
Oil No! Functional Exercise

After-Action Report/Improvement Plan

DRAFT March 15th, 2019



The After-Action Report/Improvement Plan (AAR/IP) aligns exercise objectives with preparedness doctrine to include the National Preparedness Goal and related framework and guidance. Exercise information required for preparedness reporting and trend analysis is included; users are encouraged to add additional sections as needed to support their own organizational needs.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Exercise Overview	3
Exercise Objectives and Core Capabilities	4
Exercise Background	5
Analysis of Core Capabilities	5
Objective 1	6
Objective 2	7
Objective 3	8
Objective 4	8
Objective 6	9
Additional Comments	11
Appendix A: Exercise Schedule	12
Appendix B: Exercise Participants	13
Appendix C: Improvement Plan	14

EXERCISE OVERVIEW

Exercise Name	Oil No!
Exercise Dates	Thursday, September 13 th 2018
Exercise Location	Red Lion Hotel, 909 N Hayden Island Drive, Portland, OR 97217
Scope	Hazardous Material Spill
Mission Area(s)	Response
Core Capabilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operational Coordination • Operational Communication • Public Warning & Notification • Planning • Logistics & Supply Chain Management • Mass Care Services
Objectives	See page 2 <i>Exercise Objectives and Core Capabilities</i> for a list
Scenario	<p>During a heavy rain event, at approximately 3:00am local time, a nearby construction crane that was unattended and left inadequately secured tipped over from the high winds, it came into contact with Tank 3579, leading to catastrophic tank damage and total loss of primary containment. The tank was at near full capacity, holding approximately 3,183,180 gallons of Diesel product. Due to the ongoing rainfall, the storm drains were left open which allowed the discharged product to flow into the oil-water separator, which has overflowed into the storm water drainage system. At approximately 4:00am local time, a vessel operator at the Shaver dock notices a strong diesel odor and sees a large sheen near Outfall 19. At the same time, the on-duty Phillips 66 operator on duty notices the low-level alarms are activated for Tank 3579. It has been discovered that approximately 1,050,000 gallons of the Diesel from Tank 3579 has been discharged to the Willamette River</p>
Participating Organizations	See Appendix B: Exercise Participants
Point of Contact	<p><i>Robert Quinn</i> Training & Exercise Coordinator Multnomah County Office of Emergency Management (503) 307-4129 robert.quinn@multco.us</p>

EXERCISE OBJECTIVES AND CORE CAPABILITIES

The following exercise objectives in *Table 1* describe the expected exercise outcomes. Objectives are linked to core capabilities, which are distinct critical elements necessary to achieve specific mission area(s). The objectives and aligned core capabilities are guided by organization priorities and previous exercise lessons learned.

Note: Bolded Core Capabilities are identified in the Multnomah County Emergency Management Training & Exercise Plan.

Note: Items crossed out were not addressed during the time allotted for this exercise.

<i>Exercise Objectives</i>	<i>Core Capability</i>	<i>Rating</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Emergency Operations Center (EOC) will develop an initial Incident Command System (ICS) 201, 203, and 205 Form to include an organizational structure 	Operational Coordination	<i>S – Performed with Some Challenges</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete three (3) resource requests through the entire logistical cycle 	<i>Logistics & Supply Chain Management, Operational Coordination</i>	<i>M – Performed with Major Challenges</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Emergency Operations Center (EOC) Planning Section will complete a Situation Report 	<i>Planning</i>	---
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify the type and method of communication with individuals where English is their second language and those who cannot read. 	Public Information & Warning, Operational Communications	<i>S – Performed with Some Challenges</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Determine how all water response resources are going to communicate to share information and coordinate response operations. 	Operational Coordination	—
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify how evacuated individuals will be transported to and from shelter operations. 	<i>Mass Care services</i>	<i>S – Performed with Some Challenges</i>

Table 1. Exercise Objectives and Associated Core Capabilities

EXERCISE BACKGROUND

This exercise was developed parallel to a Full-Scale Exercise of the Phillips 66 Global Incident Management Assistance Team (IMAT), the American Multinational energy company. Phillips 66 requested local emergency response personnel participate to address the local response to a hazardous spill in the Willamette and Columbia Rivers. The original intent was to have personnel from the City of Portland and Multnomah County participate in their Emergency Operations/Coordination Center (EOC/ECC) roles receiving resource requests from the Phillips 66 IMAT.

