoon breakout groups."

"We need to make the small group discussion more to the point. The size of the disaster was unclear at the start of the exercise, people had different assumptions and different directions to the problem. Many of the GMs were new and not familiar with the

process and did not read the plans in advance. I believe we need more home work in advance of the session.”

“The small discussion groups should have had an actual simulation exercise so that staff would know how to react in case of a real emergency.”

“There should only be one afternoon set aside for discussion groups. The facilitator should ensure that just a couple of people do not dominate the discussions and give an opportunity to all to present and express their views.”

“Some presentations should also be done by staff who are actually doing the work of emergency preparedness and not just the General Managers of various departments.”

“After a presentation by Lucy (Jones), anti-anxiety medications should have been made available to all of us!”

Please contact me at 213 978-0536 or rob.freeman@lacity.org if you have any questions or comments regarding this project and our status.

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

Date: December 22, 2006

To: Anna Burton, Chair
Emergency Management Committee

From: Rob Freeman, Chair
National Incident Management System Integration Task Force

**Subject: NATIONAL INCIDENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM INTEGRATION 2006
COMPLIANCE REPORT**

Recommendation

That the Emergency Management Committee (EMC) accept and forward to the Emergency Operations Board (EOB) for review and approval this report that documents City of Los Angeles Emergency Operations Organization (EOO) compliance with the federal fiscal year 2006 requirements of the National Incident Management System (NIMS).

Executive Summary

On behalf of the City's NIMS Integration Task Force, I am pleased to report that as of September 30, 2006, the City of Los Angeles EOO has met the 2006 federal fiscal year requirements for compliance with the federal NIMS. Compliance will be formally documented and self-certified through revision to the City's existing entry in the NIMCAST federal database. This revision will be processed through the Los Angeles County Operational Area and the State of California Governors' Office of Emergency Services (OES) and included in the State's overall NIMCAST certification.

The City has achieved compliance in the following areas:

1. Adoption of NIMS by local governing body and approval of an Implementation Plan
2. Institutionalized use of the Incident Command System (ICS)
3. Completion of required staff training
4. Use of a NIMS compliant Resource Management System
5. Use of a NIMS compliant Joint Information System (JIS)
6. Adoption of NIMS compliant responder Certification and Qualification standards
7. Use of NIMS compliant Information Management/Communications Technology protocols
8. Revision of existing Emergency Operations Plan to ensure NIMS compliance
9. Adoption of a plan to ensure ongoing NIMS maintenance

The following report details compliance achievements in each of these areas, identifies compliance goals that will be addressed through ongoing maintenance, and offers recommendations for meeting federal 2007 fiscal year requirements for the City.

1. Adoption of NIMS by local governing body and approval of an Implementation Plan

On April 22, 2006, the Los Angeles City Council approved a motion to formally recognize NIMS as the emergency operations response and management system for the City of Los Angeles. The Council also approved a NIMS Implementation Plan that was drafted by the NIMS Integration Task Force and approved by the City's EMC and EOB. This plan outlined specific tasks and deadlines to be accomplished in order to achieve compliance with the 2006 federal requirements. This plan has been successfully implemented.

2. Institutionalized use of the Incident Command System (ICS)

All divisions of and departments in the City of Los Angeles EOO are presently using the NIMS required ICS in their preparedness, response, training and exercising activities. The EOO has already met local compliance requirements of the State of California Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS) and has formally institutionalized use of ICS on a citywide basis. EOO department and division compliance with NIMS ICS requirements are documented in the City's Emergency Operations Master Plan and Procedures and its various hazard and function specific annexes.

3. Completion of required staff training

All EOO divisions and departments identified staff that required NIMS training and implemented training programs incorporating on-line study and classroom courses to complete the training. All of the City's major emergency preparedness, response, recovery and support agencies participated in this project. More than 6,000 City employees from over twenty agencies complete basic level NIMS awareness and ICS training. Almost 1000 staff also received training on the National Response Plan (NRP). Detailed department training records are available through the Emergency Preparedness Department (EPD). NIMS training is an ongoing challenge. Departments targeted supervisory level field, Department Operations Center (DOC) and Emergency Operations Center (EOC) responders for initial NIMS training during the 2006 federal fiscal year. Additional support staff will be trained during the 2007 fiscal year as part of ongoing maintenance of NIMS compliance.

