

Model Emergency Action Plans-Will They Work in Schools and Industry

Author: Dennis K. Sullivan,CEM,CHMM
Key Words: emergency planning, Emergency Action Plan, EAP



Abstract

- The University of Louisville is a state institution of higher learning with three campuses in the Louisville metro area. It is the second largest university in Kentucky with approximately 21,000 students, 5,000 employees and 150 buildings. The University was founded in 1798, and in its two hundred year history has grown from a private seminary to a city university and finally to a state university.

Abstract

- During 1998, the University of Louisville Department of Environmental Health and Safety (DEHS) conducted a gap analysis of emergency planning and fire safety programs on the University campuses. The gap analysis provided information that included the need for emergency planning. One of the primary goals was to ensure that each building or facility had an effective, building-specific emergency action plan.

Abstract

- DEHS had a strategy ready to reach its goal of 150 building-specific plans. The first step was to develop a model Emergency Action Plan (EAP) that could be sculpted into a building-specific plan. This presentation will discuss the requirements that had to be met for developing the EAP and the benefits derived from the use of the model plan for developing specific emergency

Model Emergency Action Plans-Will They Work in Schools and Industry

Dennis K. Sullivan, CEM, CHMM
Department of Environmental
Health and Safety
University of Louisville



Purpose:

- Outline the emergency planning process
- The need for planning for schools, businesses and industry
- The planning effort at U of L
- Problems encountered
- Effectiveness of the process

**The Need for
Emergency Planning**

OSHA requires emergency planning for every business with more than five employees

Kentucky State Fire Codes require educational facilities to have emergency plans

AND...

It is the prudent action to take to preserve lives during and after a minor emergency or major disaster.

**Steps in Developing an
Emergency Action Plan**

- Conduct a risk analysis of your facility and the surrounding area
- Determine the potential emergencies that could affect your facility

Steps in Developing an Emergency Action Plan

- Determine what actions should be taken to protect employees/students in the event of each potential emergency
- Develop a document that covers each type of emergency and the appropriate actions

Steps in Developing an Emergency Action Plan

- Train the employees and/or students
- Test the plan
- Revise the plan as necessary
- Review and revise the plan annually

U of L's Experience

- Some buildings on campus prepared EAP's independently
- Public Safety was given responsibility for developing plans for every building, but was not given resources.
- No trained Emergency Manager on staff to review plans

U of L's Need for EAP's

- The University has 160 buildings
18 laboratory buildings
120 buildings housing multiple departments/units
- 7,000 employees
- 20,000 students
- 3,000 students living on campus

Environmental Health and Safety

- In January, 1999 DEHS was given responsibility for emergency planning at U of L
- DEHS was not given additional resources to accomplish mission
- DEHS first goal was to develop emergency plans for each bldg.

DEHS's Strategy

- Develop an EAP that could be used as a model for each building
- Conduct a peer review of the EAP
- Revise the EAP as necessary
- Gain acceptance of the EAP by the University's administration

Strategy - Continued

- Meet with Department Chairs and introduce them to the model EAP
- Allow the Department to write their plan
- DEHS review by a CEM
- Revise the plan as necessary
- Plan Approval

Writing the Emergency Action Plan

CONSIDERATIONS:

- Comprehensive
- Easy to understand
- As concise as possible
- Easy to train employees to use
- Easy for DEHS to review
- Easy to update

U of L EAP Review

- Reviewed by CEM's in local Emergency Management Agency
- Reviewed by State Fire Marshall
- Reviewed by University Fire Marshall

EAP Revisions

Comments received from the peer review were incorporated into the model plan

Administration Review

- The staff of the Vice President for Finance and Administration reviewed the plan
- VPFA revisions incorporated into the plan
- Plan submitted to the Provost for final approval

The "Final" Model

The model is used in 5 departments as a trial

Input from their experience in developing their individual EAP is used to revise the Model a final time

The Planning Process

- Pre-Planning Phase
- Planning Phase
- Review
- Approval
- Implementation

The Pre-Planning Phase

- Schedule a Meeting with Department Representative
- Meet in the building to be planned
- Explain to building staff the planning and implementation process

Planning Phase

- Building occupants use the model and develop a building specific plan
- Evacuation routes are determined by building staff and/or DEHS
- Department Director approves the plan and forwards to DEHS

Review Phase

- CEM at DEHS review the plan and prepares suggested changes
- The plan is sent back tot he Department for revisions
- Final plan is returned to DEHS for approval

Implementation

- Final approved signed plan is returned to the Department
- DEHS stores an electronic and hard copy
- Letter is sent tot the department directing implementation procedures

Implementation Letter

- Requires the plan to be distributed to each employee
- Conduct a class or meeting to train employees
- Records required to be kept by the Department

DEHS Responsibilities

- Conduct training if requested by the Department
- Notify Departments annually that a review is required
- Monitor Departments efforts to test the plan annually
- Provide building contact information to Public Safety

Problems Encountered

- Departmental apathy - low on Departmental priorities list
- Lack of experience using the 2 word processing programs the plan was provided

Problems Encountered

- Evacuation route planning
- Costs of writing and implementing plan
- Insufficient staff resources in DEHS

Effectiveness

From March, 99 until December, 05 - ~100 buildings have completed their EAP's

~4 buildings per month

Effectiveness

- Improved safety awareness in planned buildings
- Department Directors and Deans became more aware of their responsibilities

Effectiveness

- Caused some Departments to begin business continuity planning
- Caused some non-science buildings to designate safety liaison

Effectiveness

- Stimulated efforts to redesign procedures for handling mobility impaired students and staff
- Stimulated Project Impact efforts resulting in matching grant for weather radios

Benefits

Efforts are moving the University towards complete compliance with OSHA and State Fire Marshal Regulations

Benefits

- DEHS was allowed to hire a part time employee to assist in emergency planning
- Expanded the roll of DEHS in meeting other regulations requiring emergency and/or contingency planning

Benefits

- Identified Departments that may be lax in other safety areas by their apathy in emergency planning
- Made DEHS more visible to non-science departments

Drawbacks

Administration expectations were raised in regards to DEHS meeting all of its emergency management goals without permanent additional resources

Drawbacks

Department's initial expectations were that DEHS should do their planning - impeding cooperation in some cases

Drawbacks

Some Departments simply
"pencil-whipped" their EAP
without taking ownership
