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Domestic Preparedness is
The organized process of planning, equipping and training of a state, local jurisdiction, or other agency in order to prevent, respond to, or recover from acts of terrorism.

(Adapted from US Department of Homeland Security, Office for Domestic Preparedness)
ORGANIZATION of DOMESTIC PREPAREDNESS

- Oct 2001 - Dept of Homeland Security
- Dec 2001 - DHMH Office of Public Health Preparedness and Response
ORGANIZATION of DOMESTIC PREPAREDNESS

- Dec 2004 - National Response Plan
- 2006 – National Incident Management System (NIMS) required by Department of Homeland Security
WHY DEVELOP PREPAREDNESS EVALUATION TOOLS?

- Many studies describe preparedness tools
- Prior studies don’t focus on
  - Public Health Preparedness Measures; *and*
  - Elements outlined as important to CDC, DHS, IOM, FEMA; *and*
  - Statewide preparedness by measuring individual counties; *and*
  - An “all hazards” approach rather than bioterrorism only
METHODS

• Development of tools to assess preparedness

• Two tools developed
  - Public Health Preparedness Plan Evaluation Tool
  - Local Health Department Preparedness Site Survey Tool

• Based on input, process, output methodology of IOM
METHODS

• Tools based on CDC, DHS Office of Domestic Preparedness, FEMA and Institute of Medicine’s MMRS guidelines

• Use an “all hazards” approach as Maryland progresses to this new methodology
PUBLIC HEALTH PREPAREDNESS
PLAN EVALUATION TOOL

• Consists of 52 elements (inputs/processes)
• Composed of Essential Incident Command System functions
• Evaluates inter-agency planning
• Based on FEMA, IOM, and CDC recommended elements for preparedness
PUBLIC HEALTH PREPAREDNESS
PLAN EVALUATION TOOL

- Will be pre-tested against Office of Domestic Preparedness “model” plans
- Pilot Study will include regional plans
- Five member panel will evaluate each plan
- Inter-evaluator variability to be assessed
PLAN EVALUATION TOOL
ELEMENTS

- Command
- Operations
- Planning Process
- Logistics
- Manpower/Personnel
- Finance
C3) Does the plan specify a public health representative to be present in a joint intelligence center if one is established in a large-scale incident, or area incident?
1) Acknowledges need for this function

2) Specifies specific personnel or job functions to be assigned to this position if needed

3) Has some plans with other agencies involved in an incident to have an official position in the joint intelligence center

4) Has an organized set of parameters under which the JIC will likely be activated with roles and responsibilities clearly defined
C5) Does the plan include a public health position in the planning division of the incident command system in order to develop real-time incident action plans (IAP)?
1) Identifies need for member in this division and identifies a specific assignment of personnel to this division on the command staff

2) Includes agreements with the public safety agencies to have a position in the planning division of the command staff

3) Includes roles and responsibilities for position on the command staff

4) All of the above plus it requires periodic testing of position within the incident command system through exercises or real world responses and includes pre-designed plans to be used as templates for ongoing planning during an incident
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANNING PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P2) Does the plan identify the agencies and officials who coordinated on the planning process?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Region I
Allegheny and Garrett Counties

Region II
Washington and Frederick Counties

Region III
Baltimore City, Anne Arundel, Baltimore, Carroll, Harford and Howard Counties

Region IV
Caroline, Cecil, Dorchester, Kent, Queen Anne’s, Somerset, Talbot, Wicomico and Worcester Counties

Region V
Calvert, Charles, Montgomery, Prince George’s and St. Mary’s Counties
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LOCAL HEALTH DEPARTMENT PREPAREDNESS SITE SURVEY TOOL

• Consists of 64 elements (processes/outputs)
• Based on DHS Chemical Biological Radiological Nuclear Explosive (CBRNE) “task capabilities by discipline” list
  – Certain MDHMH tasks added
  – Most planning elements assessed under plan evaluation tool
LOCAL HEALTH DEPARTMENT
PREPAREDNESS SITE SURVEY TOOL

