# MANAGING DISASTERS AT THE COUNTY LEVEL:

## A NATIONAL SURVEY

MARCH 2019

**Emergency Management in County Government: A National Survey**
March 2019

## Table of Contents

**Executive Summary**

In May 2018, NACo conducted a survey to assess key aspects of county emergency management, including organizational structure, budgets and funding, personnel and training, use of technology and ways counties collaborate with other government entities and nongovernmental organizations. NACo received completed responses from 397 counties in June 2018, representing all census divisions and 45 of the 50 states. The responding counties ranged in size from nearly 500 residents to more than 4.6 million, thus allowing NACo to identify general trends for small, medium and large counties. Of large counties – or counties with populations of over 500,000 – 26 out of 131 responded. Of medium counties – or counties with populations ranging from 50,000 to 500,000 – 126 out of 821 responded. Of small counties – or small counties with populations of under 50,000 – 245 out of 2,117 responded.

There are several major findings of this survey:

- Nearly three quarters of counties indicate that their chief emergency management official reports directly to the county elected official(s) – as opposed to reporting to county administrative staff.
- 95 percent of counties formally endorse the National Incident Management System (NIMS) and over 90 percent of county Emergency Management Agency (EMA) employees have completed the NIMS training program.
- 62 percent of counties have adopted administrative and financial procedures that allow the EMA to expediently request, apply for, receive, manage and expend funds during a local emergency or disaster.
- The majority of counties (over 90 percent) maintain insurance against disaster damage for buildings and infrastructure.
- At the federal level, counties most often engage FEMA – on recovery and education and training – and NOAA – on education and training and planning – on emergency management.
- Counties engage with other local governments and organizations on planning more than three times as often as they do on response – the phase on which they next most engage.
- 99 percent of counties report having an Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) and Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP). Additionally, 56 percent of counties report that they have integrated their HMP into their county comprehensive plan.
- About two-thirds of counties use social media to communicate risk before and after a disaster; although 12 percent of counties do not have social media accounts.
- 64 percent of counties have held a county-wide disaster preparedness drill within the past year. 19 percent have not done so in more than two years.
- While 77 percent of counties have pre-designated shelters for disaster evacuees, only 8 percent indicate that they have adequate housing stock to support temporary housing for residents, non-local volunteers, federal employees, etc.
- 22 percent of county respondents indicate that they do not regulate land use and 24 percent indicate that they do not regulate buildings codes. Correspondingly, 6 percent of counties report that they are not legally allowed to regulate local land use per state law and 8 percent report that they are not legally allowed to regulate local building codes per state law.

**Survey Findings**

Over the past 20 years, natural and manmade disasters have increased in both frequency, severity and cost. On average, 24 percent of counties have experienced at least one disaster in each of the last three years. The past three hurricane and wildfire seasons have included six hurricanes that combined to cost over $330 billion in damages and more than eight wildfires causing over $40 billion in damages.[i] These disasters showcase the need for government officials, particularly county governments, to renew their focus on their planning and response readiness activities. Consequently, the U.S. has learned the importance of tactics and strategies that include scenario planning, land use planning, evacuation planning, building code adoption and enforcement, internal and external communication planning, citizen preparation, controlling information on social media, tracking volunteer hours and the impact of disaster on goods movement and industry.

In order to remain healthy, vibrant, safe and economically competitive, America's counties must be engaged in all aspects and phases of emergency management: planning, preparedness, mitigation, response and recovery. This report presents findings of current U.S. counties' activities in these areas from the Survey on Emergency Management in County Government.

*Organizational Structure*

The Survey on Emergency Management in County Government defined the emergency management agency (EMA) as the department, division, organization or agency specifically tasked with Emergency Management preparedness, response, recovery and mitigation plans and efforts. EMAs can be set up in a variety of ways. They can be standalone or part of another county office, such as the sheriff's office. They can be made up of one volunteer employee or ten full-time paid staff members. Their structure is typically reliant on county size and hazard vulnerability.[ii]

**Reporting Structure**
Approximately 72 percent of survey respondents indicate that their chief emergency management official reports directly to the county elected official(s), with just under half of chief emergency management officials reporting directly to the county board (46 percent) and the other half (44 percent) reporting directly to the county administrator, executive or manager. Less than 10 percent of chief emergency management officials respond directly to the county sheriff, county public works director or county health director, indicating a potential shift towards emergency management being a standalone unit in the structure of county government. In small counties, chief emergency management officials are twice as likely to report directly to elected official(s) than in large counties (82 to 46 percent, respectively); in fact, in large counties, 31 percent of chief emergency management officials are reported to be two steps removed from county elected official(s) – with their supervisor's supervisor being the individual to report directly to the county's elected official(s). (See Tables 3 and 4.)

**Staffing**
The majority of survey respondents (88 percent) indicate that their county has a written board ordinance or resolution that formally establishes an EMA, as shown in Table 1. On average, those county EMAs employ 2.89 full time employees and 1.65 part time employees. EMA sizes are markedly different across small, medium and large counties. On average, small county EMAs employ an average of 1.14 full time and 1.41 part time employees, medium county EMAs employ 3.48 full time and 2.36 part time employees, while large county EMAs employ 9.57 full time and 1.64 part time employees. See Table 2 for a full breakdown of county EMA employment.

**Professional Development**

A number of specialized training opportunities – from certifications to PhDs – conducted by the federal government, state governments and private institutions exist for emergency managers. The Emergency Management Institute (EMI) is the primary center for the development and delivery of emergency management training in the United States.[iii] It is run by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and emphasizes programs like the National Incident Management System (NIMS). NIMS is a comprehensive, national approach to incident management that is applicable at all jurisdictional levels and across functional disciplines. It is intended to be applicable across a full spectrum of potential incidents, hazards, and impacts, regardless of size, location or complexity. Survey data suggest that 95 percent of counties formally endorse the National Incident Management System and over 90 percent of county EMA employees have completed the NIMS training program (see Tables 5 and 6). Additionally, over 15 percent have attended courses at the Emergency Management Institute (EMI), and 10 percent have received a master's degree in emergency and/or disaster management. Large county EMA employees are as likely to have a master's degree in emergency and/or disaster management as they are to have attended courses at the FEMA EMI.

States, often through their state emergency management association, certify emergency managers at several levels of certification. The survey data in Table 7 suggest that 78 percent of chief emergency management officials have been certified as an emergency manager by their state. Notably, the percentage of state certified emergency managers is approximately twice as much for small counties (84 percent) as it is for large counties (41 percent). National certification also exists through the International Association of Emergency Managers (IAEM). IAEM has two levels of certification, the Certified Emergency Manager (CEM) and the Associate Emergency Manager (AEM). 8 percent of all chief emergency management officials report that they have been certified by IAEM – with just under a quarter (23 percent) of large county chief emergency management officials having achieved certification.

Just as training levels vary among emergency managers, emergency management programs vary in capability and distinction. In order to foster excellence and accountability in emergency management, the Emergency Management Accreditation Program (EMAP) created a voluntary, peer review accreditation process in which EMAs are evaluated across 64 standards. 12 percent of respondents indicate their county is accredited and compliant with all EMAP Emergency Management Standards, and an additional 37 percent indicate that while they are not accredited, they make use of the standards (see Table 8). Having a basic understanding of the EMAP standards can be helpful in building an effective, well-rounded emergency management program.

### *Budget and Funding[iv]*

EMA departments primarily leverage local resources for annual operational support. While federal resources are available, the use of these funds correlate to the size of counties and their capacity to apply via complex application processes.

**Local Funding Sources**

The EMA budget goes to fund activities in all phases of the emergency management cycle. As shown in Tables 9 and 10, most counties dedicate 0 to 5 percent of the county's total annual budget to the EMA and manage the EMA budget within the county general fund (88 and 78 percent, respectively). Two-thirds (67 percent) of survey respondents expect the county budget for the EMA to stay the same in the

next fiscal year, about a quarter (26 percent) anticipate a budget increase, while the remaining 7 percent expect their budget to decrease (see Table 11).

Ahead of a disaster, many counties (62 percent) adopt administrative and financial procedures that allow the EMA to expediently request, apply for, receive, manage and expend funds during a local emergency or disaster (see Table 12). Counties also maintain a variety of insurance coverages. The data indicate that 43 percent of counties maintain private insurance, 41 percent participate in a statewide or regional insurance pool, 20 percent self-insure via reserved funds and 49 percent maintain a "rainy day" fund for emergencies and disasters (see Tables 13 and 14).

**Federal Resources**
Outside of county funding and insurance, counties also participate in a variety of federal grant programs. Respondents indicate the top five federal grant programs that counties of all sizes participate in:

1.  FEMA Emergency Management Performance Grant (EMPG) Program [82 percent]
2.  FEMA Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) [58 percent]
3.  FEMA Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) [52 percent]
4.  HUD Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program [39 percent]
5.  FEMA Hazard Mitigation Planning Program [35 percent]

When looking at small, medium and large counties individually, these top five are generally the same with some variation.

| Large | Medium | Small |
|---|---|---|
| 1. EMPG (96 percent) | 1. EMPG (93 percent) | 1. EMPG (75 percent) |
| 2. HSGP (83 percent) | 2. HSGP (67 percent) | 2. HMGP (53 percent) |
| 3. FEMA Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) Program (65 percent) | 3. HMGP (50 percent) | 3. HSGP (51 percent) |
| 4. HMGP (61 percent) | 4. FEMA Hazard Mitigation Planning Program (32 percent) | 4. FEMA Hazard Mitigation Planning Program (39 percent) |
| 5. PDM (48 percent) | 4. FEMA Pre-Disaster Mitigation (PDM) Grant Program (32 percent) | 5. FEMA Pre-Disaster Mitigation (PDM) Grant Program (23 percent) |

These figures suggest that small counties are less likely to go after and/or receive federal funding, which is in line with previous findings that rural communities often face barriers to competitive federal grants due to lack of expertise and/or personnel dedicated to grant writing and management.[v] See Table 15 for the full breakdown of county engagement with federal funding opportunities.

**State & Other Sources**
Beyond federal funding, counties primarily finance mitigation projects with state funding (35 percent) and local taxes (34 percent). Very few counties finance mitigation projects through public-private partnerships (9 percent) or with foundation funding (2 percent). Of note, 20 percent of respondents indicated the use of "other" non-federal financing mechanisms. Some of the sources they indicate using are general funds, in-kind funds, law enforcement forfeiture funds, stormwater and wastewater fees,

Local Emergency Planning Committee fees and grants, water management district grants and funds from a nuclear plant decommissioning agreement. See Table 16 for complete data on non-federal funding.

## *Partnerships*

The survey asked people to indicate the agencies and organizations with whom they have worked over the past five years, and in which phases they most often engaged and/or partnered with them. At each level of government, counties indicated the top two phases in which they were most often engaged:

| Federal | State | Regional | Local | Within county |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Education and training | Planning | Planning | Planning | Planning |
| Planning | Response | Education and training | Response | Education and training |

The federal agencies that responding counties indicate engaging with most often, across all phases of emergency management, are FEMA – primarily on recovery and education and training, and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) – primarily on education and training and planning. The local governments and organizations counties engage with most often are schools, municipalities, hospitals, other counties, faith-based organizations and the local business community – and they engage with these local entities on planning more than three times as often as they do on response. See Table 37 for the full scope of county partnerships.

## *Planning*

99 percent of counties report having an Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) and Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) in place. Of those counties, 69 percent report that the county EMA prepared the EOP, 13 percent report that the EOP was prepared by a county multi-agency task force and 10 percent of EOPs were prepared by a contractor (see Table 17). Additionally, 56 percent of counties report that they have integrated their HMP into their county comprehensive plan (see Table 18). As hazard mitigation often involves land use or other planning-related activities, this collaboration across departments helps to promote consistency within and concurrency between plans while also increasing the probability of the plan's implementation.[vi]

**Coordination Across Plans**
Looking beyond EOPs and HMPs, respondents indicate the top five plans and agreements counties have in place:

1. Mutual aid agreements with other jurisdictions (78 percent)
2. Mass casualty incident plans (60 percent)
3. Continuity of operations/government plans—COOP/COG (58 percent)
4. Evacuation plans (57 percent)
5. Memoranda of understanding with other governments (56 percent)

These findings further suggest that counties understand the importance of and highly value planning partnerships with surrounding counties and jurisdictions. When looking at small, medium and large counties individually, this holds true as the plans and agreements they most often have in place are:

| Large | Medium | Small |
|---|---|---|
| 1. COOP/COG (95 percent) | 1. Mutual aid agreements with other jurisdictions (86 percent) | 1. Mutual aid agreements with other jurisdictions (73 percent) |
| 2. Mutual aid agreements with other jurisdictions (86 percent) | 2. Mass casualty incident plan (72 percent) | 2. Evacuation plan (55 percent) |
| 3. Debris management plan (82 percent) | 3. Debris management plan (63 percent) | 3. Mass casualty incident plans (53 percent) |
| 4. Mass casualty incident plans (77 percent) | 4. Evacuation plan (62 percent) | 3. Memoranda of understanding with other governments (53 percent) |
| | | 4. COOP/COG (53 percent) |
| 5. Memoranda of understanding with other governments (64 percent) | 5. Memoranda of understanding with other governments (61 percent) | |

Interestingly, the data in this table suggest small and medium counties are slightly more likely to have evacuation plans in place than large counties (50 percent). The Disaster Recovery Reform Act of 2018 (DRRA) – which modified several FEMA programs to better assist state and local disaster mitigation, preparedness and recovery – requires FEMA to develop and issue guidance regarding the identification and maintenance of evacuation routes. This new requirement – as well as the evacuation issues observed the past few disaster seasons – may impact county evacuation plans, both in content and frequency of development and adoption.