The Multnomah County decided to expand their participation by developing our own Functional Exercise using the same scenario as the Phillips 66 IMAT, but with the intent to address more specific local needs to the evacuation and sheltering of affected individuals. *Note: This exercise was initially identified as a Tabletop/Drill, however after further consideration it was deemed a Functional Exercise.*

The Multnomah County Office of Emergency Management (MCEM) in collaboration with its local partners identified specific response gaps that were adjusted to become exercise objectives (*objectives can be found on page 4*). This exercise used emergency management professionals familiar with the local capabilities to evaluate each identified objective. This information was collected through Exercise Evaluation Guides (EEGs) and submitted to the MCEM for inclusion in this After-Action Report.

ANALYSIS OF CORE CAPABILITIES

Aligning exercise objectives and core capabilities provides a consistent taxonomy for evaluation that transcends individual exercises to support preparedness reporting and trend analysis. This section pertains to the exercise objectives, aligned core capabilities, and performance ratings for each core capability as observed during the exercise and determined by the evaluation team. The following sections provide an overview of the performance related to each exercise objective and associated core capability, highlighting strengths and areas for improvement.

The National Preparedness Goal of September 2015 has steered the focus of homeland security toward a capabilities-based planning approach using 32 identified Core Capabilities. Capabilities-based planning focuses on planning under uncertainty because the next disaster can never be forecast with complete accuracy. Therefore, capabilities-based planning takes an all-hazards approach to planning and preparation that builds capabilities, which can be applied to a wide variety of incidents. States and urban areas use capabilities-based planning to identify a baseline assessment of their homeland security efforts by comparing their current capabilities against the Core Capabilities. This approach identifies gaps in current capabilities.

The Core Capabilities are essential for the execution of each of the five mission areas: Prevention, Protection, Mitigation, Response, and Recovery. These capabilities provide the foundation for development of the exercise design objectives and scenario. This exercise focuses on core capabilities associated with the Response mission area:

- *Response Mission Area:* “the capabilities necessary to save lives, protect property and the environment, and meet basic human needs after an incident has occurred.”

OBJECTIVE 1

The Emergency Operations Center (EOC) will develop an initial Incident Command System (ICS) 201, 203, and 205 Form to include an organizational structure

Core Capability: Operational Coordination

Strength

- *Strength 1:* The Planning Section developed a DRAFT Incident Briefing Form (ICS 201). This form was made available to all participants by the end of the exercise.
- *Strength 2:* The appropriate players were at the table to determine an organizational chart that assisted with the development of realistic incident and tactical objectives.
- *Strength 3:* A neutral location was utilized as a mobile county Emergency Operations Center (EOC).

Area(s) for Improvement

- *Are for Improvement 1:* Understanding command/leadership during a hazardous materials incident was difficult.
 - Analysis: Identifying the organizational structure during a hazardous materials incident was difficult. Existence of organizational plans, and if there are plans, understanding of the included content is unclear to county-wide partners from a public and private perspective. There is little understanding from the private sector perspective about the role local government will play in command and control of these incident versus their response personnel/teams. Identification or legal language that identifies this ownership/responsibility would be helpful.

It should be noted, the County Emergency Operations Center (EOC) did not have an Emergency Support Function (ESF) #10: Hazardous Materials representative during this exercise. A representative in this seat is thought to be responsible for communicating with their peers to determine command/leadership during hazardous materials response.
- *Are for Improvement 2:* The Incident objectives/priorities were not communicated to the Emergency Operations Center (EOC) staff.
 - Analysis: Specific directions from Emergency Operations Center (EOC) leadership was difficult to obtain due to leadership workload. The incident objectives (*different than the exercise objectives*) were not provided to all staff

At the start of play is when the EOC Manager should have stood up and told everyone what the incident objectives were and there should have been a call for a Command and General Staff meeting right away to determine/confirm strategies and tactics. There was essentially, no EOC Manager. For the Planning Section, the OSC and the EOC Manager are both key players that need to provide information and direction, and that was lacking. Thus resulting in an incomplete org chart and no 203 could be produced.

