Access and Functional Needs (AFN) Strategic Planning Initiative
October 29, 2013 - 9am to 1pm

Attendees: Neal Atkinson (City of San Jose OES), Lynn Brown (City of Mountain View), Tom Busk (American Red cross Silicon Valley), Richard Devylder (Cal OES OAFN), Monica Dibble (City of San Jose OES) Katie Heatley (OUTREACH Paratransit), Dana McQuary (County SSA) Douc Micetich (Silicon Valley ILC), Rev. Dr. John Avery Palmer (SCCO Advisory Commission on Disabilities) Emma Reed (graduate intern), Sandy Sherman (SARC), Sean Simonson (City of Milpitas), Jim Yoke (County Fire Department), Diana Miller (SSA), Cindy Stewart (County OES) Marsha Hovey, Anna Swardenski (Consultant), Dennis Kempel (CADRE)

Welcome - Open Introductions and ground rules

Project Overview and Community Landscape –
   Scope of Definition
   Nexus of Communication – how to mitigate
   Where to start – CAL EMA, CMIST

Power point presented by Anna Swardenski
   a. History of planning in Santa Clara County and why are we here
   b. Demographics of Santa Clara County and Functional Needs populations
   c. Legal responsibilities to meet functional needs
   d. Proposed project approach - objectives, outcomes, and deliverables

Open Discussion – Community Landscape - Political and Technical barriers - Why aren’t we there? What are the strategies that will overcome the barriers? There are number of plans – looking at the process we will need during an event – it is customer service for the support needed and the process.

Have not had the ear of the political to drive this – lack of understanding at local government level – Op Area Council will help change that culture

Legal Issues Relative to Functional Needs - Richard Devylder joins discussion via SKYPE – discussion of legal documents in participant package where the department of justice is coming from in regard to planning tools
   o Legal foundation for FNS – Stafford Act
   o Accessibility issues in shelters – mitigate accessibility issues
   o Equal Opportunity – services accessible – inclusion - communication – evacuation – para-transit
   o Functional Needs Individuals need to be part of the planning process
   o Equal Access
   o ADA – surcharges
- When are these laws in effect?
- General population shelters - locations
- Not planning is worse than planning - gap analysis

**Open discussion and questions to Richard**
- Political power to push to action – issues of his office – federal state and local government – lawsuits
- Inclusion – AFN individuals need included in planning objectives – does this working group include all the right representatives? Changes in the way government is structured and ways to get all back to the table. Possible sub committees to be developed

**Richard portion of power point presentation** – starting at slide 29 – Office for Access and Functional Needs
- Reasons for naming office - away from diagnosis for planning – functional needs
- Purpose of the office
- Priorities – community network created and its function
- Disaster Response Interpreter Program – communication in shelters and media events
- SB1451 – State Committees by law must have 3 representatives with disabilities
- FEMA – AFN course and standards – trainers have to meet certain qualifications
- Shelter Planning
- Operational Area
- Website and videos – interpreter issues in media camera shots
- Evacuations tool kit on website

**Questions**
- Self-determination – people with disabilities do not want to be identified – how provide help to those? Messaging is important – “Plan as if no one is coming to rescue you.” Planning for yourself is planning with your neighbors. Co-workers, Neighbors and Friends Don’t Leave Anyone Behind – individual needs to build a support team around themselves.

**BREAK** - Agenda - revision before break - small group leaders lead full group discussion
- Definition
- Scope - Road Map
- Partner Resources

**Scope of Definition** – Discussion led by Sean Simonson (City of Milpitas)

**Considerations** –
- Defining it generally to a population of people who do not have a strong understanding of what Access and Functional Needs are.
- Scope narrow enough to have an effect but broad enough incorporate all with AFN
- Inclusion of invisible Disabilities – knowing how to recognize individuals with these needs to assist them – what is it we can do to assist you? Include those who are unable to identify their need to you.
o Caregivers knowledge of individuals included in definition - Nexus of Communication – how get message to caregiver – how to mitigate that when we are out in the community

Where to start in definition–
- Referring documents San Jose and State Plan, CAL EMA, CMIST, State Plan including pre-disaster homeless, Small Group B prep documents
- Add pre-disaster homeless – “needs”
- CMIST language current – standard has moved around in verbiage
- M- Maintaining Independence, S –Self Determination Richard will return to language and provide back, where is medical fall, FEMA working on definition of AFN
Leaning toward accepting Richmond/FEMA/San Jose merger with definition keeping with CMIST categories

Introduction paragraph – review of plans – standardization is a goal
- Consider base definition from state that should be available by end of calendar year.
- Proactive - Adopt for current to have in place to ultimately swap out with state to be unilateral with them.
- National Response framework as base with consideration of meaning of before disaster ‘needs’
- Differentiate between what is disability driven and what is needs driven – Parameters defining what the North, South East and West to know what is done and when
- “Unique requirements to prepare respond and recover in a disaster” anyone could have a unique requirement
- Two levels - immediate needs to sustain life and how to get to normal?
- ADA definition guiding bullets included
- People with disabilities are a protected class