Findings also suggest that large counties are likely to return to normal operations faster than small and medium counties as they are one and a half to two times as likely to have a debris removal and continuity of operations plan in place. Having a COOP plan indicates the county has pre-identified vital departmental functions that must continue regardless of a disaster and has thought through the execution of those functions to ensure minimal disruption to normal operations. See Table 19 for the full breakdown of county emergency management planning efforts.

**Special Populations**
In planning, counties often account for the needs of special populations. Respondents suggest that the special populations most often identified and addressed in county plans are:

1. Nursing home residents (85 percent)
2. Hospital patients (77 percent)
3. Pet owners (68 percent)
4. Non-English-speaking residents (41 percent)
5. Prisoners (38 percent)

These stay true across all government sizes, except 57 percent of large counties also plan for public transit dependent populations. As FEMA continues its implementation of DRRA – which requires the development of guidance regarding health care and long-term care facility prioritization and assistance in the development of evacuation plans that account for the care and rescue of animals – it will be

interesting to see how often and in what capacity special populations are accounted for in county plans. See Table 20 for further information on the inclusion of special populations in county planning efforts.

**Use of Technology**
Geographic Information Systems (GIS) is an integral tool in today's planning toolkit. Organizations use GIS not only to map what is where but also consolidate data on those geographic points that can provide situational awareness and information to support decision making, real-time and for planning purpose. GIS enhance information sharing, communication and collaboration.[vii] Looking at county use of GIS, 6 percent of counties indicate that they do not use GIS (see Table 21). Of those that do use GIS, respondents indicate how their communities most often use GIS:

1.  Accurate addressing[viii] (68 percent)
2.  Dispatching response units (67 percent)
3.  Mapping response resources (58 percent)
4.  Identifying persons or facilities for notification of potential hazards (56 percent)
5.  Identifying areas affected by an incident using meteorological information (52 percent)
6.  Assessing risk (52 percent)

When looking at small, medium and large counties individually, the GIS is most often used for:

| Large | Medium | Small |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Mapping response resources (86 percent) | 1. Accurate addressing (76 percent) | 1. Accurate addressing (64 percent) |
| Identifying persons or facilities for notification of potential hazards (86 percent) | 2. Dispatching response units (75 percent) | 2. Dispatching response units (63 percent) |
| 3. Identifying areas affected by an incident using meteorological information (77 percent) | 3. Mapping response resources (70 percent) | 3. Identifying persons or facilities for notification of potential hazards (52 percent) |
| Assessing risk (77 percent) | 4. Identifying areas affected by an incident using methodological information (61 percent) | 4. Mapping response resources (49 percent) |
| Plan for critical infrastructure (77 percent) | 5. Identifying persons or facilities for notification of potential hazards (58 percent) | 5. Assessing risk (47 percent) |
| Facilitate recovery (77 percent) | Plan for critical infrastructure (58 percent) | 6. Identifying areas affected by an incident using methodological information (45 percent) |

Over half of county respondents indicate that their EMA works with an employee in the county planning department or another central government unit to fulfill their GIS needs (see Table 22). Another quarter have an in-house EMA employee perform their GIS work. Only 9 percent outsource to a private contractor, and 5 percent work with their regional planning office.

*Preparedness*

Before a disaster strikes, local governments must ensure that all stakeholders – from local elected officials to the public – understand their risks to all hazards and are prepared for when they strike. Counties employ various strategies to communicate risk and raise awareness of risk reduction strategies to residents. Table 23 details the top four ways that responding counties – regardless of size – communicate risk before a disaster:

1. Trainings or exercises (85 percent)
2. Public meetings (73 percent)
3. Social media (71 percent)
4. School visits (60 percent)

Beyond these top four strategies, large, medium and small counties communicate risk through:

| Large Counties (500,000 or more) | Medium Counties (50,000-500,000) | Small Counties (50,000 or less) |
|---|---|---|
| Civic engagement events (65 percent) | Civic engagement events (62 percent) | Newspaper or magazine ads (47 percent) |
| Radio or television spots (57 percent) | Radio or television spots (47 percent) | Civic engagement events (30 percent) |
| Newspaper or magazine ads (39 percent) | Newspaper or magazine ads (36 percent) | Radio or television spots (29 percent) |

Additionally, 30 percent of large counties use direct mailers, compared to only 6 percent of medium and small counties.

Exercises play a vital role in national preparedness by enabling whole community stakeholders to test and validate plans and capabilities, and identify capability gaps and areas for improvement. While 85 percent of respondents identified trainings and exercises as the top means by which their county builds disaster risk reduction awareness, only 64 percent have held a county-wide disaster preparedness drill within the past year (see Tables 24 and 25). Looking within the last two years, that number rises to 81 percent. However, 19 percent of responding counties have not held a county-wide disaster preparedness drill in over two years. When drills are held, the formats typically used are table top exercises (63 percent), functional drills (48 percent) and full-scale simulations (46 percent). Drills, regardless of format, are important means by which counties can test emergency plans and procedures. They provide feedback on the process, promote interorganizational contact before a disaster strikes and yield publicity that informs the public on the county's planning and preparedness efforts.[ix]

**Preparedness Levels by County Agency and Community Groups**
When asked to what extent agencies and community groups within their county are prepared for all hazards, respondents indicated that most groups are prepared at a level two or three on a scale of zero to four, with zero being not prepared at all and four being extremely prepared (see Table 26). The most prepared groups are the local police departments, local fire departments and local hospitals and health care providers. 68 percent of counties said their local police departments are prepared at a level three,

60 percent said their local fire departments are prepared at a level three and 55 percent said their local hospitals and health care providers are prepared at a level three.

The least prepared groups are residents, the business community and early childhood development centers – with over 25 percent of respondents indicating that these groups were only prepared at a level one. Counties must ensure they have the necessary resources – food, water, vehicle, volunteers, etc. – and facilities – shelters, recovery center, etc. – in place in the event of a disaster. The survey data suggests that counties feel their various agencies and departments are generally prepared at a level three (45 percent) or two (40 percent).

Digging deeper into the specifics of county preparedness efforts, 77 percent of respondents report their counties have pre-designated shelters for disaster evacuees (see Table 27). Only 8 percent, however, indicate that they have adequate housing stock to support temporary housing for residents, non-local volunteers, federal employees, etc. (see Table 28). Temporary housing is necessary after a disaster to help get residents on the way back to their homes and to restore emergency shelter facilities to their original intended functions to help the community get back to its normal ready state.

## *Mitigation*

With the FEMA 2022 Moonshots and DRRA, the topic of mitigation has once again risen to the top in the resilience conversation. The FEMA 2022 Moonshots look to quadruple national investment in mitigation and double the number of properties covered by insurance by 2022. The DRRA promises further investments in mitigation and prevention efforts through several programs. Through both these initiatives, the federal government is asking local governments to collaborate with them to achieve these goals.

Some counties are already pursuing hazard mitigation strategies to build local disaster resilience. Looking at local mitigation policies, the data in Table 29 suggests the top five mitigation policies adopted by counties in the United States:

1. Building codes (56 percent)
2. Building setbacks (41 percent)
3. Overlay districts (41 percent)
4. Emergency vehicle access requirements (38 percent)
5. Buffer zones (26 percent)

While this ranking stays true for large, medium and small county governments, large and medium counties are more likely to adopt mitigation policies than small counties. For example, 73 percent of large and 70 percent of medium counties have adopted building code requirements while only 46 percent of small counties have done so. Of note, 22 percent of respondents indicate that they do not regulate land use and 24 percent indicate that they do not regulate buildings codes. Correspondingly, 6 percent of counties report that they are not legally allowed to regulate local land use per state law and 8 percent report that they are not legally allowed to regulate local building codes per state law.[x] As part of its changes to federal hazard mitigation policy, the DRRA emphasized the importance of the adoption and enforcement of the latest published consensus-based codes, specifications and standards. These changes include allowing the local government to engage FEMA during recovery to help the address local building code and floodplain ordinance administration and enforcement post-disaster.

Beyond mitigation policy, 24 percent of large counties and 3 percent of all counties have established non-FEMA funded repetitive flood loss property buyout programs, as shown in Table 30. Flood buyout, or property acquisition, programs enable local governments to purchase eligible homes prone to frequent flooding from willing, voluntary owners and return the land to open space, wetlands, rain gardens or greenways.[xi] These programs reduce the number of flood-prone buildings and can decrease the overall flood risk in the floodplain.

Additionally, as shown in Table 31, 53 percent of respondents indicate that their county participates in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Community Rating System (CRS). CRS is a voluntary incentive program that recognizes communities for implementing floodplain management practices that exceed the federal minimum requirements of the NFIP to provide protection from flooding. In exchange for a community's proactive efforts to reduce flood risk, policyholders can receive reduced flood insurance premiums for buildings in the community.[xii] There are 10 CRS Classes. Class 1 requires the most credit points and provides the largest flood insurance premium reduction (45 percent), while Class 10 means the community does not participate in the CRS, or has not earned the minimum required credit points, and residents receive no premium reduction.

## _Response_

A community's initial response to a disaster can set the tone for its recovery. Open and proper communications play a huge role in disaster response, both within county government, between county government and its partners and from county government to the public. During response, EMAs are in charge of implementing the Incident Command System (ICS) structure for field response and managing the Emergency Operations Center (EOC).[xiii] The ICS enables coordinated, collaborative, effective and efficient incident management by integrating a combination of facilities, equipment, personnel, procedures and communications operating within a common organizational structure.

Concurrently, EOCs help counties to coordinate response activities by gathering decision makers together in one location to supply them with the most current information.[xiv] An EOC can be physical or virtual and can be dedicated solely to the EMA or used by multiple departments. The data in Table 32 suggests that 53 percent of counties have an EOC dedicated solely to the EMA; 43 percent of county EMAs share the EOC with other departments; and 4 percent of counties have no EOC.

Beyond using an EOC to coordinate county communications internally, the top external means of communications county respondents indicate using during emergencies are:

1. Emergency Alert Systems (90 percent)
2. Facebook (82 percent)
3. Landlines (71 percent)
4. Text messaging (70 percent)
5. Internet/email (62 percent)

When looking at small, medium and large counties individually, these hold true with slight variation, although the levels of usage can vary quite substantially from large to small counties. See those variations in Table 33.

**Social Media**
With the rise of social media over the past decade, EMA communications have transformed. EMAs now use social media during a disaster to as an emergency management tool to conduct emergency communications and issue warnings; receive victim requests for assistance; monitor user activities and postings for situational awareness; identify and get in front of incorrect information and rumors; and crowdsource information for flood water monitoring, damage assessments, etc. While 17 percent of small counties indicate that they do not have any social media accounts, the majority of counties do have social media accounts and employ staff to manage those accounts in a variety of ways during a disaster (see Table 34). Many counties have a county employee who handles social media on a regular basis (32 percent) and/or assign one employee to manage social media during a disaster as "other duties as assigned" (25 percent). Very few counties engage social media volunteer teams during disaster (6 percent) and then only medium and small counties use this method. As for having an employee fully committed to social media, large counties lead the way at 18 percent, medium counties closely follow at 13 percent and only 5 percent of small counties indicate having an employee fully committed to social media. With regards to controlling misinformation during a disaster, 77 percent of counties closely monitor social media to identify and get in front of rumors (see Table 35).

**Other Communication Channels**
Beyond social media, county EMAs use a variety of technology and software to help with information management and communications. According to the survey data in Table 36, the top five technologies and software most used by all sizes of county government – with slight variations in order – are:

1. WebEOC® (76 percent)
2. Interoperable communications equipment (71 percent)
3. Ham/shortwave radio (64 percent)
4. CAMEO (Computer-Aided Management of Emergency Operations)/ALOHA (49 percent)
5. Homeland Security Information Network (HSIN) (43 percent)

WebEOC® is a crisis management software that enhances an organization's preparedness, disaster recovery and emergency management efforts.[xv] Interoperable communications equipment allows county emergency responders to communicate and share voice and data information.[xvi] Ham and shortwave radios are operated by members of the public and regulated by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC).[xvii] During a disaster, licensed and trained ham radio operators – often members of the Amateur Radio Emergency Service (ARES) or Radio Amateur Civil Emergency Service (RACES) – help provide both voice and data communications modes to bridge interoperability gaps between agencies. CAMEO is a system of software applications used to plan for and respond to chemical emergencies; ALOHA is a one of the software applications that estimates threat zones for chemical spills.[xviii] HSIN is a network through which agencies can share sensitive but unclassified information, manage operations, analyze data and send alerts and notices relevant to public safety.[xix]

**Conclusion**

County governments generally feel well prepared in the event of a disaster. They are less confident, however, in the preparedness of their residents and the non-governmental organizations within their communities. To better prepare local communities, counties might increase their usage of no- or low-cost pre-hazard mitigation strategies, their focus on social vulnerability – or the inability of a population to withstand adverse impacts from disaster or other stressors – during the planning process and their risk communications prior to a disaster. With the rise of social media – in general and as an emergency communications strategy – counties have an ideal, no- to low- cost vehicle to share preparedness messages.