OBJECTIVE 2

Complete three (3) resource requests through the entire logistical cycle

Core Capability: Logistics & Supply Chain Management, Operational Coordination

Strengths

Exercise evaluators observed the following strengths:

- *Strength 1:* The Multnomah County Resource Request Form was used successfully to address single resource requests.
- *Strength 2:* Having staff who were knowledgeable in available county assets was very beneficial in identifying/locating resources.
- *Strength 3:* The Logistics Section staff worked with Emergency Support Function (ESF) point of contacts to maintain awareness of ongoing requests and clarify information.

Area(s) for Improvement

The following areas require improvement to reach full capability level:

- *Area for Improvement 1:* Resource requests were not addressed from a “Mission” perspective, leading to inefficiencies in requesting resources.
 - Analysis: Incoming resources from the same “task” or “mission” was addressed separately.
- *Area for Improvement 2:* The Logistics & Finance Section had a lack of knowledge/awareness for resources external to the Multnomah County Government.
 - Analysis: The Logistics and Finance Section were able to address resource requests when Multnomah County resources were available, however the staff were not familiar with external resources available for use. Without the knowledge or awareness of available resources, the process to fulfill resource requests was slowed.

This gap came from a general lack of understanding for the Emergency Support Functions (ESFs) involved with response operations.

Issues were identified with: understanding the storage of mutual aid agreements/contracts the county has, where Logistics Section staff are directed to look if the agreements are expended, and being able to know who ESF partners are that may be able to help.
- *Area for Improvement 3:* The County Emergency Operations Center (EOC) currently lacks a process for prioritizing of resource requests.
 - Analysis: The prioritization of resource requests relied on the three (3) National Incident Management System (NIMS) priorities: Life Safety, Incident Stabilization, Property/Environmental Preservation. This prioritization process worked well to separate the incoming resource requests, however a problem came up with the timeframe of requests.

Some requests were prioritized lower than others, and were addressed after the requested fulfillment time. There is a lack of knowledge around whether a prioritization matrix exists or who has the responsibility to complete, and approve prioritization decisions,

- *Area for Improvement 4:* It was unclear to staff how to access the status of resource requests.
 - Analysis: Operations Section staff with active resource requests did not have the status readily available to them without direct contact with the Logistics Section. This affected the ability for the Operations Section to address incoming questions, or subsequent conversation, as they were unsure about the resource request status.

OBJECTIVE 3

The Emergency Operations Center (EOC) Planning Section will complete a Situation Report

Core Capability: Planning

Strengths

- *Strength 1:* Situation Unit staff with no pre-exercise position experience and with minimal direction, sought out information from key players and developed a Situation Report.

OBJECTIVE 4

General communications observations & identify the type and method of communication with individuals where English is their second language and those who cannot read.

Core Capability: Public Information & Warning, Operational Communications

Strengths

Exercise evaluators observed the following strengths:

- *Strength 1:* The Communications Staff & Public Information Officer's utilized multiple avenues to address individuals who speak English as their second language. Conversations with local first responders were had to determine resident communications needs. Census data was utilized to identify which languages were likely impacted.
- *Strength 2:* Primary and back-up interpreters were identified for use if needed.
- *Strength 3:* Dialogue was immediately initiated between the Phillips 66 Joint Information Center (JIC) and the County Public Information Officers (PIOs) to build a single message and situational awareness.
- *Strength 4:* The partnership between the Phillips 66 Joint Information Center (JIC) and the County Public Information Officers (PIOs) allowed for response actions to be easily shared between organizations. This helped improve overall situational awareness of ongoing response actions by both entities.

