# Support tool: District Disaster Management Group emergency action plan (EAP) review

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Abbreviations:** | |
| WSSR | *Water Supply (Safety and Reliability) Act 2008* |
| DM | *Disaster Management Act 2003* |
| EMAF | Emergency Management Assurance Framework |
| EMAF Principles | Leadership, Public safety, Partnership and Performance |
| Standard | Standard for Disaster Management in Queensland |

**Background –** An effective EAP is an agreement between the dam owner and key parties in the disaster management area. All parties who have a role in implementation of the EAP need to agree on their roles and responsibilities.

This is a tool to assist a chairperson of the district disaster management group (DDMG) to review an emergency action plan (EAP) under section 352HC of the *Water Supply (Safety and Reliability) Act 2008* (the Act) for its consistency with the relevant district disaster management plan (DDMP).

**Integrating framework –** This support tool refers to the Act requirements and the Emergency Management Assurance Framework (EMAF).

**Responsibilities**  **–** If given a copy of an EAP by a dam owner, the relevant chairperson of a DDMG reviews the EAP for consistency with its DDMP, provides a Notice to the dam owner advising if the EAP is consistent with the DDMP and, if not, outline reasons why.

The review is not necessarily expected to assess EAP effectiveness or review technical competency; rather to consider consistency of warnings and alert triggers and how interaction between stakeholders at all levels is described. It also provides an opportunity to improve awareness of risks and harms at a district scale.

The EAP version provided to the DDMG must be the same version as that submitted to the chief executive for approval. It is requested for the EAP version to be stated in any Notice provided to the dam owner.

**What’s included in this support tool –** The support tool contains a **checklist** that can be used when assessing an EAP. Once completed, a **template** is provided to assist in producing the notice.

**CHECKLIST: Emergency action plan (EAP)   
review**

**This checklist is intended as an internal assessment tool for local government. Inclusion within a notice to dam owner, local government or DNRME is optional.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | |  | |
| **Name of dam owner:** | |  | |
| **Title of EAP and version number:** | |  | |
| **Date EAP received by the DDMG:** | |  | |
| **Person completing support tool:** | |  | |
| **Date support tool completed:** | |  | |
|  | |  | |
| **Checklist:** | |  | |
|  | |  | |
| **Reference** | **Hazard identification and risk assessment** | | |
| s.352H WSSR  s. 23(d) DM | What are the name/s of the relevant local disaster management plans (LDMPs) covering the areas identified in the EAP for an emergency event/s of the dam? | |  |
| s.352H WSSR  s. 23(d) DM  Standard, Component 1, Key Outcomes 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 | For each dam hazard, does the EAP clearly identify the area likely to be affected by a dam hazard event or emergency event arising from the dam hazard, including, for example, by attaching to the plan maps showing areas vulnerable to flooding if the event were to happen? | | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
|  |  | |  |
| **Reference** | **Hazard mitigation and risk reduction** | |  |
| s. 352H WSSR  s. 23(d) DM  Standard, Component 2, Key Outcome 2.2 | Does the dam owner and relevant local government/s provide an education program for the PAR and the broader community about the EAP that aligns with the relevant DDMP? | | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| s. 352H WSSR  s. 23(d) DM  Standard, Component 2,  Key Outcome 2.3 | Does the dam owner and local government perform any other risk reduction activities that align with the relevant DDMP? For example, evacuation planning? | | Yes ☐ No ☐ |

| **Reference** | **Preparedness and planning** | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| s. 352HC WSSR  EMAF Principles | Have any DDMG member/s participated in the development of this EAP? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| If yes, please indicate the level of collaboration with the dam owner in the development:  Minimal  Good  Comprehensive | |
| EMAF Principles | Was the DDMG invited by the local government or its LDMG to participate in their assessment of the EAP? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| EMAF Principles  Standard, Component 3,  Key Outcomes 3.1 and 3.2 | Have any DDMG member/s participated in an exercise or testing of the EAP in the last 12 months? | Yes  No |
| s. 352HC WSSR  s. 23(d) DM EMAF Principles, Standard  Component 3  Key Outcome 3.3 | Is the DDMG aware of learnings captured from exercises or events (including any disaster management review recommendations) implemented in the EAP? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Reference** | **Emergency communications** | |
| s. 352H WSSR  s. 23(d) DM | Has the local government/s or relevant LDMG/s advised the DDMG of any inconsistency between the EAP and the LDMP - with particular focus on: | |
|  | * inconsistency between the EAP and LDMP on the escalation triggers, priority order and/or delivery of notifications and warnings for identified dam hazards during a response to an emergency event of the dam | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
|  | * consistency with the key community messages about the EAP and any relevant messaging in the relevant LDMP/s? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| Standard, Component 5, Key Outcomes 5.1 and 5.2 | * the roles and responsibilities in delivering the notifications and warnings to relevant entities that includes the PAR | Yes ☐ No ☐ |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Reference** | **Response** | | |
| WSSR Act  S352HC | Is there agreed principles and common language used across agencies and entities? | | Yes  No |
|  | If no, where are there inconsistencies in the language contained in the EAP? | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | |
|  | Does the EAP clearly document agreed control responsibilities that stem from legislation and align with relevant disaster management plans? | | Yes  No |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Emergency action plan review findings** | |
| What is the current title and version number of the DDMP relevant to this EAP? | |
| Is the EAP consistent with the above plan? Specifically, is there consistency in terms of community communications, notifications and warnings? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| If no, please outline the areas of inconsistency: | |

**TEMPLATE: District Disaster Management Group Notice to a Dam Owner**

***Note:***

*Section 352HC (1) provides that, if a district group is given a copy of an emergency action plan under section 352HA (b), the chairperson of the group* ***may*** *review the plan for consistency with the group’s disaster management plan*

*Section 352HC (2) provides that, the chairperson* ***may****,* ***within 30 business days*** *after receiving the emergency action plan, give the owner of the dam a notice*

**DISTRICT DISASTER GROUP NOTICE TO DAM OWNER**

*Water Supply (Safety and Reliability) Act 2008,* Section 352HC

**1. <<NAME OF DISTRICT DISASTER GROUP>>** was given a copy of an emergency action plan (EAP) for <<insert name of dam>>, <<version number>> by <<insert dam owner name>> on <<insert date copy EAP received>> to review its consistency with the group’s disaster management plan.

**2.** This notice is given under section 352HC of the *Water Supply (Safety and Reliability) Act 2008* (Qld).

**3.** The District Disaster Group considers the EAP is consistent with the disaster management plan

<<OR>>

The District Disaster Group considers the EAP is not consistent with the disaster management plan for the following reasons:

<< insert reasoning>>

Dated: <<insert date of notice>>

<<INSERT DDC NAME>>

**District Disaster Coordinator**

**<<NAME OF DISTRICT DISASTER GROUP>>**