Counties have done well to get their central emergency management plans in place: EOPs, HMPs, mutual aid agreements, mass casualty incident plans and COOPs. They are accounting more often for special populations with medical needs, but they could continue to increase their focus on other socially vulnerable populations and housing concerns. Housing continues to be an issue – not only the lack of affordable housing pre-disaster, but also the lack of temporary housing post-disaster.

Regarding the implementation of plans, funding for local projects is a major issue. Based on the survey results, many counties may need a better understanding of what federal grant programs and non-federal financing mechanisms are out there – especially for mitigation – and/or they may need assistance in putting together more competitive applications.[xx]

Overall, counties appear to be doing well in their planning for, preparedness for and response to disasters. However, they could improve their mitigation planning, policies and implementation.


**Methodology**

NACo prepared the survey instrument with input from the Carl Vinson Institute of Government at the University of Georgia and emergency management practitioners from local and federal emergency management agencies. Requests with instructions for completing the survey went out in May to each of the 3,069 U.S. counties. The requests were sent to county clerks, board presidents and emergency management directors. Instructions requested that the clerk and/or board president send the request, which was signed by NACo Resilient Counties Advisory Board Chair and Sonoma County Supervisor James Gore, to the appropriate emergency management professional. NACo received completed responses from 397 counties in May and June 2018, representing all Census divisions and 45 of the 50 states.

**Acknowledgements**

## About the National Association of Counties

The National Association of Counties (NACo) unites America's 3,069 county governments. Founded in 1935, NACo brings county officials together to advocate with a collective voice on national policy, exchange ideas and build new leadership skills, pursue transformational county solutions, enrich the public's understanding of county government and exercise exemplary leadership in public service. More information at: www.naco.org.

## About NACo's Resilient Counties Initiative

Through the Resilient Counties initiative, NACo works with counties and their stakeholders to bolster their ability to thrive amid changing physical, environmental, social and economic conditions. Hurricanes, wildfires, economic collapse and other disasters can be natural or man-made, acute or long-term, foreseeable or unpredictable. Preparation for and recovery from such events requires both long-term planning and immediate action. Learn more about the initiative and its sponsors at: https://www.naco.org/resources/signature-projects/resilient-counties-initiative.

**Appendix A: Glossary**

**Associate Emergency Manager (AEM).** The AEM designation is one of two types of certification offered to emergency management professionals by IAEM.
*Source: https://www.iaem.com/cem.*

**Building codes**. Building codes govern the design, construction, alteration and maintenance of structures by specifying minimum requirements to adequately safeguard the health, safety and welfare of building occupants. Rather than create and maintain their own codes, many communities adopt the model building codes maintained by the International Code Council (ICC).
*Source: https://www.fema.gov/building-codes.*

**Building setbacks**. Building setbacks can help keep development out of harm's way. Setback standards establish minimum distances that structures must be positioned (or set back) from river channels and coastal shorelines.
*Source: https://www.fema.gov/setback.*

**Computer-Aided Management of Emergency Operations (CAMEO).** CAMEO is a system of software applications used to plan for and respond to chemical emergencies; ALOHA is a one of the software applications that estimates threat zones for chemical spills.
*Source: https://www.epa.gov/cameo*

**Certified Emergency Manager (CEM).** The CEM designation is one of two types of certification offered to emergency management professionals by IAEM.
*Source: https://www.iaem.com/cem.*

**Comprehensive plans.** A comprehensive plan sets the overall policy direction for a community's future development. It guides coordinated development and sets high standards of public services and facilities in a county. They are important decision-making and priority-setting tools.
*Source: https://projects.arlingtonva.us/plans-studies/comprehensive-plan/*

**Continuity of operations/government plans (COOP/COG).** COOPs help to ensure the execution of essential organizational functions and the fundamental duty of a department during all-hazards emergencies or other situations that may disrupt normal operations. A COOP should: describe the readiness and preparedness of the organization and its staff; outline to whom it should be distributed; detail the process for activating and relocating (or not-relocating) personnel from the organization's primary facility to its continuity site(s); identify the continuation of essential functions – and delineate responsibilities for key staff positions; identify critical communications and information technology (IT) systems to support connectivity during crisis and disaster conditions; and specify how the organization and its staff will return to normal operations. Ideally, a COOP also explains how it fits into other county plans. They are helpful in managing scarce resources during disaster response and identifying vital departmental functions that must continue regardless of a disaster.
*Source: https://www.naco.org/resources/managing-disasters-county-level-focus-flooding-0*

**Debris management plans**. A debris management plan is a written document that establishes procedures and guidelines for managing disaster debris in a coordinated, environmentally-responsible and cost-effective manner. The more local governments take a proactive approach to coordinating and managing debris removal operations the better prepared they will be to restore public services and ensure public health and safety in the aftermath of a disaster.
*Source: https://emilms.fema.gov/IS0633/groups/8.html*

**Disaster preparedness exercises**. Training and emergency exercises ensure that county personnel and residents understand proper protocols and procedure. They prepare individuals to be ready to assist in times of disaster and can be targeted to specific groups or for the public at-large.
*Source: https://www.ready.gov/business/testing/exercises*

**Disaster Recovery Reform Act of 2018 (DRRA)**. On October 5, President Trump signed H.R. 302, which contains the Disaster Recovery Reform Act of 2018 (DRRA), on a 93-6 vote. DRRA modified several FEMA programs to better assist state and local hazard mitigation, preparedness and recovery.
*Source: www.naco.org/drra.*

**Emergency Alert Systems (EAS)**. The Emergency Alert System is a national public warning system that requires TV and radio broadcasters, cable television systems, wireless cable systems, satellite digital audio radio service providers, direct broadcast satellite service providers and wireline video service providers to offer all levels of government the communications capability to address the American public during a national emergency.
*Source: https://www.fcc.gov/consumers/guides/emergency-alert-system-eas*

**Emergency Management Accreditation Program (EMAP)**. Emergency Management Accreditation Program (EMAP) is a voluntary, peer review accreditation process in which EMAs are evaluated across 64 standards.
*Source: https://www.emap.org/*

**Emergency Operations Centers (EOC)**. EOCs help counties to coordinate response activities by gathering decision makers together in one location to supply them with the most current information. An EOC can be physical or virtual and can be dedicated solely to the EMA or used by multiple departments.
*Source: https://www.ready.gov/business/implementation/incident*

**Emergency Operations Plan (EOP)**. In compliance with state laws, counties must develop emergency operations plans (EOP) to address how they will deal with emergencies and disasters. An EOP specifies the roles and responsibilities of county agencies and officials as well as state and federal agencies and volunteer organizations. They can be contained within a comprehensive emergency management plan – which also establishes a framework for mitigation, preparation, response and recovery.
*Source: https://www.naco.org/resources/managing-disasters-county-level-focus-flooding-0*

**Geographic Information Systems (GIS)**. GIS is an integral tool in today's planning toolkit. Organizations use GIS not only to map what is where but also consolidate data on those geographic points that can provide situational awareness and information to support decision making, real-time and for planning purpose.
*Source: https://www.esri.com/about/newsroom/blog/mapping-future-gis/*

**Ham/shortwave radio.** Ham and shortwave radios are operated by members of the public and regulated by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). During a disaster, licensed and trained ham radio operators – often members of the Amateur Radio Emergency Service (ARES) or Radio Amateur Civil Emergency Service (RACES) – help provide both voice and data communications modes to bridge interoperability gaps between agencies.
*Source:* https://www.domesticpreparedness.com/preparedness/ham-radio-in-emergency-operations/

**Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP).** Hazard mitigation plans are documents that aim to identify, assess and reduce the long-term risk to life and property from a range of natural hazards. They must be updated every five years and can be stand-alone documents or integrated in a community's local comprehensive plan. Counties can prepare hazard mitigation plans on their own, with other jurisdictions within the county or with other counties as part of a multi-county region. Counties must have FEMA approved hazard mitigation plans in place to be eligible to receive federal funding for mitigation and other non-emergency disaster projects.
*Source: https://www.naco.org/resources/managing-disasters-county-level-focus-flooding-0*

**Homeland Security Information Network (HSIN).** HSIN is a network through which agencies can share sensitive but unclassified information, manage operations, analyze data and send alerts and notices relevant to public safety.
*Source: https://www.dhs.gov/homeland-security-information-network-hsin*

**HUD Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program.** The CDBG program assists urban, suburban and rural communities to improve housing and living conditions and expand economic opportunities for low- and moderate-income persons. Counties use the flexibility of CDBG funds to partner with the private and non-profit sectors to develop and upgrade local housing, water, infrastructure and human services programs. There is also a separate Community Development Block Grant Disaster Relief (CDBG-DR) program through which Congress allocates billions in funding to HUD for necessary expenses related to natural disasters relief, long-term recovery, restoration of infrastructure and housing and economic revitalization.
*Sources: https://www.naco.org/resources/support-local-development-and-infrastructure-projects-community-development-block-grant-1; https://www.hudexchange.info/resources/documents/CDBG-DR-Fact-Sheet.pdf*

**Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).** FEMA is an agency of the United States Department of Homeland Security focused on helping America – local governments, first responders, residents, etc. – prepare for, prevent, respond to and recover from disasters.
*Source: www.fema.gov/*

**FEMA 2022 Moonshots.** The FEMA 2022 Moonshots look to quadruple national investment in mitigation and double the number of properties covered by insurance by 2022.
*Source: https://www.treasury.gov/initiatives/fio/Documents/FACIFebruary2018_FEMA.pdf*

**FEMA Emergency Management Institute (EMI)**. EMI is the primary center for the development and delivery of emergency management training in the United States.
*Source: https://training.fema.gov/*

**FEMA Emergency Management Performance Grant (EMPG) Program**. EMPG provides resources to assist state, local, tribal and territorial governments in preparing for all hazards. The EMPG program's allowable costs support efforts to build and sustain core capabilities across the Prevention, Protection, Mitigation, Response and Recovery mission areas.
*Source: https://www.fema.gov/emergency-management-performance-grant-program*

**FEMA Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP)**. HMPG funds help communities implement hazard mitigation measures following a Presidential Major Disaster Declaration.
*Source: https://www.fema.gov/hazard-mitigation-grant-program*

**FEMA Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP)**. HSGP provides funding to states, territories, urban areas and other local and tribal governments to prevent, protect against, mitigate, respond to and recover from potential terrorist attacks and other hazards.
*Source: https://www.fema.gov/homeland-security-grant-program*

**FEMA National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP).** NFIP aims to reduce the impact of flooding on private and public structures by providing affordable insurance to property owners, renters and businesses.
*Source: https://www.fema.gov/national-flood-insurance-program*

**FEMA National Flood Insurance Program Community Rating System (CRS)**. CRS is a voluntary incentive program that recognizes communities for implementing floodplain management practices that exceed the Federal minimum requirements of the NFIP to provide protection from flooding. In exchange for a community's proactive efforts to reduce flood risk, policyholders can receive reduced flood insurance premiums for buildings in the community. There are 10 CRS Classes. Class 1 requires the most credit points and provides the largest flood insurance premium reduction (45 percent), while Class 10 means the community does not participate in the CRS, or has not earned the minimum required credit points, and residents receive no premium reduction. Learn more on the CRS page on www.FloodSmart.gov.
*Source: https://www.fema.gov/national-flood-insurance-program-community-rating-system*

**FEMA Pre-Disaster Mitigation (PDM) Grant Program**. The PDM Grant Program is designed to assist local communities in implementing a sustained pre-disaster natural hazard mitigation program. The goal is to reduce overall risk to future hazard events and reliance on federal funding in future disasters.
*Source: https://www.fema.gov/pre-disaster-mitigation-grant-program*

**FEMA Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) Program**. Part of HSGP, the UASI Program intended to provide financial assistance to address high-threat, high-density Urban Areas in efforts to build and sustain the capabilities necessary to prevent, protect against, mitigate, respond to and recover from acts of terrorism using the Whole Community approach.
*Source: https://www.homelandsecuritygrants.info/GrantDetails.aspx?gid=17162*

**Flood buyouts**. Flood buyout, or property acquisition, programs enable local governments to purchase eligible homes prone to frequent flooding from willing, voluntary owners and return the land to open space, wetlands, rain gardens or greenways.
*Source: https://www.naco.org/resources/managing-disasters-county-level-focus-flooding-0*

**International Association of Emergency Managers (IAEM)**. IAEM is the premier organization for emergency management. It promotes the principles of emergency management to advance the emergency management profession.
*Source: www.iaem.com/*

