# Support tool: Local Government emergency action plan (EAP) assessment

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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 requires agreement between 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 local government when assessing an EAP for consistency with the relevant local disaster management plan (LDMP) under section 352HB of the *Water Supply (Safety and Reliability) Act 2008* (the Act).

**Integrating framework –** This support tool refers to the Act requirements and the Emergency Management Assurance Framework (EMAF), including the Standard for Disaster Management in Queensland (the Standard) which is an approved standard under the *Disaster Management Act 2003.*

**Responsibilities –** If given a copy of an EAP for assessment by a dam owner the local government, in consultation with its local disaster management group (LDMG), must assess the plan for consistency with its local disaster management plan (LDMP).

The local government must, within 30 business days after receiving the EAP, provide the dam owner with a **notice** stating whether or not it considers the EAP to be consistent with its LDMP. If the local government considers the EAP is not consistent, the notice must outline the reason why. The notice should be signed by the chief executive officer or appropriate delegate of the local government.

The EAP version provided to the local government for assessment **must** be the same version as that submitted to the chief executive for approval. It is requested that the EAP version be stated in the Notice 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) assessment**

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| **Name of dam owner:** |  |
| **Title of EAP and version number:** |  |
| **Date EAP received:** |  |
| **Person completing support tool:** |  |
| **Date support tool completed:** |  |
|  |  |
| **Checklist:** |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk assessment** | | |
| What is the name of the LDMP that covers the areas of identified dam hazards and emergency events in this EAP? |  | |
| Were any members of the local government or LDMG involved 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 | | |
| 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 ☐ |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Risk reduction** | |
| Are the roles and responsibilities for the below stakeholders made clear in the EAP:  Dam owner  Local Council  Local Disaster Management Group  District Disaster Management Group  Other relevant entities  Population at Risk | |
| Have the roles and responsibilities been agreed to for each dam hazard identified in the EAP? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| Does the dam owner outline in the EAP how it will register lessons learned following an emergency event? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| Will the approved EAP be readily accessible to communities to which they relate?  Noting that a redacted copy of the approved EAP will be available on the Business Queensland website. | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| Are any residual risks identified in the EAP and assigned in the relevant disaster management plans? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| Is modelling and mapping used in the EAP to inform disaster operations, including public information and warnings? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Preparedness and planning** | |
| Has the local government/s or its LDMG invited the DDMG to participate in this assessment of this EAP under section 352HB of the Act? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| Has any member/s of the local government of LDMG participated in an exercise or testing of this EAP in the last 12 months? | Yes  No |
| Is the local government or LDMG aware of learnings captured from exercises or events (including any disaster management review recommendations) implemented in the EAP? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| Do all the disaster management stakeholders roles required for the activation of the EAP have the skills and knowledge required to perform their role/s?  If not, what roles require further training? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| Is there a dam liaison officer available to the local council or LDMG during an emergency event under the EAP?  If not, how can a liaison officer be made available? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| Does each relevant entity stated in the EAP agree to their priorities for disaster management and the responsibilities for key functions and roles? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| Are the escalation points and capability limits clearly outlined in the EAP? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| Was there engagement with all stakeholders in the documenting of roles in the EAP? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Emergency communications** | |
| Has the local government/s or its 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 and priority order for notifications and warnings of identified dam hazards and the relevant communication systems used to relay notifications and warnings during activation of an EAP | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| * the communication systems – are they robust and provide for redundancy appropriate to the environment for the identified affected community/ies | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| * consistency with the key community messages about the EAP and any relevant messaging in the relevant LDMP/s? If ”yes”, what is the inconsistency? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| * roles and responsibilities in delivering the warnings and notifications to persons at risk of harm and notifications to relevant entities - are the messages: | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| * + clearly outlined in the EAP for each dam hazard | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| * + appropriate for each dam hazard trigger levels (i.e. evacuation messages and timings are consistent with LDMP) | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| * appropriate to the local environment | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| * use common language | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| * communication responsibilities are agreed | Yes ☐ No ☐ |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Response** |  |
| Is there agreed doctrine and common language used across agencies and entities? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| If not, 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 assessment findings** |  |
| What is the current title and version number of the LDMP relevant to this EAP? |  |
| Is the EAP consistent with the above plan? Specifically, is there consistency in terms of community communications, notifications and warnings – who, how, when and priority order of messaging is clear and aligns with the above plan? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| If no, please outline the areas of inconsistency: |  |