- Designed to be delivered in one-day site visit
  - Not comprehensive, depends on other tools
- To be pre-tested at 3 sites prior to full-scale use
- Utilizes a 3 point scale scoring system for each element
- Composite preparedness score for each site
SITE SURVEY TOOL ELEMENTS

- Management Oversight/Coordination
- Staffing
- Personal Protective Equipment
- Quarantine/Isolation
- Decontamination
SITE SURVEY TOOL ELEMENTS

- Healthcare Management
- Strategic Stockpile Management
- Weapons of Mass Destruction Response Systems
- Workforce Protection
- Surveillance/Forensic Epidemiology
- Public Health Communication
### Management Oversight/Coordination

1) Is there evidence that the local public health agency has an integrated response system with other jurisdictional agencies, including elements of the incident command/unified command structures?
10) Have public health responders been trained on the roles and responsibilities of partner agencies (public safety, healthcare, government, etc.) by documentation?
4) What percentage of personnel are trained in the Incident Command System?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14) What percentage of staff have received the DHMH Public Health Response Team training in 2005?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments: (PLEASE INCLUDE THE ACTUAL NUMBER OF STAFF TRAINED BELOW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decontamination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29) Does the agency have personnel trained to monitor the decontamination efforts of exposed victims and workers to chemical, biologic, and radiological agents?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8) Has a quarantine/isolation procedure been exercised within the past year?
Maryland Local Health Departments
RESULTS

• Plan evaluation
  – train evaluators
  – pre-test planned
  – evaluate regional plans for qualitative assessment
  – perform inter-rater variation analysis
  – evaluate local plans
RESULTS

• Survey Site Visit Tool
  – train evaluators
  – pre-test tool at three local health departments
  – actual site visits planned
    • teams of 2 raters (inter-rater variation analysis)
  – tool will provide overall preparedness score
DISCUSSION

CDC, FEMA, and DHS

*All* require measurement of preparedness at state and local levels to receive grant monies
DISCUSSION

Maryland DHMH to use three-pronged approach to fulfill requirement

- PUBLIC HEALTH PREPAREDNESS PLAN EVALUATION TOOL
- LOCAL HEALTH DEPARTMENT PREPAREDNESS SITE SURVEY TOOL
- CDC’s LOCAL PUBLIC HEALTH PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE CAPACITY INVENTORY
DISCUSSION

PUBLIC HEALTH PREPAREDNESS PLAN EVALUATION TOOL

- Strengths include:
  - multi-agency approach
  - pre-testing methodology
  - Institute of Medicine widely accepted basis
  - Scaled scoring system
DISCUSSION

PUBLIC HEALTH PREPAREDNESS PLAN EVALUATION TOOL

- Weaknesses include:
  - current ability to evaluate only regional plan
  - evaluator training requirements (In ICS)
  - reliance on other tools
DISCUSSION

LOCAL HEALTH DEPARTMENT PREPAREDNESS SITE SURVEY TOOL

• **Strengths include:**
  - multi-agency approach
  - pre-testing methodology
  - ODP basis for capabilities
  - quantitative preparedness score
DISCUSSION

LOCAL HEALTH DEPARTMENT PREPAREDNESS SITE SURVEY TOOL

• **Weaknesses include:**
  - some qualitative nature of scoring
  - reliance on other tools
DISCUSSION

CDC’s *LOCAL PUBLIC HEALTH PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE CAPACITY INVENTORY*

- **Strengths:**
  - Widely utilized to evaluate personnel and preparedness activities at local health department
  - Potentially important feedback tool
CDC’s *LOCAL PUBLIC HEALTH PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE CAPACITY INVENTORY*

- Weaknesses:
  - Self-assessment only
  - No independent scoring system
CONCLUSIONS

- The National Response Plan, CDC, and DHS require public health preparedness
  - Public Health is traditionally “outside” other response agencies
    - It plays an increasingly important role
- Future funds will depend on measurable inputs, processes, and outputs
- MDHMH will stay at forefront through continuing research and planning activities
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