**Incident Command System (ICS).** The ICS is a flexible, standardized management system designed to enable coordinated, collaborative, effective and efficient incident management by integrating a combination of facilities, equipment, personnel, procedures and communications operating within a common organizational structure.
*Source: https://www.fema.gov/pdf/emergency/nims/nimsfaqs.pdf*

**Interoperable communications equipment**. Interoperable communications equipment allows county emergency responders to communicate and share voice and data information
*Source: http://www.disaster-resource.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=859&Itemid=50*

**Mass-Casualty Incident (MCI) Plans**. MCI plans are designed to provide guidance to assist emergency response personnel in ensuring adequate and coordinated efforts to minimize loss of life, disabling injuries, and human suffering by providing effective emergency medical assistance. They are usually an annex within a larger county EOP.
*Source: https://www.countyofnapa.org/DocumentCenter/View/1824/Multi-Casualty-Incident-Management-Plan---Updated-June-2013-PDF*

**Memoranda of understanding (MOU) with other governments**. MOUs are formal inter-local agreements that define the roles and responsibilities of two governments during an emergency – or any other event.
*Source: https://emilms.fema.gov/is554/lesson4/01_04_030f1.htm*

**Mutual aid agreements with other jurisdictions**. Mutual Aid Agreements are important mechanisms to secure county operations in times of emergency because they can authorize assistance between two or more neighboring counties, jurisdictions, and/or states – and also between private sector entities, NGOs and other community partners. They put in place formalized systems that allow for expedited assistance and acquisition of equipment and personnel in times of emergency. The primary difference between a MOU and mutual aid agreement is an MOU can be used to pledge assistance without mutual benefits while mutual aid agreements are reciprocal.
*Source: https://www.naco.org/resources/managing-disasters-county-level-focus-flooding-0*

**National Incident Management System (NIMS)**. NIMS is a comprehensive, national approach to incident management that is applicable at all jurisdictional levels and across functional disciplines. It is intended to be applicable across a full spectrum of potential incidents, hazards, and impacts, regardless of size, location or complexity.
*Source: https://www.fema.gov/pdf/emergency/nims/nimsfaqs.pdf*

**National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)**. NOAA is an agency within the United States Department of Commerce that focuses on the conditions of the oceans, major waterways and the atmosphere.
*Source: www.noaa.gov/*

**Overlay districts**. Overlay zoning is a regulatory tool that creates a special zoning district, over an existing base zone(s), which identifies special provisions in addition to those in the underlying base zone. Regulations or incentives are attached to the overlay district to guide development within a special area. Within an overlay zone, common requirements may include building setbacks, density standards, lot sizes, impervious surface reduction and vegetation requirements.
*Source: https://www.uwsp.edu/cnr-ap/clue/Documents/PlanImplementation/Overlay_Zoning.pdf*

**Statewide or regional insurance pools**. Similar to NFIP, statewide or regional insurance pools act as insurers of last resort for property owners.

**WebEOC®**. WebEOC® is an incident management software that enhances an organization's preparedness, disaster recovery and emergency management efforts.
*Source: https://www.juvare.com/solutions/webeoc*

## Appendix B: Data Tables

**Table 1.** *Does your county have a written board ordinance or resolution formally establishing an emergency management agency (EMA) and its responsibilities?*

|  | *Total* | *Large* | *Medium* | *Small* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Yes** | 87.91% | 86.94% | 88.89% | 92.31% |
| **No** | 8.06% | 7.76% | 9.52% | 3.85% |
| **Do Not Know** | 4.03% | 5.31% | 1.59% | 3.85% |
| *Count* | *397* | *26* | *126* | *245* |

**Table 2.** *How many individuals does the EMA employ?*

|  | *Total* | *Large* | *Medium* | *Small* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Full Time Average** | 2.89 | 9.57 | 3.48 | 1.14 |
| **Full Time Standard Deviation** | 4.46 | 6.62 | 5.21 | 1.23 |
| **Part Time Average** | 1.65 | 1.64 | 2.36 | 1.41 |
| **Part Time Standard Deviation** | 2.36 | 0.84 | 4.11 | 1.39 |
| *Count* | *397* | *26* | *126* | *245* |

**Table 3.** *How many reporting levels are there between the chief emergency management official and the county elected official(s)?*

|  | *Total* | *Large* | *Medium* | *Small* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1 - reports directly to elected official(s) (e.g. supervisor, commissioner, council member, borough member, etc.)** | 71.79% | 46.15% | 56.35% | 82.45% |
| **2 - supervisor of the chief of emergency management reports directly to elected official(s)** | 16.37% | 19.23% | 25.40% | 11.43% |
| **3 - supervisor's supervisor reports directly to elected official(s)** | 7.05% | 30.77% | 11.90% | 7.05% |
| **Other** | 4.79% | 3.85% | 6.35% | 4.79% |
| *Count* | *397* | *26* | *126* | *245* |

**Table 4.** *To whom does the chief emergency management official directly report? Please select all that apply.*

|  | *Total* | *Large* | *Medium* | *Small* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **County Board** | 45.59% | 19.23% | 30.16% | 56.33% |
| **County Administrator, Executive or Manager** | 43.83% | 61.54% | 53.97% | 36.73% |
| **County Sheriff** | 8.06% | 7.69% | 7.94% | 10.61% |
| **County Public Works Director or Engineer** | 0.76% | 0.00% | 3.17% | 1.63% |
| **County Health Director** | 2.02% | 0.00% | 0.79% | 0.82% |
| **Other** | 18.89% | 34.62% | 18.25% | 17.55% |
| *Count* | *397* | *26* | *126* | *245* |

**Table 5.** *Please describe the education and training experience of the EMA. Please select all that apply.*

| | Total | Large | Medium | Small |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Completed the National Incident Management System (NIMS) Training Program** | 93.04% | 96.00% | 96.80% | 90.76% |
| **Attended some courses at the FEMA Emergency Management Institute (EMI)** | 16.75% | 24.00% | 15.20% | 16.81% |
| **Completed the Basic Academy at EMI** | 14.33% | 36.36% | 12.38% | 12.94% |
| **Completed the Advanced Academy at EMI** | 9.02% | 20.00% | 11.20% | 6.72% |
| **Completed the Executive Academy at EMI** | 4.12% | 8.00% | 4.80% | 3.36% |
| **Completed the Master's Program at Naval Postgraduate School Center for Homeland Defense and Security (NPS CHDS)** | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| **Completed the Executive Leaders Program at NPS CHDS** | 1.80% | 4.00% | 2.40% | 1.26% |
| **Master's degree in emergency and/or disaster management** | 9.79% | 24.00% | 16.80% | 4.62% |
| *Count* | *388* | *25* | *125* | *238* |

**Table 6.** *Does your county formally endorse the National Incident Management System?*

| | Total | Large | Medium | Small |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Yes** | 94.84% | 100.00% | 98.15% | 92.69% |
| **No, but we do use the system.** | 3.15% | 0.00% | 0.93% | 4.57% |
| **No, and we do not use the system.** | 0.29% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.46% |
| **Do Not Know** | 1.72% | 0.00% | 0.93% | 2.28% |
| *Count* | *349* | *22* | *108* | *219* |

**Table 7.** *Is your Chief Emergency Management Officer certified as an Emergency Manager by any of the following?*

| | Total | Large | Medium | Small |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Your State** | 78.05% | 40.91% | 75.24% | 83.58% |
| **International Association of Emergency Managers** | 7.62% | 22.73% | 12.38% | 3.48% |
| **Other** | 14.33% | 36.36% | 12.38% | 12.94% |
| *Count* | *328* | *22* | *105* | *201* |

**Table 8.** *Is your county accredited by the Emergency Management Accreditation Program (www.emap.org)?*

|  | Total | Large | Medium | Small |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Yes, we are accredited and compliant with all EMAP Emergency Management Standards.** | 11.79% | 36.00% | 8.00% | 11.23% |
| **No, but we make use of EMAP Emergency Management Standards** | 37.44% | 48.00% | 47.20% | 31.25% |
| **No, and we do not make use of EMAP Emergency Management Standards.** | 34.10% | 16.00% | 38.40% | 33.75% |
| **Do Not Know** | 16.67% | 0.00% | 6.40% | 23.75% |
| *Count* | *390* | *25* | *125* | *240* |

**Table 9.** *What percentage of the county's total annual budget is dedicated to the EMA?*

|  | Total | Large | Medium | Small |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **0-5%** | 87.53% | 86.96% | 93.81% | 84.55% |
| **5-10%** | 6.23% | 0.00% | 3.54% | 8.15% |
| **10-15%** | 0.54% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.86% |
| **15-20%** | 0.27% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.43% |
| **20-25%** | 0.27% | 4.35% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| **Other** | 5.15% | 8.70% | 2.65% | 6.01% |
| *Count* | *369* | *23* | *113* | *233* |

**Table 10.** *The budget for the EMA is located in the:*

|  | Total | Large | Medium | Small |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **General Fund** | 78.14% | 95.65% | 78.76% | 76.09% |
| **Separate governmental fund** | 13.93% | 0.00% | 12.39% | 16.09% |
| **Other** | 7.92% | 4.35% | 8.85% | 7.83% |
| *Count* | *366* | *23* | *113* | *230* |

**Table 11.** *Do you anticipate the budget for the EMA in the next fiscal year for your county to decrease, stay the same or increase?*

|  | Total | Large | Medium | Small |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Decrease** | 7.07% | 13.04% | 3.54% | 8.19% |
| **Stay the Same** | 66.85% | 69.57% | 61.95% | 68.97% |
| **Increase** | 26.09% | 17.39% | 34.51% | 22.84% |
| *Count* | *368* | *23* | *113* | *232* |

**Table 12.** *Pre-disaster, has your county adopted -- or during a disaster declaration, does your state automatically implement -- administrative and fiscal procedures that allow the EMA to expediently request, apply for, receive, manage and expend funds during a local emergency or disaster event?*

|  | *Total* | *Large* | *Medium* | *Small* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Yes** | 61.81% | 81.82% | 73.21% | 54.35% |
| **No** | 22.25% | 9.09% | 19.64% | 24.78% |
| **Do Not Know** | 13.19% | 4.55% | 4.46% | 18.26% |
| **Other** | 2.75% | 4.55% | 2.68% | 2.61% |
| *Count* | *364* | *22* | *112* | *230* |

**Table 13.** *Does your county maintain insurance against disaster damage for its buildings and infrastructure? Please select all that apply.*

|  | *Total* | *Large* | *Medium* | *Small* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Yes, it maintains private insurance coverage** | 43.14% | 14.29% | 41.67% | 46.61% |
| **Yes, it is part of a statewide/regional insurance pool.** | 41.43% | 14.29% | 35.19% | 47.06% |
| **Yes, it self-insures using reserved funds.** | 19.71% | 80.95% | 34.26% | 6.79% |
| **No, it has no disaster insurance** | 3.43% | 4.76% | 0.93% | 4.52% |
| *Count* | *350* | *21* | *108* | *221* |

**Table 14.** *Does your county maintain a "rainy day" reserve fund to pay for emergencies and disasters?*

|  | *Total* | *Large* | *Medium* | *Small* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Yes** | 48.78% | 56.72% | 52.21% | 46.35% |
| **No** | 30.89% | 30.43% | 27.43% | 32.62% |
| **Do Not Know** | 20.33% | 13.04% | 20.35% | 21.03% |
| *Count* | *369* | *23* | *113* | *233* |

**Table 15.** *Does your county participate in any of the following federal grant programs? Please select all that apply.*

| | Total | Large | Medium | Small |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **FEMA Pre-Hazard Mitigation Grant Program** | 27.62% | 47.83% | 32.43% | 22.86% |
| **FEMA Hazard Mitigation Grant Program** | 52.33% | 60.87% | 49.55% | 52.86% |
| **FEMA Flood Mitigation Assistance Grant Program** | 15.12% | 30.43% | 18.02% | 11.90% |
| **FEMA Fire Prevention and Safety Grants** | 20.64% | 17.39% | 26.13% | 18.10% |
| **FEMA Hazard Mitigation Planning Program** | 35.47% | 21.74% | 32.43% | 38.57% |
| **FEMA Emergency Management Performance Grant Program** | 81.98% | 95.65% | 92.79% | 74.76% |
| **FEMA Homeland Security Grant Program** | 58.43% | 82.61% | 66.67% | 51.43% |
| **FEMA Radiological Emergency Preparedness Program** | 11.92% | 21.74% | 15.32% | 9.05% |
| **FEMA Urban Area Security Initiative Program** | 8.72% | 65.22% | 9.91% | 1.90% |
| **HUD Community Development Block Grant Program** | 39.13% | 16.22% | 10.95% | 14.53% |
| **HUD Community Development Block Grant–Disaster Recovery Program** | 6.10% | 13.04% | 10.81% | 2.86% |
| **USDA Emergency Watershed Protection Program** | 4.65% | 8.70% | 4.50% | 4.29% |
| **NOAA Coastal Resilience Grant Program** | 2.62% | 4.35% | 2.70% | 2.38% |
| **CDC Hospital Preparedness Program - Public Health Emergency Preparedness Cooperative Agreement** | 10.76% | 26.09% | 14.41% | 7.14% |
| **Other** | 8.14% | 8.70% | 8.11% | 8.10% |
| *Count* | *331* | *23* | *110* | *198* |