| **Optional: Further considerations** | |
| --- | --- |
| The following questions on emergency communications provides a more in-depth Local Government assessment, if the local government chooses to. | |
| Please identify if you understand the roles and responsibilities identified in the EAP for the delivery of:  ☐ Notifications about the dam  ☐ Warnings about the dam  ☐ Communications about the dam | Yes ☐ No ☐  Yes ☐ No ☐  Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| Is the EAP clear on the communication system(s) / method(s) used by the dam owner to **notify and warn the PAR**?  If yes, will the dam owner use the Emergency Alert system as a form of communicating warnings? | Yes ☐ No ☐  Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| Is the EAP clear on the communication system(s) / method(s) used by the dam owner to **notify the** **relevant entities**? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| Does the EAP detail **how and how often** the dam owner will provide the disaster management groups with notifications about the dam during an emergency event? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| Are the messages considered to be in plain language? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| Are there community education programs to inform the community of the hazards identified in the EAP? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| Are there multiple delivery channels which are adaptable to meet audience needs and circumstances? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| Does the EAP provide for communications to be accurate, reliable, relevant and timely? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| Does the EAP provide communications that link to warning types, sources and content? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| Does the EAP provide for communications that are consistent across, and vertically through entities and systems? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| Are the roles and responsibilities for public information and public education on the communications outlined in the EAP agreed to and documented in the EAP? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| Are you aware if the public information and education activities are regularly tested for community understanding of content, perception of authority and resultant action? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| Does the communication system/s support the continuous flow of up-to-date critical information between stakeholders? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| Are roles, responsibilities and protocols for use and access to communication systems in the EAP agreed? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| Does the communication system/s in the EAP support the continuous flow of up-to-date critical information between key stakeholders? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| Is there a redundancy in place for primary communication system/s? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| Are the communications system/s responsive to the range of reasonably foreseeable operating environments for the dam location? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| Are the communities at risk of impact of a dam hazard or emergency event profiled to identify and define groups? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| Are there any identified barriers to communication outlined in the EAP? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| Does the EAP outline that the warning messages and systems are regularly reviewed, tested and exercised? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| Are the warning messages in the EAP delivered by entities with the authority to do so, in line with agreed documented roles and responsibilities? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| Does the dam owner value-add to warnings with appropriate local context and content and tailor dissemination approaches to local needs? | Yes ☐ No ☐ |

**TEMPLATE: Local Government   
Notice to a Dam Owner**

***Note:***

*Section 352HB (1) provides that, if a local government is given a copy of an emergency action plan under section 352HA (a), the local government must assess the emergency action plan for consistency with its disaster management plan*

*Section 352HB (2) provides that, in assessing the emergency action plan, the local government must consult with it local group for the plan*

*Section 352HB (3) provides that, the local government must* ***within 30 business days*** *after receiving the emergency action, give the owner of the dam a notice*

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT NOTICE TO DAM OWNER**

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

**1. <<INSERT NAME OF COUNCIL>>** (the Council) 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 assess its consistency with the Council’s disaster management plan.

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

**3.** The Council considers the EAP is consistent with the local government’s disaster management plan

<<OR>>

The Council considers the EAP is not consistent with the local government’s disaster management plan for the following reasons:

<< insert reasoning>>

Dated: <<insert date of notice>>

<<INSERT NAME>>

**<<TITLE>>**

**<<Name of Local Government>>**