Conclusion - blend language from Santa Cruz ADA, National Framework and City of San Jose with previously homeless category added who do fall under the protected class

Do we add registered sex offenders and parolees out in the community? Topic did come up in past community planning forums. How will we address their needs and supervision aspects? Cannot treat them differently in a shelter – becomes a law enforcement issue – if they are out in public can’t segregate them – becomes security issue for shelter – not included in definition – even if they have a disability it falls within the parameters of law enforcement criteria how they are making a decision - Keep as footnote to planning to acknowledge issue

Template recap – National Response Framework Definition and San Jose /ADA from Santa Cruz Annex omit “additional needs” - keep last statement under the first paragraph from Santa Clara County
Project Scope/Resources – discussed simultaneously with Group A /Group C handouts
  o Vision statement – add SAVES LIVES
  o Use of the word – “Road Map”
  o Shelters - “Reasonably Accessible” strike ‘fully’ accessible - shelters will be accessible
  o Maintenance of plan – “Sustainable Road Map” – has to stay current - Is vision the idea of the task force or beyond that? – Objective is to hand off to sustainable group – keep word in vision
  o Transparent/Accountability-Public right to know if you are ready! – May not have those shelters after a quake – more will rely on our processes and policies in shelters - need to be much more honest about readiness- ability to maintain this increases success to identify shelters on the fly - “There are things that people want to hear and there are things that people need to hear”
  o Contingency planning of assets and resources
  o Level needs to be – REALITY of will be accessible –accommodating – being process not materials -adjustments to make it accessible – it’s the process not the materials
  o Compliance – are programs and services accessible?
  o Shelter Services will be accessible

Objectives Outcomes and Deliverables – discussion to add/change/remove
  o Add to second – “develop strategies to perpetuate knowledge and capabilities“ – insure readiness
  o Develop strategies to ensure readiness
  o Third bullet – assigning tasks - also “provide training for tasks” - third bullet actually a sub bullet then training will be its own bullet
  o Create schedule with deadlines?
  o Components of Road Map first – then later ask how and when?
  o Work toward end of December then vision of phases with timeline to that – moving through communities landscape with a process by which needs to be embraced and validated attaching names/positions to responsibilities.

First bullet as written
  o ID barriers address - what are they – who – how do they get attacked?
  o Expectations? Articulate barriers –for preparedness, response and recovery-add as bullet point
  o Ethnicity question –cultural stigma? Addressed in communication planning?
    Transgender usage? – The individual decides- self-determination- parking lot issue

Resources Part – who should be at the table to find resources they have
  o Supply chain management process- City, Counties, NGO’s, State
  o WALMART International Emergency Manager to local resources – Red Cross is connected –not OES- needs to be a common picture private retail - Op Council has public/private

Discussion - Should group now touch on other outcomes and deliverables and focus on resources in November meeting – get big picture of components- what may still be missing?
Discussion - what are we doing? How does this group feed into work already done? All the work done public and private is where the OP area council will come in to play and bring it together. What is it that this group needs to do that other groups have not already done? – Scope issue

- Most of dialogue to date has focused on Sheltering
- Responsibility – comes from the individual
- Response - All processes need to be accessible
- Global – through the whole disaster cycle – it’s not sheltering it’s housing
- Transportation – gas

Change Scope/Vision –

- Lives will be saved and our disaster services will be accessible – not just shelter services
- Phases – first sheltering then life aspects, recovery then preparedness
- Criteria of players at table- scope out evacuation criteria
- Criteria – evaluation planning
- Connect the parts that have already done into system of awareness
- Are all of our partners adequately prepared that are at the table– are they ready and accountable? - “May be different people for different planning”

Broad or Focused Project – Objective –consider narrowing – limits discussed

- Recommendations – dovetails to the next steps – housing recovery
- Identify Next Steps
- Includes “All Hazards”
- Broad scope with bite size pieces

Second bullet point is that our vision is that disaster services are accessible

Phase One Objectives and deliverables focus on Sheltering – then look forward at other pieces

- Reality that this all works right now keeping it as shelter services
- Process steps lead to work and communication
- Keep it as Shelter Services
- Brief all hazards statement – what at risk is common – response is always the same
- Build from bottom up – the size of the population can be overwhelming logistics cab be huge
- Start small
- Logistics and data sharing at different levels across jurisdictions
- Communication and readiness is essential

All agree to send ideas in as they come

Final comments – Input from the day give you back draft language create essentially table of contents of what components the road map should entail

November –how are we going to get there and who are the resources – prioritization
Brainstorming activity question important for group to review and send back.

Closing remarks and thank you’s