**Table 16.** *What non-federal financing mechanisms have you used to fund mitigation projects?*

| | Total | Large | Medium | Small |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **State funding** | 34.83% | 11.11% | 31.67% | 37.88% |
| **Local tax funding** | 34.33% | 33.33% | 35.00% | 34.09% |
| **Foundation funding** | 1.99% | 11.11% | 3.33% | 0.76% |
| **Public private partnerships** | 8.46% | 11.11% | 13.33% | 6.06% |
| **Other** | 20.40% | 33.33% | 16.67% | 21.21% |
| *Count* | *201* | *9* | *60* | *132* |

**Table 17.** *Who prepared the emergency operations plan?*

|  | *Total* | *Large* | *Medium* | *Small* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **County EMA** | 68.97% | 63.64% | 71.56% | 68.20% |
| **County multi-agency task force** | 13.22% | 22.73% | 16.51% | 10.60% |
| **Regional planning organization** | 4.02% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 6.45% |
| **Contractor** | 9.48% | 9.09% | 9.17% | 9.68% |
| **Other** | 4.31% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 6.45% |
| *Count* | *348* | *22* | *109* | *217* |

**Table 18.** *Is your county's hazard mitigation plan integrated into its comprehensive plan?*

|  | *Total* | *Large* | *Medium* | *Small* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Yes** | 55.68% | 47.83% | 57.27% | 55.71% |
| **No** | 27.84% | 39.13% | 30.91% | 25.11% |
| **Do Not Know** | 16.48% | 13.04% | 11.82% | 19.18% |
| *Count* | *352* | *23* | *110* | *219* |

**Table 19.** *Does your county have any of the following emergency management plans or agreements? Please select all that apply.*

|  | *Total* | *Large* | *Medium* | *Small* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Emergency Operations Plan** | 99.43% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 99.08% |
| **Hazard Mitigation Plan** | 98.84% | 100.00% | 94.50% | 94.50% |
| **Evacuation Plan** | 57.02% | 50.00% | 62.39% | 55.05% |
| **Disaster Recovery Plan** | 44.13% | 59.09% | 48.62% | 40.37% |
| **Continuity of Operations/Government Plan** | 57.59% | 95.45% | 59.63% | 52.75% |
| **Donations Management Plan** | 28.94% | 59.09% | 38.53% | 21.10% |
| **Debris Management Plan** | 52.72% | 81.82% | 63.30% | 44.50% |
| **Pre-Event, FEMA Approved Debris Removal Contract** | 14.61% | 31.82% | 26.61% | 6.88% |
| **Mass Casualty Incident Plan** | 60.46% | 77.27% | 71.56% | 53.21% |
| **Mutual aid agreements with other jurisdictions** | 77.94% | 86.36% | 86.24% | 72.94% |
| **Memoranda of understanding with other governments** | 56.45% | 63.64% | 61.47% | 53.21% |
| **Other** | 5.16% | 0.00% | 9.17% | 3.67% |
| *Count* | *349* | *22* | *109* | *218* |

**Table 20.** *Do your plans specifically identify and address the needs of any of the below special populations? Please select all that apply.*

|  | *Total* | *Large* | *Medium* | *Small* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Nursing homes** | 85.48% | 85.71% | 82.83% | 86.89% |
| **Hospitals** | 76.90% | 90.48% | 83.84% | 71.58% |
| **Homeless** | 21.78% | 38.10% | 26.26% | 17.49% |
| **Non-English speaking** | 40.90% | 90.48% | 48.48% | 30.60% |
| **Public transit dependent** | 24.09% | 57.14% | 34.34% | 14.75% |
| **Pet owners** | 68.32% | 90.48% | 77.78% | 60.66% |
| **Prisoners** | 37.95% | 47.62% | 41.41% | 34.97% |
| **Sex offenders** | 12.21% | 19.05% | 17.17% | 8.74% |
| **Other** | 5.28% | 4.76% | 6.06% | 4.92% |
| *Count* | *303* | *21* | *99* | *183* |

**Table 21.** *How does your county use Geographic Information Systems (GIS) technology? Please select all that apply.*

|  | *Total* | *Large* | *Medium* | *Small* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Dispatch response units** | 67.35% | 72.73% | 75% | 62.91% |
| **Manage resources** | 40.82% | 68.18% | 45.37% | 35.68% |
| **Identify areas affected by an incident using meteorological information** | 52.19% | 77.27% | 61.11% | 45.07% |
| **Identify persons or facilities (schools, nursing homes, etc.) for notification about potential hazards** | 55.98% | 86.36% | 58.33% | 51.64% |
| **Risk assessment** | 51.90% | 77.27% | 56.48% | 46.95% |
| **Plan for critical infrastructure** | 48.69% | 77.27% | 58.33% | 40.85% |
| **Identify special populations** | 30.61% | 59.09% | 37.96% | 23.94% |
| **Map response resources (e.g. water sources)** | 58.31% | 86.36% | 70.37% | 49.30% |
| **Facilitate recovery** | 36.73% | 77.27% | 47.22% | 27.23% |
| **Accurate addressing** | 67.64% | 63.64% | 75.93% | 63.85% |
| **Other** | 5.25% | 0.00% | 5.56% | 5.63% |
| **We do not use GIS.** | 5.83% | 4.55% | 0.93% | 8.45% |
| *Count* | *343* | *22* | *108* | *213* |

**Table 22.** *Who performs the GIS work specifically for the EMA? Please select all that apply.*

| | Total | Large | Medium | Small |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **EMA employee** | 26.91% | 36.36% | 20.56% | 29.29% |
| **Employee of planning department or other central government unit** | 57.80% | 77.27% | 73.83% | 46.97% |
| **Regional planning office** | 4.89% | 4.55% | 2.80% | 6.06% |
| **Private contractor** | 8.56% | 0.00% | 4.67% | 11.62% |
| **Other** | 18.35% | 4.55% | 13.08% | 22.73% |
| *Count* | *327* | *22* | *107* | *198* |

**Table 23.** *What strategies does your county employ to build disaster risk reduction awareness among local elected officials and the public? Please select all that apply.*

| | Total | Large | Medium | Small |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Public meetings** | 72.93% | 82.61% | 77.06% | 69.86% |
| **Civic engagement events (ex. "build your bucket" for an emergency)** | 42.17% | 65.22% | 62.39% | 29.68% |
| **Training or exercises** | 84.62% | 95.65% | 89.91% | 80.82% |
| **School visits** | 59.26% | 60.87% | 67.89% | 54.79% |
| **Radio or television spots** | 36.47% | 56.52% | 46.79% | 29.22% |
| **Newspaper or magazine ads** | 43.30% | 39.13% | 35.78% | 47.49% |
| **Direct mailers** | 7.69% | 30.43% | 5.50% | 6.39% |
| **Billboards** | 5.98% | 13.04% | 9.17% | 3.65% |
| **Location-based visualization applications** | 4.56% | 13.04% | 8.26% | 1.83% |
| **Social media** | 70.94% | 82.61% | 80.73% | 64.84% |
| **Other** | 8.26% | 17.39% | 6.42% | 8.22% |
| *Count* | *351* | *23* | *109* | *219* |

**Table 24.** *When was the last time your county conducted a county-wide disaster preparation drill or exercise?*

| | Total | Large | Medium | Small |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Within the last 6 months** | 32.19% | 30.43% | 40.37% | 28.31% |
| **6-12 months ago** | 31.62% | 43.48% | 32.11% | 30.14% |
| **1-2 years ago** | 16.81% | 8.70% | 15.60% | 18.26% |
| **More than 2 years ago** | 19.37% | 17.39% | 11.93% | 23.29% |
| *Count* | *351* | *23* | *109* | *219* |

**Table 25.** *Would you describe the drill or exercise as any of the following? Please select all that apply*

|  | *Total* | *Large* | *Medium* | *Small* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Table top exercise** | 62.94% | 59.09% | 62.96% | 63.33% |
| **Functional drill** | 48.53% | 63.64% | 56.48% | 42.86% |
| **Full-scale simulation** | 45.88% | 45.45% | 57.41% | 40.00% |
| **Other** | 7.94% | 9.09% | 10.19% | 6.67% |
| *Count* | *340* | *22* | *108* | *210* |

**Table 26.** *To what extent is each of the following groups within your county prepared for the types of disasters that have hit the county in the past or might hit in the future? Please rate each on a scale of 0 (not prepared at all) to 4 (extremely prepared).*

| *County agencies/departments* | *Total* | *large* | *Medium* | *Small* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **0-not prepared at all** | 0.58% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.92% |
| **1** | 4.05% | 4.55% | 2.80% | 4.61% |
| **2** | 39.88% | 40.91% | 35.51% | 41.94% |
| **3** | 45.09% | 45.45% | 45.79% | 44.70% |
| **4-extremely prepared** | 9.09% | 15.89% | 7.83% | 10.40% |
| *Count* | *346* | *22* | *107* | *217* |

| *Local Police departments* | *Total* | *large* | *Medium* | *Small* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **0-not prepared at all** | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| **1** | 3.77% | 4.55% | 3.74% | 3.70% |
| **2** | 24.06% | 9.09% | 27.10% | 24.07% |
| **3** | 68.18% | 51.40% | 58.80% | 57.10% |
| **4-extremely prepared** | 15.07% | 18.18% | 17.76% | 13.43% |
| *Count* | *345* | *22* | *107* | *216* |

| *Local Fire departments* | *Total* | *Large* | *Medium* | *Small* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **0-not prepared at all** | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| **1** | 0.58% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.92% |
| **2** | 16.18% | 9.09% | 12.15% | 18.89% |
| **3** | 59.83% | 54.55% | 63.55% | 58.53% |
| **4-extremely prepared** | 23.41% | 36.36% | 24.30% | 21.66% |
| *Count* | *346* | *22* | *107* | *217* |

| *Local Hospitals & Health Care Providers* | *Total* | *Large* | *Medium* | *Small* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **0-not prepared at all** | 2.11% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 3.45% |
| **1** | 2.11% | 0.00% | 0.93% | 2.96% |
| **2** | 24.40% | 22.73% | 21.50% | 26.11% |
| **3** | 55.42% | 72.73% | 58.88% | 51.72% |
| **4-extremely prepared** | 15.96% | 4.55% | 18.69% | 15.76% |
| *Count* | *332* | *22* | *107* | *203* |

| Local municipalities (cities, towns, boroughs, etc.) | Total | Large | Medium | Small |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0-not prepared at all | 0.59% | 0.00% | 0.94% | 0.47% |
| 1 | 13.82% | 0.00% | 14.15% | 15.09% |
| 2 | 44.41% | 45.45% | 39.62% | 46.70% |
| 3 | 36.47% | 54.55% | 35.85% | 34.91% |
| 4-extremely prepared | 0.00% | 9.43% | 2.83% | 4.71% |
| Count | 340 | 22 | 106 | 212 |

| Residents | Total | Large | Medium | Small |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0-not prepared at all | 1.16% | 4.55% | 1.87% | 0.46% |
| 1 | 28.32% | 22.73% | 25.23% | 30.41% |
| 2 | 54.62% | 50.00% | 55.14% | 54.84% |
| 3 | 14.45% | 22.73% | 15.89% | 12.90% |
| 4-extremely prepared | 1.45% | 0.00% | 1.87% | 1.38% |
| Count | 346 | 22 | 107 | 217 |

| Business Community | Total | Large | Medium | Small |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0-not prepared at all | 2.61% | 0.00% | 2.83% | 2.76% |
| 1 | 29.57% | 22.73% | 30.19% | 29.95% |
| 2 | 54.49% | 59.09% | 50.00% | 56.22% |
| 3 | 11.88% | 13.64% | 15.09% | 10.14% |
| 4-extremely prepared | 1.45% | 4.55% | 1.89% | 0.92% |
| Count | 345 | 22 | 106 | 217 |

| Volunteer Community | Total | Large | Medium | Small |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0-not prepared at all | 2.05% | 0.00% | 0.94% | 2.80% |
| 1 | 13.74% | 4.55% | 9.43% | 16.82% |
| 2 | 46.78% | 36.36% | 43.40% | 49.53% |
| 3 | 34.50% | 54.55% | 40.57% | 29.44% |
| 4-extremely prepared | 2.92% | 4.55% | 5.66% | 1.40% |
| Count | 342 | 22 | 106 | 214 |

| Faith-based Community | Total | Large | Medium | Small |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0-not prepared at all | 2.05% | 4.55% | 0.95% | 2.34% |
| 1 | 17.89% | 9.09% | 19.05% | 18.22% |
| 2 | 50.15% | 54.55% | 43.81% | 52.80% |
| 3 | 27.27% | 31.82% | 31.43% | 24.77% |
| 4-extremely prepared | 2.64% | 0.00% | 4.76% | 1.87% |
| Count | 341 | 22 | 105 | 214 |

| Colleges & Universities | Total | Large | Medium | Small |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **0-not prepared at all** | 8.24% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 15.79% |
| **1** | 11.76% | 4.55% | 8.00% | 15.79% |
| **2** | 39.61% | 54.55% | 45.00% | 33.08% |
| **3** | 37.25% | 36.36% | 42.00% | 33.83% |
| **4-extremely prepared** | 3.14% | 4.55% | 5.00% | 1.50% |
| *Count* | *255* | *22* | *100* | *133* |

| K-12 Schools | Total | Large | Medium | Small |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **0-not prepared at all** | 0.87% | 4.55% | 0.00% | 0.93% |
| **1** | 6.40% | 4.55% | 7.55% | 6.02% |
| **2** | 37.79% | 54.55% | 36.79% | 36.57% |
| **3** | 47.67% | 31.82% | 48.11% | 49.07% |
| **4-extremely prepared** | 7.27% | 4.55% | 7.55% | 7.41% |
| *Count* | *344* | *22* | *106* | *216* |

| Early childhood development centers and daycares | Total | Large | Medium | Small |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **0-not prepared at all** | 4.53% | 9.09% | 4.72% | 3.94% |
| **1** | 23.87% | 36.36% | 27.36% | 20.69% |
| **2** | 47.73% | 31.82% | 50.94% | 47.78% |
| **3** | 21.15% | 18.18% | 15.09% | 24.63% |
| **4-extremely prepared** | 2.72% | 4.55% | 1.89% | 2.96% |
| *Count* | *331* | *22* | *106* | *203* |