4. Use of NIMS compliant Resource Management System

The City's existing EOC Information Management System (WebEOC) has been modified and enhanced by the addition of a NIMS compliant resource management module. Using the federal resource management list of 120 types of standard resources and associated protocols for detailed sub-descriptions, staff from the Department of General Services, the Information Technology Agency and EPD have upgraded the system to provide DOC and EOC responders with a standardized, automated tool for requesting, assigning and tracking resources. This application is intended for use during major incidents where multiple City and/or outside agencies respond. The application does not replace current resource procurement and deployment systems in use by various City departments; rather it enhances the capability of these existing systems to address large, complex incidents where resource needs are too large to be met by individual agencies and must be coordinated through

DOCs and the EOC. More than 200 resource entries have been input into the system, with more planned for fiscal year 2007. The system is operational and has already been used for EOC activations and training sessions.

5. Use of NIMS compliant Joint Information System (JIS)

Pursuant to Part 6 of the City's Emergency Operations Master Plan and Procedures, the City's EOC conducts emergency public information in accordance with both SEMS and NIMS/ICS. Public information officers (PIOs) from various City agencies work through the Office of the Mayor as the City's lead PIO during periods of emergency preparedness and response. When the City's EOC is activated, the Office of the Mayor serves as ICS Section Coordinator for Information and Public Affairs and coordinates the work of other departmental PIOs in that Section. During the 2006 fiscal year, enhancements to the City's WebEOC application were recommended. These recommendations included the purchase of additional, specialized emergency public information software which would enhance our ability to develop, release and disseminate information to the public and media. Efforts are underway to purchase this software by December 31, 2006 using available homeland security grant funds.

6. Adoption of NIMS compliant responder Certification and Qualification standards

The federal NIMS Integration Center (NIC) is in the process of issuing specific responder certification and qualification standards and recommended requirements. They recently issued standards for fire service responders which are consistent with those already in use by the Los Angeles City Fire Department. We anticipate standards for other disciplines will be issued including those regarding EOC responders. EPD has developed certification criteria for our EOC responders that include training, exercise and activation participation elements. These pre-date, but are consistent with draft NIMS standards for these functions and are already compliant with the ICS and SEMS. Other City agencies including the Los Angeles Police Department, the Department of Water and Power, and the Department of Public Works have developed internal training and qualification requirements for field, DOC and EOC responders.

7. Use of NIMS compliant Information Management/Communications Technology protocols

The City has upgraded its EOC Information Management System (WebEOC) to serve as a real time, data sharing tool for use at the field, DOC and EOC level. This application is designed to give responders a common operational picture of situation status during major incidents and emergencies. While the application provides the City with a NIMS compliant information management capability, further customization and upgrades are underway that will be completed during the 2007 fiscal year. Other technology upgrades such as interoperable radio communications capabilities are coordinated by LAPD, LAFD and ITA. Enhancements that further address NIMS communications systems compliance are undertaken as resources are available. The City maintains ICS communications protocols and capabilities with the Los Angeles County Operational Area, State OES and federal DHS/FEMA in accordance with SEMS.

8. Revision of existing Emergency Operations Plan to ensure NIMS compliance

The City's Emergency Operations Master Plan and Procedures (Master Plan) was

reviewed and revised to ensure NIMS compliance. This revision has been approved by the EOB. The revision was comprehensive and addressed all aspects of NIMS compliance including the subject areas described above. The Master Plan serves as the City's overall Emergency Operations Plan and is now NIMS compliant. Additional resources are required to bring individual departmental emergency plans into compliance with NIMS. A draft Request for Proposal (RFP) has been submitted to the Mayor's Office requesting the use of available homeland security grant funds to hire a planning consultant to review and revise the various departmental plans to ensure NIMS compliance during the 2007 federal fiscal year.

9. Adoption of a plan to ensure ongoing NIMS maintenance

Because NIMS training and compliance requirements are ongoing concerns, the NIMS Integration Task Force will continue to monitor compliance, coordinate training and exercises, and work with City agencies to maintain our NIMS compliant status. There are additional training requirements for the 2007 fiscal year that are being reviewed and a plan developed to accomplish them. Additionally, with new staff and the regular transition of staff assigned to emergency operations and management duties, basic NIMS training needs to be included as a formal, regular component of EOO and department specific training programs. EPD will continue to offer and coordinate this training on a citywide basis. Departments are also challenged to maintain and enhance their training capabilities to maintain compliance.

Conclusion

It is further recommended that the EMC continue the work of the NIMS Integration Task Force as a working group to monitor compliance and develop plans to address new federal requirements. The Task Force is chaired by EPD and includes representatives from all of the major emergency preparedness and response agencies in the City. This Task Force should continue to meet quarterly during the 2007 federal fiscal year. The EMC Operations Subcommittee, as needed, can manage monthly reports and other required items.

Please refer any questions regarding this report to me at 213 978-0590 or rob.freeman@lacity.org.

RF