Area(s) for Improvement

The following areas require improvement to reach full capability level:

- *Area for Improvement 1:* Mass communication to the public becomes increasingly complex during expanding incidents.
 - Analysis: Mass communication to the public is complicated during expanding incidents as they could require multiple messaging efforts. During this exercise the incident messaging started in the Linton area where an initial CENS was disseminated (*in exercise play*). The hazardous materials plume expanded across the Willamette River towards the St. Johns neighborhood requiring additional public messaging to a new population.

As the incident continued to grow, the plume expanded into Southwest Washington State, which would require additional messaging and increase the complexity of maintaining a single incident public message.

Understanding how the county will address incident messaging during potentially expanding incidents should be addressed.
- *Area for Improvement 2:* Limited options for contacting translation service organization after their normal working hours.
 - Analysis: Multnomah County Communications staff have built personal connections with staff at the translation services that have improved after-hours translation services in past incidents. Without these connections, there are currently no process for contacting the translation services after-hours.
- *Area for Improvement 3:* Messaging intended for *Facebook* is currently to be housed on the County English language-based sites, which would limit individuals who do not speak English as their primary language.
 - Analysis: It was determined that videos were to be developed in the affected languages to disseminate the emergency messaging, however these videos were meant for the English language-based County Emergency Management Facebook site. With this current process, there is the hope that a dual language speaker would see the message and share it with their community partners.

OBJECTIVE 6

Identify how evacuated individuals will be transported to and from shelter operations

Core Capability: Mass Care Services

Strengths

Exercise evaluators observed the following strengths:

- *Strength 1:* Operationalizing the Multnomah County Mass Shelter Plan was easily accomplished by the participants. Concepts within the plan were completed, such as: identifying a location, notifying and working with identified partners, and “beginning” shelter operations.

- *Strength 2:* The utilization of *Lift Paratransit Service* by the County during response operations was clarified. There is language within their contract allowing them to continue operations during response operations with their contract status. This resource must be requested directly from the Emergency Operations Center (EOC) to *Lift Paratransit Service*.

Area(s) for Improvement

The following areas require improvement to reach full capability level:

- *Area for Improvement 1:* Moving information from the Geographic Information System (GIS) database to the County Human Services *DATAMART* was not able to be accomplished.
 - Analysis: During the exercise the County Human Services would have had to take the information from County GIS and manually input relevant content into the *DATAMART* system. During a real-world emergency, real-time information is important for shelter staff to have for internal use and public awareness.

Evacuation boundaries had to be build three separate times (Everbridge, GIS, *DATAMART*), it is unclear how to reduce the workload and streamline mapping.
- *Area for Improvement 2:* Sauvie Island medically vulnerable populations are not currently in the *DATAMART* system.
 - Analysis: During the exercise, the Sauvie Island Fire Department discussed their list of medically vulnerable populations on the island (*Strength*). These populations were not known to the County Human Services personnel as they were not included in the *DATAMART*¹ system.
- *Area for Improvement 3:* One Disaster Resource Center (DRC) may not appropriately address everyone who is affected by an emergency/disaster incident.
 - Analysis: Multiple Disaster Resource Centers (DRC)/shelter locations may be necessary to address the citizen response to an incident. These DRCs may need to be outside of the Counties jurisdiction (*in this exercise it was identified that a DRC would be helpful in Columbia County jurisdiction*).
- *Area for Improvement 4:* ESF 1 & ESF 6 lacked information regarding the other due to limited information flow.
 - Analysis: Transportation and shelter operations will require effective coordination and communication capabilities during evacuation response efforts. Shelter management staff will need transportation information regarding the available resources, in use, and the type and number of evacuated persons being transported to shelters. Transportation staff will need to know what information to provide drivers and managers and general shelter information.

It was unclear for some participants what this process for sharing and providing updated information is.

¹ DATAMART is a system used by Multnomah County to _____

- *Area for Improvement 5:* The process for evacuation operations is still unclear.
 - Analysis: The roles and responsibilities during evacuation operations are still unclear. Lack of a clear organizational structure and action responsibilities has created hesitation and confusion for response organizations during real-world incidents and the *Oil No!* Exercise.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

- There is a need for a more clarified definition of shelter-in-place
- A large Incident Command System (ICS) organization chart, visible to all, would have been helpful.