**Table 27.** *Are there pre-designated public shelters within your county for evacuees from disasters?*

| | Total | Large | Medium | Small |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Yes** | 77.33% | 71.43% | 81.31% | 75.93% |
| **No** | 18.31% | 23.81% | 16.82% | 18.52% |
| **Do Not Know** | 4.36% | 4.76% | 1.87% | 5.56% |
| *Count* | *344* | *21* | *107* | *216* |

**Table 28.** *Does your county have adequate housing stock to support temporary housing needs for local residents, non-local volunteers, federal employees, etc. in the event of a major disaster?*

| | Total | Large | Medium | Small |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Yes** | 8.38% | 9.52% | 10.28% | 7.34% |
| **No** | 79.19% | 71.43% | 76.64% | 81.19% |
| **Do Not Know** | 12.43% | 19.05% | 13.08% | 11.47% |
| *Count* | *346* | *21* | *107* | *218* |

**Table 29.** *What types of mitigation policies does your county have in place? Please select all that apply.*

| | Total | Large | Medium | Small |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Freeboard** | 16.73% | 26.67% | 25.27% | 11.43% |
| **Buffer zones** | 25.62% | 40% | 35.16% | 19.43% |
| **Building setbacks** | 41.28% | 40% | 53.85% | 34.86% |
| **Overlay districts (ex. floodplain, avalanche, etc.)** | 41.28% | 46.67% | 52.75% | 34.86% |
| **Green infrastructure** | 9.25% | 40.00% | 9.89% | 6.29% |
| **Building code, including materials requirements** | 55.52% | 73.33% | 70.33% | 46.29% |
| **Continuous load paths** | 5.34% | 6.67% | 6.59% | 4.57% |
| **Emergency vehicle access requirements** | 37.72% | 60.00% | 47.25% | 30.86% |
| **Other** | 2.85% | 0.00% | 2.20% | 3.43% |
| **Per state law, counties are not legally allowed to regulate local land use.** | 5.54% | 11.76% | 8.51% | 3.37% |
| **Per state law, counties are not legally allowed to regulate local building codes.** | 7.61% | 35.29% | 7.45% | 5.06% |
| **We do not regulate land use.** | 22.15% | 17.65% | 13.83% | 26.97% |
| **We do not regulate building codes.** | 24.22% | 17.65% | 12.77% | 30.90% |
| *Count* | *289* | *17* | *94* | *178* |

**Table 30.** *Does your county have a non-FEMA funded repetitive flood loss property buyout program?*

| | Total | large | Medium | Small |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Yes** | 3.23% | 23.81% | 2.88% | 1.39% |
| **No** | 79.18% | 61.90% | 81.73% | 79.63% |
| **Do Not Know** | 17.60% | 14.29% | 15.38% | 18.98% |
| *Count* | *341* | *21* | *104* | *216* |

**Table 31.** *Does your county participate in the National Flood Insurance Program Community Rating System?*

| | Total | large | Medium | Small |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Yes** | 52.79% | 76.19% | 64.42% | 44.91% |
| **No** | 20.23% | 14.29% | 13.46% | 20.23% |
| **Do Not Know** | 26.98% | 9.52% | 22.12% | 31.02% |
| *Count* | *341* | *21* | *104* | *216* |

**Table 32.** *Does your county have a primary Emergency Operations Center dedicated solely to the EMA?*

| | Total | Large | Medium | Small |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Yes** | 52.67% | 76.00% | 64.29% | 44.21% |
| **No, but we do have an EOC** | 43.26% | 24.00% | 34.92% | 49.59% |
| **No, we do not have an EOC.** | 3.56% | 0.00% | 0.79% | 5.37% |
| **Do Not Know** | 0.51% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.83% |
| *Count* | *393* | *25* | *126* | *242* |

**Table 33.** *What means of communications does your county employ during disasters? Please select all that apply.*

|  | Total | Large | Medium | Small |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Emergency Alert System (radio, cable television, wireless cable and satellite providers)** | 90.26% | 95.45% | 91.67% | 89.04% |
| **Door-to-door** | 55.30% | 68.18% | 59.26% | 52.05% |
| **Landline (ex. 211 or reverse 911)** | 70.77% | 95.45% | 75.00% | 66.21% |
| **Cell phone applications (e.g. Next Door)** | 58.45% | 81.82% | 57.41% | 56.62% |
| **Internet/email** | 61.89% | 95.45% | 73.15% | 52.97% |
| **Text messaging** | 69.05% | 86.36% | 63.89% | 69.86% |
| **Twitter** | 45.27% | 86.36% | 69.44% | 29.22% |
| **Facebook** | 81.66% | 95.45% | 88.89% | 76.71% |
| **Other** | 10.89% | 18.18% | 8.33% | 11.42% |
| *Count* | *349* | *22* | *108* | *219* |

**Table 34.** *How does your county manage social media during a disaster?*

|  | Total | Large | Medium | Small |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **The county has an employee fully committed to social media.** | 8.31% | 18.18% | 12.96% | 5.02% |
| **The county has an employee who handles social media on a regular basis.** | 32.09% | 31.82% | 39.81% | 28.31% |
| **The county assigns one employee to social media during a disaster as "other duties as assigned."** | 24.64% | 22.73% | 18.52% | 27.85% |
| **The county engages a team of social media volunteers.** | 6.02% | 0.00% | 6.48% | 6.39% |
| **We do not have any social media accounts.** | 11.75% | 0.00% | 2.78% | 17.35% |
| **Other** | 17.19% | 27.27% | 19.44% | 15.07% |
| *Count* | *349* | *22* | *108* | *219* |

**Table 35.** *Does your county monitor social media during a disaster to identify and get in front of incorrect information or rumors?*

|  | Total | Large | Medium | Small |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Yes** | 77.03% | 90.48% | 86.92% | 70.83% |
| **No** | 17.15% | 4.76% | 9.35% | 22.22% |
| **Do Not Know** | 5.81% | 4.76% | 3.74% | 6.94% |
| *Count* | *344* | *21* | *107* | *216* |

**Table 36.** *Does your county currently use any of the following technology/software?*

| | *Total* | *Large* | *Medium* | *Small* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **WebEOC®** | 77.51% | 86.36% | 81.65% | 74.24% |
| **Cameo/Aloha** | 49.24% | 54.55% | 57.80% | 43.94% |
| **Ham/Shortwave Radio** | 63.83% | 77.27% | 75.23% | 56.06% |
| **DisasterLAN (D-LAN)** | 4.56% | 4.55% | 7.34% | 3.03% |
| **Homeland Security Information Network (HSIN)** | 42.55% | 68.18% | 54.13% | 33.33% |
| **Knowledge Center** | 16.11% | 22.73% | 22.02% | 12.12% |
| **Interoperable communications equipment (800 MHz Radio)** | 71.12% | 95.45% | 83.49% | 61.62% |
| **Other** | 13.68% | 9.09% | 11.01% | 15.66% |
| *Count* | 329 | 22 | 109 | 198 |

**Table 37.** Which agencies and organizations has the EMA worked with over the past five years, and in what phases have you engaged/partnered with them?
*Note: Due to a survey formatting error, respondents were only able to select the phase during which they most often engaged each agency or organization. Not selecting any options*

**Federal Partnerships.**

| Phases | FEMA | EPA | USDA | NOAA | Other Homeland Security agency | Other federal agency/ department |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Education/Training** | 22.17% | 10.58% | 7.81% | 28.97% | 10.83% | 5.29% |
| **Mitigation** | 12.85% | 1.76% | 2.77% | 1.01% | 2.27% | 0.76% |
| **Planning** | 15.87% | 10.83% | 12.85% | 24.94% | 9.32% | 4.53% |
| **Recovery** | 24.94% | 3.53% | 4.28% | 1.01% | 0.25% | 1.51% |
| **Response** | 5.79% | 12.59% | 4.28% | 14.36% | 2.52% | 2.02% |
| *Count* | 324 | 156 | 127 | 279 | 100 | 56 |

**State and Regional Partnerships.**

| Phases | State EMA | State EPA | Other state agency | COGs/Regional planning organizations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Education/Training** | 19.40% | 5.79% | 4.03% | 5.04% |
| **Mitigation** | 4.28% | 1.76% | 1.01% | 3.27% |
| **Planning** | 35.77% | 10.58% | 6.05% | 29.72% |
| **Recovery** | 5.29% | 3.53% | 0.76% | 1.26% |
| **Response** | 15.62% | 17.13% | 6.55% | 2.02% |
| *Count* | 319 | 154 | 73 | 164 |

**Local Government Partnerships.**

| Phases | Other county agencies | Other counties | Local municipalities | Schools |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Education/Training | 10.83% | 13.85% | 10.08% | 15.11% |
| Mitigation | 3.53% | 0.76% | 4.53% | 3.02% |
| Planning | 30.23% | 36.27% | 43.32% | 52.39% |
| Recovery | 1.76% | 1.26% | 2.52% | 0.50% |
| Response | 9.07% | 17.63% | 16.12% | 7.05% |
| *Count* | *220* | *277* | *304* | *310* |

**Local Community Partnerships.**

| Phases | RACES/ ARES | National volunteer organizations | Local VOAD | Faith-based organizations | Other local non-profits | Local hospitals | Local business community |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Education/ Training | 8.56% | 8.06% | 5.54% | 9.32% | 5.54% | 12.59% | 12.09% |
| Mitigation | 0.50% | 0.25% | 0.00% | 0.50% | 0.00% | 0.76% | 1.01% |
| Planning | 21.41% | 19.65% | 23.43% | 31.23% | 12.09% | 50.13% | 38.04% |
| Recovery | 1.01% | 5.79% | 7.05% | 7.81% | 2.02% | 0.00% | 1.51% |
| Response | 18.39% | 11.34% | 7.30% | 11.08% | 5.29% | 8.31% | 5.29% |
| *Count* | *198* | *179* | *172* | *238* | *99* | *285* | *230* |

## Appendix C: County Survey Respondents

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Calhoun County, AL | Manatee County, FL | Marshall County, IL |
| Chambers County, AL | Martin County, FL | Stephenson County, IL |
| Clarke County, AL | Sumter County, FL | Wabash County, IL |
| Lamar County, AL | Volusia County, FL | Winnebago County, IL |
| Mobile County, AL | Baldwin County, GA | Franklin County, IN |
| Morgan County, AL | Bartow County, GA | Marshall County, IN |
| Washington County, AL | Ben Hill County, GA | Ohio County, IN |
| Denali Borough, AK | Camden County, GA | Posey County, IN |
| Cochise County, AZ | Catoosa County, GA | Putnam County, IN |
| Coconino County, AZ | Charlton County, GA | Warrick County, IN |
| Navajo County, AZ | Crawford County, GA | Black Hawk County, IA |
| Santa Cruz County, AZ | DeKalb County, GA | Butler County, IA |
| Yuma County, AZ | Gilmer County, GA | Poweshiek County, IA |
| Baxter County, AR | Greene County, GA | Washington County, IA |
| Bradley County, AR | Hart County, GA | Barton County, KS |
| Clay County, AR | Heard County, GA | Butler County, KS |
| Lafayette County, AR | Henry County, GA | Cowley County, KS |
| Pike County, AR | Jeff Davis County, GA | Ellis County, KS |
| Pope County, AR | Lamar County, GA | Ford County, KS |
| Prairie County, AR | Macon County, GA | Franklin County, KS |
| Pulaski County, AR | Mitchell County, GA | Grant County, KS |
| Searcy County, AR | Pierce County, GA | Hamilton County, KS |
| Sevier County, AR | Rockdale County, GA | Kingman County, KS |
| White County, AR | Spalding County, GA | Lane County, KS |
| Yell County, AR | Sumter County, GA | McPherson County, KS |
| Calaveras County, CA | Taliaferro County, GA | Nemaha County, KS |
| Contra Costa County, CA | Telfair County, GA | Pottawatomie County, KS |
| Del Norte County, CA | Whitfield County, GA | Saline County, KS |
| Fresno County, CA | Maui County, HI | Scott County, KS |
| Mono County, CA | Adams County, ID | Sedgwick County, KS |
| Orange County, CA | Bear Lake County, ID | Shawnee County, KS |
| Sacramento County, CA | Blaine County, ID | Stanton County, KS |
| San Diego County, CA | Caribou County, ID | Unified Govt. of Wyandotte |
| Baca County, CO | Clearwater County, ID | County and Kansas City, KS |
| Chaffee County, CO | Latah County, ID | Barren County, KY |
| Eagle County, CO | Teton County, ID | Bath County, KY |
| Gilpin County, CO | Valley County, ID | Fleming County, KY |
| Grand County, CO | Washington County, ID | Garrard County, KY |
| Montezuma County, CO | Alexander County, IL | Henderson County, KY |
| Montrose County, CO | Champaign County, IL | Marshall County, KY |
| Phillips County, CO | Cumberland County, IL | Mason County, KY |
| Routt County, CO | Jefferson County, IL | Morgan County, KY |
| Yuma County, CO | Kane County, IL | Russell County, KY |
| Sussex County, DE | Lee County, IL | Shelby County, KY |
| Alachua County, FL | McHenry County, IL | Spencer County, KY |
| Brevard County, FL | Madison County, IL | Beauregard Parish, LA |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Morehouse Parish, LA | Pemiscot County, MO | Madison County, NY |
| St. Helena Parish, LA | Platte County, MO | Nassau County, NY |
| West Baton Rouge Parish, LA | Ray County, MO | Sullivan County, NY |
| Waldo County, ME | Scotland County, MO | Wayne County, NY |
| Calvert County, MD | Vernon County, MO | Yates County, NY |
| Carroll County, MD | Webster County, MO | Bladen County, NC |
| Cecil County, MD | Blaine County, MT | Burke County, NC |
| Dorchester County, MD | Fallon County, MT | Camden County, NC |
| Wicomico County, MD | Garfield County, MT | Columbus County, NC |
| Arenac County, MI | Liberty County, MT | Craven County, NC |
| Grand Traverse County, MI | McCone County, MT | Franklin County, NC |
| Gratiot County, MI | Butte-Silver Bow County, MT | Granville County, NC |
| Ingham County, MI | Boone County, NE | Guilford County, NC |
| Macomb County, MI | Cherry County, NE | Iredell County, NC |
| Mason County, MI | Clay County, NE | Nash County, NC |
| Montcalm County, MI | Dakota County, NE | Pitt County, NC |
| Montmorency County, MI | Dawes County, NE | Tyrrell County, NC |
| Ottawa County, MI | Dodge County, NE | Union County, NC |
| Wexford County, MI | Douglas County, NE | Warren County, NC |
| Anoka County, MN | Frontier County, NE | Washington County, NC |
| Benton County, MN | Hayes County, NE | Burleigh County, ND |
| Hennepin County, MN | Jefferson County, NE | Dunn County, ND |
| Nobles County, MN | Kearney County, NE | Foster County, ND |
| Olmsted County, MN | Logan County, NE | Mountrail County, ND |
| Otter Tail County, MN | McPherson County, NE | Ward County, ND |
| Ramsey County, MN | Nemaha County, NE | Athens County, OH |
| Renville County, MN | Nuckolls County, NE | Guernsey County, OH |
| Roseau County, MN | Otoe County, NE | Hardin County, OH |
| Washington County, MN | Platte County, NE | Medina County, OH |
| Benton County, MS | Rock County, NE | Mercer County, OH |
| DeSoto County, MS | Saline County, NE | Muskingum County, OH |
| Grenada County, MS | Scotts Bluff County, NE | Tuscarawas County, OH |
| Harrison County, MS | York County, NE | Union County, OH |
| Neshoba County, MS | Clark County, NV | Blaine County, OK |
| Atchison County, MO | Elko County, NV | Cleveland County, OK |
| Barton County, MO | Nye County, NV | Greer County, OK |
| Boone County, MO | Cape May County, NJ | Murray County, OK |
| Callaway County, MO | Passaic County, NJ | Rogers County, OK |
| Cape Girardeau County, MO | Grant County, NM | Seminole County, OK |
| Carroll County, MO | Guadalupe County, NM | Texas County, OK |
| Cass County, MO | Santa Fe County, NM | Tillman County, OK |
| Christian County, MO | Socorro County, NM | Washington County, OK |
| Greene County, MO | Union County, NM | Washita County, OK |
| Lawrence County, MO | Allegany County, NY | Woods County, OK |
| McDonald County, MO | Chenango County, NY | Baker County, OR |
| Madison County, MO | Clinton County, NY | Harney County, OR |
| Maries County, MO | Erie County, NY | Malheur County, OR |
| Mississippi County, MO | Lewis County, NY | Union County, OR |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bedford County, PA | Aransas County, TX | Warren County, VA |
| Blair County, PA | Archer County, TX | Washington County, VA |
| Cameron County, PA | Bastrop County, TX | York County, VA |
| Carbon County, PA | Bell County, TX | Asotin County, WA |
| Chester County, PA | Brewster County, TX | Columbia County, WA |
| Erie County, PA | Calhoun County, TX | Jefferson County, WA |
| Fayette County, PA | Cameron County, TX | King County, WA |
| Franklin County, PA | Cooke County, TX | San Juan County, WA |
| Greene County, PA | Fort Bend County, TX | Snohomish County, WA |
| Jefferson County, PA | Gaines County, TX | Stevens County, WA |
| Lancaster County, PA | Hardin County, TX | Doddridge County, WV |
| Lehigh County, PA | Harris County, TX | Hardy County, WV |
| Luzerne County, PA | Jefferson County, TX | Jackson County, WV |
| McKean County, PA | Johnson County, TX | Morgan County, WV |
| Mercer County, PA | Kaufman County, TX | Pleasants County, WV |
| Montour County, PA | Kendall County, TX | Barron County, WI |
| Northumberland County, PA | Kent County, TX | Bayfield County, WI |
| Schuylkill County, PA | Lavaca County, TX | Burnett County, WI |
| Somerset County, PA | Liberty County, TX | Chippewa County, WI |
| Warren County, PA | Lubbock County, TX | Dodge County, WI |
| Barnwell County, SC | Roberts County, TX | Eau Claire County, WI |
| Florence County, SC | Robertson County, TX | Iron County, WI |
| Horry County, SC | San Saba County, TX | Jackson County, WI |
| Lancaster County, SC | Smith County, TX | Kewaunee County, WI |
| Marion County, SC | Terrell County, TX | Lafayette County, WI |
| Lake County, SD | Wichita County, TX | Manitowoc County, WI |
| Lincoln County, SD | Wise County, TX | Pepin County, WI |
| Minnehaha County, SD | Daggett County, UT | Polk County, WI |
| Clay County, TN | Davis County, UT | Richland County, WI |
| Fayette County, TN | Wasatch County, UT | Sheboygan County, WI |
| Grundy County, TN | Washington County, UT | Vilas County, WI |
| Lincoln County, TN | Weber County, UT | Waushara County, WI |
| McMinn County, TN | Bath County, VA | Winnebago County, WI |
| Marshall County, TN | Greene County, VA | Goshen County, WY |
| Meigs County, TN | Henrico County, VA | Hot Springs County, WY |
| Montgomery County, TN | James City County, VA | Laramie County, WY |
| Shelby County, TN | Loudoun County, VA | Niobrara County, WY |
| Williamson County, TN | Powhatan County, VA | Teton County, WY |
| Andrews County, TX | Surry County, VA | |

**Appendix D: Survey Instrument**

## Introduction

**Survey on Emergency Management in County Government**

**The National Association of Counties (NACo) is asking for your help as we seek to assess key aspects of county emergency management, including organizational structure, personnel and training, budgets and funding, partnerships and planning, preparedness, mitigation and response efforts.** Your responses will help NACo shape its future resilience programming and aid our members as they make recommendations on federal policy issues and legislation pertaining to emergency management.

Please complete the questions on the following pages to the best of your ability. The length of time needed to complete the survey will vary depending on how much detail you choose to provide us. **The core portion of the questionnaire should take approximately 20-25 minutes to complete.** We recommend that you complete the entire survey in one sitting. However, if you would like to complete it in stages, you can return by closing out of the browser and using the original survey link to re-enter the survey; your previously entered answers will automatically repopulate. **The survey deadline is Friday, June 1, 2018.**

**Thank you in advance for taking the time to complete this survey.** NACo intends to conduct a similar survey every five years; the responses to this survey will be our baseline going forward. Your individual responses will be kept confidential. **If you have any questions or need any assistance with the survey, please contact Jenna Moran at jmoran@naco.org.**

**County and Organizational Structure**

## COUNTY AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Please indicate your: *

County.

State.

What is the population of your county? *

○  Above 500,000

○  50,000 to 500,000

○  Under 50,000

How many jurisdictions are in your county? (i.e. cities, towns, etc.)

In the past 2 years, has your county been part of a disaster or emergency declaration? Please check all that apply. *

☐  Presidentially declared disaster (federal)

☐  State declared disaster

☐  Locally declared disaster

Does your county have a written board ordinance or resolution formally establishing an emergency management agency (EMA) and its responsibilities? *

*For the purposes of this survey, the emergency management agency ("EMA") is the department, division, organization or agency specifically tasked with Emergency Management preparedness, response, recovery and mitigation plans and efforts, and interaction with the Federal Emergency Management Agency or officials within the state emergency management office or departments of homeland security or military affairs.*

○  Yes

○  No

○  Do No Know

To whom does the chief emergency management official *directly* report? Please check all that apply. *

☐  County board

☐  County administrator, executive or manager

☐  County sheriff

☐ County public works director or engineer

☐ County health director

☐ Other [                    ]

How many reporting levels are there between the chief emergency management official and the county elected official(s)? *

○  1 - reports directly to elected official(s) (e.g. supervisor, commissioner, council member, borough member, etc.)

○  2 - supervisor of the chief of emergency management reports directly to elected official(s)

○  3 - supervisor's supervisor reports directly to elected official(s)

○  Other [                    ]

Is your Chief Emergency Management Officer certified as an Emergency Manager by any of the following? Please check all that apply.

○  Your State

○  The International Association of Emergency Managers

○  Other [                    ]

What percentage of the chief emergency management official's time is spent on emergency management?

[                    ]

How many individuals does the EMA employ? Please check all that apply and indicate how many employees are employed in that category in the text box. *

☐ Full time [                    ]

☐ Part time [                    ]

How many FTEs (full time equivalents) does this represent?

[                    ]

Is your county accredited by the Emergency Management Accreditation Program (www.emap.org)?

○ Yes, we are accredited and compliant with all EMAP Emergency Management Standards.

○ No, but we make use of EMAP Emergency Management Standards.

○ No, and we do not make use of EMAP Emergency Management Standards.

○ Do Not Know

Does your county have a primary Emergency Operations Center (EOC) dedicated solely to the EMA?

○ Yes

○ No, but we do have an EOC.

○ No, we do not have an EOC.

○ Do Not Know

**Funding**

## FUNDING

What is the dollar amount of the budget for the EMA (excluding grants and other sources) in the current fiscal year for your county? *

[                    ]

The budget for the EMA is located in the:

○ General fund

○ Separate governmental fund

○ Other [                    ]

What percentage of the county's total annual budget is dedicated to the EMA? *

○ 0-5%

○ 5-10%

○ 10-15%

○ 15-20%

○ 20-25%

○ Other: [                    ]

Do you anticipate the budget for the EMA in the next fiscal year for your county to:

○ Decrease

○ Increase

○ Stay the same

What portion of your county's capital expenditures were devoted to natural hazard mitigation in the current fiscal year for your county?

○ 0-5%

○ 5-10%

○ 10-15%

○ 15-20%

○ 20-25%

○ Other: [                    ]

Does your county participate in any of the following federal grant programs? Please check all that apply. If applicable, please also indicate how much funding your county received from that program in the past fiscal year, and if the funding was used for natural hazard mitigation.

☐ FEMA Pre-Hazard Mitigation Grant Program [                    ]

☐ FEMA Hazard Mitigation Grant Program [                    ]

☐ FEMA Flood Mitigation Assistance Grant Program [                    ]

☐ FEMA Fire Prevention and Safety Grants [                    ]

☐ FEMA Hazard Mitigation Planning Program [                    ]

☐ FEMA Emergency Management Performance Grant Program [                    ]

☐ FEMA Homeland Security Grant Program [                    ]

☐ FEMA Radiological Emergency Preparedness Program _____

☐ FEMA Urban Area Security Initiative Program _____

☐ HUD Community Development Block Grant Program _____

☐ HUD Community Development Block Grant–Disaster Recovery Program
_____

☐ USDA Emergency Watershed Protection Program _____

☐ NOAA Coastal Resilience Grant Program _____

☐ CDC Hospital Preparedness Program - Public Health Emergency Preparedness Cooperative Agreement _____

☐ Other (i.e. DOT, EPA, etc.) _____

What non-federal financing mechanisms have you used to fund mitigation projects? Please describe the nature of the funding; if applicable, you can provide a link to the funding source page.