APPENDIX A: EXERCISE SCHEDULE

<i>Time</i>	<i>Exercise Component</i>
0700 – 0800	Check-In & Breakfast
0800 – 0815	Welcome & Introduction, Pre-Exercise Briefing
0815 – 0830	Initial Incident Update
0830 – 0845	County Exercise Introduction
0845 – 0945	Module 1: Incident Onset
0945 – 1000	Break
1000 – 1100	Module 2: Incident +1 Hour
1100 – 1115	Break
1115 – 1150	Module 3: Incident +4 Hours
1150 – 1200	Hot Wash

Table 2. Exercise Schedule

APPENDIX B: EXERCISE PARTICIPANTS

County
Multnomah County Office of Emergency Management (MCEM)
Multnomah County Sheriff’s Office (MCSO)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • River Patrol
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land Patrol
Multnomah County Department of Human Services (DCHS)
Multnomah County Health Department (MCHD)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Behavioral Health
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public Health & Preparedness
Multnomah County Office of Communications
Multnomah County Department of Community Services (DCS)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Animal Services
County Emergency Operations Center (EOC)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operations Section
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Logistics Section
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finance/Administrative Section
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Section
City/Town
Portland Bureau of Emergency Management (PBEM)
Portland Bureau of Transportation (PBOT)
Regional Organization
TriMet
Private/Non-Profit Organizations
Red Cross
External Partners
Columbia County Office of Emergency Management

Table 3. Exercise Participant

APPENDIX C: IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Objective	Issue/Area for Improvement	Potential Corrective action	Capability Element	Responsible Organization
The Emergency Operations Center (EOC) will develop an initial Incident Command System (ICS) 201, 203, and 205 Form to include an organizational structure	Identifying the organizational structure during a hazardous materials incident was difficult.		Organization	MCEM
	Incident objectives/priorities were not communicated to the Emergency Operations Center (EOC) staff.			MCEM
2. Complete three (3) resource requests through the entire logistical cycle	Resource requests were not addressed from a "Mission" perspective, leading to inefficiencies in requesting resources.		Planning	MCEM, Logistics Section
	The Logistics & Finance Section had a lack of knowledge/awareness for resources external to the Multnomah County Government.		Planning/Training	MCEM, Logistics Section
	The County Emergency Operations Center (EOC) currently lacks a process for prioritizing of resource requests.		Planning	MCEM, Logistics Section
	It was unclear to staff how to access the status of resource requests.		Planning	MCEM, Logistics Section

Objective	Issue/Area for Improvement	Potential Corrective action	Capability Element	Responsible Organization
4. General communications observations & identify the type and method of communication with individuals where English is their second language and those	Mass communication to the public becomes increasingly complex during expanding incidents.		Planning	Communications
	There are limited options for contacting the translation services organization after their normal working hours.		Planning	Communications
	Messaging intended for Facebook is currently to be housed on the County English language-based sites, which would limit individuals who do not speak English as their primary language.		Planning	MCEM, Communications
6. Identify how evacuated individuals will be transported to and from shelter operations.	Moving information from the Geographic Information System (GIS) database to the County Human Services DATAMART was not able to be accomplished.		Planning	DCHS, DCA GIS
	Sauvie Island medically vulnerable populations are not currently in the DATAMART system.		Planning	DCHS, Suavie Island Fire
	One Disaster Resource Center (DRC) may not appropriately address everyone who is affected by an emergency/disaster incident.		Planning	DCHS, MCEM
	ESF 1 & ESF 6 lacked information regarding the other due to limited information flow			
	The process and/or guidance for evacuation operations is still unclear	<i>Develop plans/processes to set up evacuation group operations with clearly defined roles & responsibilities. Have plans for unique transportation options?</i>		



Objective	Issue/Area for Improvement	Potential Corrective action	Capability Element	Responsible Organization
Additional Comments	A large Incident Command System (ICS) organization chart, visible to all, would have been helpful.		Equipment	MCEM
	There is a need for a more clarified definition of shelter-in-place		Planning	MCEM, MCSO