○ State funding (e.g. recurrent funding, one-time contribution, steady funding, annual appropriation, etc.) _____

○ Local tax funding (e.g. special taxing district, tourism/bed tax, etc.) _____

○ Foundation funding _____

○ Public private partnerships _____

○ Other _____

Pre-disaster, has your county adopted -- or during a disaster declaration, does your state automatically implement -- administrative and fiscal procedures that allow the EMA to expediently request, apply for, receive, manage and expend funds during a local emergency or disaster event (e.g. Human Resources policies to pay exempt employees overtime or waivers from certain permitting processes)?

○ Yes

○ No

○ Do Not Know

○ Other [　　　　　　　]

Does your county maintain insurance against disaster damage for its buildings and infrastructure? Please check all that apply.

☐ Yes, it maintains private insurance coverage.

☐ Yes, it is part of a statewide/regional insurance pool.

☐ Yes, it self insures using reserved funds.

☐ No, it has no disaster insurance.

Does your county maintain a "rainy day" reserve fund to pay for emergencies and disasters? *

○ Yes

○ No

○ Do Not Know

**Partnerships**

## PARTNERSHIPS

Which agencies and organizations has the EMA worked with over the past five years, and in what phases have you engaged/partnered with them? Please indicate which other agencies, organizations, etc. your county engaged in the text box.

| | Planning | Mitigation | Response | Recovery | Education/Training |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Other county agencies (e.g. planning department) [　　] | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| FEMA | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| EPA | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| USDA | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| NOAA | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Other Homeland Security agency [　　] | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

| | Planning | Mitigation | Response | Recovery | Education/Training |
|---|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|
| Other federal agency/department | O | O | O | O | O |
| State EMA | O | O | O | O | O |
| State EPA | O | O | O | O | O |
| Other state agency | O | O | O | O | O |
| COGs/Regional planning organizations | O | O | O | O | O |
| RACES/ARES | O | O | O | O | O |
| Other counties | O | O | O | O | O |
| Local municipalities (cities, towns, boroughs, etc.) | O | O | O | O | O |
| Schools | O | O | O | O | O |
| National volunteer organizations | O | O | O | O | O |
| Local VOAD | O | O | O | O | O |
| Faith-based organizations | O | O | O | O | O |
| Other local non-profits | O | O | O | O | O |
| Local hospital(s) | O | O | O | O | O |
| Local business community | O | O | O | O | O |
| Other | O | O | O | O | O |

## Planning

## PLANNING

In what year did your county last conduct a hazard identification and risk assessment? *

Does your county have any of the following emergency management plans or agreements? Please check all that apply and if known indicate in what year they were last updated.

☐ Emergency Operations Plan [_____]

☐ Hazard Mitigation Plan [_____]

☐ Evacuation Plan [_____]

☐ Disaster Recovery Plan [_____]

☐ Continuity of Operations/Government Plan (COOP/COG) [_____]

☐ Donations Management Plan [_____]

☐ Debris Management Plan [_____]

☐ Pre-Event, FEMA Approved Debris Removal Contract [_____]

☐ Mass Casualty Incident Plan [_____]

☐ Mutual aid agreements with other jurisdictions [_____]

☐ Memoranda of understanding with other governments [_____]

☐ Other [_____]

Is your county's hazard mitigation plan integrated into its comprehensive plan? *

○ Yes
○ No
○ Do Not Know

Do your plans specifically identify and address the needs of any of the below special populations? Please check all that apply. If your evacuation plan has special sheltering arrangements for any of these populations, please indicate that via the text box with a "yes."

☐ Nursing homes [_____]

☐ Hospitals [                    ]

☐ Homeless [                    ]

☐ Non-English speaking [                    ]

☐ Public transit dependent [                    ]

☐ Pet owners [                    ]

☐ Prisoners [                    ]

☐ Sex offenders [                    ]

☐ Other [                    ]

Who prepared the emergency operations plan?

○ County EMA

○ County multi-agency task force

○ Regional planning organization

○ Contractor

○ Other [                    ]

How does your county use Geographic Information Systems (GIS) technology?
Please check all that apply.

☐ Dispatch response units

☐ Manage resources

☐ Identify areas affected by an incident using meteorological information

☐ Identify persons or facilities (schools, nursing homes, etc.) for notification about potential
hazards

☐ Risk assessment

☐ Plan for critical infrastructure

☐ Identify special populations

☐ Map response resources (e.g. water sources)

☐ Facilitate recovery

☐ Accurate addressing

☐ Other [                    ]

☐ We do not use GIS.


Who performs the GIS work specifically for the EMA? Please check all that apply.

☐ EMA employee

☐ Employee of planning department or other central government unit

☐ Regional planning office

☐ Private contractor

☐ Other [                    ]


Does your county currently use any of the following technology/software? Please check all that apply.

☐ Web EOC

☐ Cameo/Aloha

☐ Ham/Shortwave Radio

☐ DisasterLAN (D-LAN)

☐ Homeland Security Information Network (HSIN)

☐ Knowledge Center

☐ Interoperable communications equipment (800 MHz Radio)

☐ Other [                    ]


**Preparedness**

## <u>PREPAREDNESS</u>

Does your county formally endorse the National Incident Management System?

○ Yes

○ No, but we do use the system.

○ No, and we do not use the system.

○ Do Not Know

To what extent is each of the following groups within your county prepared for the types of disasters that have hit the county in the past or might hit in the future? Please rate each on a scale of 0 (not prepared at all) to 4 (extremely prepared).

| | 0-not prepared at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4-extremely prepared |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| County agencies/ departments | O | O | O | O | O |
| Local police departments | O | O | O | O | O |
| Local fire departments | O | O | O | O | O |
| Local hospitals and health care providers | O | O | O | O | O |
| Local municipalities (cities, towns, boroughs, etc.) | O | O | O | O | O |
| Residents | O | O | O | O | O |
| Business community | O | O | O | O | O |
| Volunteer community | O | O | O | O | O |
| Faith-based community | O | O | O | O | O |
| Colleges and universities | O | O | O | O | O |
| K-12 schools | O | O | O | O | O |
| Early childhood development centers and daycares | O | O | O | O | O |

What strategies does your county employ to build disaster risk reduction awareness among local elected officials and the public? *

☐ Public meetings

☐ Civic engagement events (ex. "build your bucket" for an emergency)

☐ Training or exercises

☐ School visits

☐ Radio or television spots

☐ Newspaper or magazine ads

☐ Direct mailers

☐ Billboards

☐ Location-based visualization applications (ex. San Diego County's Know Your Hazards map)

☐ Social media [ ]

☐ Other [ ]

When was the last time your county conducted a county-wide disaster preparation drill or exercise? *

○ Within the last 6 months

○ 6-12 months ago

○ 1-2 years ago

○ More than 2 years ago

Would you describe the drill or exercise as any of the following? If you have had more than one, please check all that apply.

☐ Table top exercise

☐ Functional drill

☐ Full-scale simulation

☐ Other [ ]

Has your county held any neighborhood-level disaster trainings, drills or exercises in the past 12 months to gauge the public's understanding and expectations of EMA?

○ Yes

○ No

○ Do Not Know

**Response**

## RESPONSE

What means of communications does your county employ during disasters? Please check all that apply. *

- [ ] Emergency Alert System (radio, cable television, wireless cable and satellite providers)
- [ ] Door-to-door
- [ ] Landline (ex. 211 or reverse 911)
- [ ] Cell phone applications (e.g. Next Door)
- [ ] Internet/email
- [ ] Text messaging
- [ ] Twitter
- [ ] Facebook
- [ ] Other [_____]

How does your county manage social media during a disaster? *

- ( ) The county has an employee fully committed to social media.
- ( ) The county has an employee who handles social media on a regular basis.
- ( ) The county assigns one employee to social media during a disaster as "other duties as assigned."
- ( ) The county engages a team of social media volunteers.
- ( ) We do not have any social media accounts.
- ( ) Other [_____]

Does your county monitor social media during a disaster to identify and get in front of incorrect information or rumors?

- ( ) Yes
- ( ) No
- ( ) Do Not Know

Are there pre-designated public shelters within your county for evacuees from disasters? If yes, please indicate what the public sheltering capacity is as a percentage of your county's total population.

- ( ) Yes [_____]
- ( ) No
- ( ) Do Not Know

Does your county have adequate housing stock to support temporary housing needs for local residents, non-local volunteers, federal employees, etc. in the event of a major disaster? If yes, please indicate what the temporary housing capacity is as a percentage of your county's total population.

○ Yes [                    ]

○ No

○ Do Not Know

**Mitigation**

## MITIGATION

What types of mitigation policies does your county have in place? In the text box, please indicate the specifics of that policy (e.g. Freeboard, 3 feet).

☐ Freeboard [                    ]

☐ Buffer zones [                    ]

☐ Building setbacks [                    ]

☐ Overlay districts (ex. floodplain, avalanche, etc.) [                    ]

☐ Green infrastructure [                    ]

☐ Building code, including materials requirements [                    ]

☐ Continuous load paths [                    ]

☐ Emergency vehicle access requirements [                    ]

☐ Other [                    ]

☐ Per state law, counties are not legally allowed to regulate local land use.

☐ Per state law, counties are not legally allowed to regulate local building codes.

☐ We do not regulate land use.

☐ We do not regulate building codes.

Does your county have a non-FEMA funded repetitive flood loss property buyout program? If yes, please list your funding sources in the text box (e.g. local stormwater fee). *

O Yes [                    ]

O No

O Do Not Know

Does your county participate in the National Flood Insurance Program Community Rating System? If yes, please indicate at which class the county is currently rated. *

O Yes [                    ]

O No

O Do Not Know

**This is the end of the survey. Once you click "Submit," you will not be able to return to change your answers.**

Powered by Qualtrics

[i] "Billion-Dollar Weather and Climate Disasters: Table of Events," NOAA, https://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/billions/events.

[ii] "Chapter 3: Building an Effective Emergency Management Organization," FEMA, https://training.fema.gov/hiedu/docs/fem/chapter%203%20-%20building%20an%20effective%20em%20org.doc.

[iii] Emergency Management Institute, FEMA, https://training.fema.gov/.

[iv] The average dollar amount of the budget (excluding grants and other sources) for county EMAs could not be calculated due to inconsistencies in the data reported back.

[v] Vying for Funding, Rural Counties Often Lose to Big Cities, Governing, http://www.governing.com/topics/finance/gov-how-rural-communities-can-compete-for-development-cash.html.

[vi] "Integrating Hazard Mitigation Into Local Planning," FEMA, https://www.fema.gov/media-library-data/20130726-1908-25045-0016/integrating_hazmit.pdf.

[vii] "Mapping the Future of GIS," Esri, https://www.esri.com/about/newsroom/blog/mapping-future-gis/.

[viii] Per the 2003 Supplement Enterprise Information Technology Strategic Plan for Nevada County, Calif., "address data is integral to the operations of many County departments and applications…Having consistent, accurate addressing allows for the mapping of this information using a GIS capability referred to as geocoding...An example of the importance of consistent and accurate data would be an application that would route emergency response vehicles to an incident based on an address." See more at https://www.mynevadacounty.com/DocumentCenter/View/11171/2003-Strategic-Plan-Supplement-GIS-Enterprise-PDF-test-rename.

[ix] "Chapter 9 – Preparedness for Emergency Response," FEMA, https://training.fema.gov/hiedu/docs/fem/chapter%209%20-%20preparedness%20for%20emergency%20response.doc.

[x] The American Planning Association recently completed a Survey of State Land-Use and Natural Hazards Planning Laws in coordination with FEMA's Cooperating Technical Partners (CTP) program. Check out your state's survey results at https://www.planning.org/nationalcenters/hazards/statesurvey/.

[xi] "Managing Disasters at the County Level: A Focus on Flooding," NACo, https://www.naco.org/resources/managing-disasters-county-level-focus-flooding-0.

[xii] Ibid.

[xiii] "NIMS: FAQs," FEMA, https://www.fema.gov/pdf/emergency/nims/nimsfaqs.pdf.

[xiv] "Incident Management," Ready.gov, https://www.ready.gov/business/implementation/incident.

[xv] "The New WebEOC," Juvare, https://www.juvare.com/solutions/webeoc.

[xvi] "Interoperable Communications," Disaster Resource Guide, http://www.disaster-resource.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=859&Itemid=50.

[xvii] "Ham Radio in Emergency Operations," Domestic Preparedness, https://www.domesticpreparedness.com/preparedness/ham-radio-in-emergency-operations/.

[xviii] "CAMEO: Computer-Aided Management of Emergency Operations," NOAA, https://cameo.noaa.gov/.

[xix] "Homeland Security Information Network (HSIN)," U.S. Department of Homeland Security, https://www.dhs.gov/homeland-security-information-network-hsin.

[xx] The survey asked which federal grant programs responding counties participated it. It did not ask them to distinguish if they applied and received funding, if they applied and did not receive funding or if they did not apply at all.