Texas Hurricane Evacuation Study Meeting
Galveston Study Area (GSA)
August 28, 2003
Kemah, TX

Agenda:

1. **Welcome/Introduction**
2. **Study Status:**
    a. Contracts have been finalized with PBS&J and USACE Mobile District for updates to the GSA Hurricane products.
    b. Work has begun on updating the surge areas and draft PDF maps have been produced. John Eringman provided an overview of the work he has been doing to update the storm surge maps.
    c. We will be expanding the study to include a Transportation Analysis Model for the GSA for comparison with the existing Evacuation Times and Model.
    d. Draft Data CD Due Out Nov 2003
    e. Draft GIS CD Due Out Feb 2004
    (Dates are dependent on how quickly raw data is compiled and submitted to contractors.)
3. **Critical Facilities:**
    a. Existing critical facility data from the previous study was distributed to attendees. This information needs to be updated for the entire study area for incorporation into the Data and GIS CDs. Information supplied will be used to determine impacts of surge, winds and inland flooding on the facilities.
    b. Updating critical facility information requires following actions:
        i. Verify that facilities on existing list are still there. Delete any that no longer exist or are no longer considered "critical" facilities.
        ii. Check for (and eliminate) duplicate facilities and locations.
        iii. Incorporate facilities built since the early 90s or not included on the original list.
        iv. Include or verify (if data already exists) Latitude and Longitude and elevation data for each facility– Highest accuracy possible in decimal degrees.
        v. Determine if you would like to incorporate additional information about a facility. If so, guidelines will need to be developed for consistency. Recommendation: One additional column added after the last field for "Comments" that acts as a catchall for additional information. If there is

no need for additional information this column will not be added. Keep in mind that this information can be pulled up on the GIS CD, if there is any additional information you would like to have on facilities during a storm threat, this would be the ideal location.

c. I have received one request to alter the facility codes for more detailed facility identification. After discussing this with Mike Peacock we determined that we would like to keep the existing code system using either the Name field or the "Comments" field, if added, to provide more information about the facility type. However, if this is something many of you would like to see changed, we can we can discuss alternative codes.

d. Existing Codes: C = Communication, E = Electricity, F = Fire Station, G = Federal Government, H = Hospital, I = Industry, J=Prison Facility, L = Local Government, M = Military, N = Nursing Home, O=Emergency Operating Center, P = Law Enforcement Agency, R = Potential Post-Disaster Shelter, S = Sewage Treatment Facility, ST=State Government Facility, T = Transportation, W = Water Treatment Plant or Reservoir, WL=Wildlife Refuge, X = Hazardous Materials

4. A question has arisen about public access to sensitive information. This will be relevant to any information the Project Delivery Team (PDT) posts to a website for distribution and to information posted to a State or National Hurricane Evacuation Study website. I have contacted Chuck Gregg about how or if any other states have addressed this issue and if there was any existing guidance. The following is guidance received:

* Government agencies should be cautious about critical facility information available for public access that could compromise the security or vulnerability of that site.
* If we decide to make certain information (e.g., a database) accessible on a government web site, it should demand a user name and password, and in which the password is carefully controlled.
* General maps depicting a site on a map such as a storm surge map is probably not a problem because this is traditionally public accessed information and there is nothing that a potential terrorist could do about it, but if that map displayed information like a text box or government- only road, etc. then it should not be on a public accessible web site or released in a public document. Another example would be a site that could be vulnerable because of its proximity to something that could be damaged or vandalized such as pump stations, levees, etc. nearby and the map displays such information along with hurricane surge, etc.
* In summary, I think sites on a general hurricane risk map are not a problem but text or spreadsheets or databases should be kept at local government agency control and use.

5. We would like to submit updated critical facility data to PBS&J by the 2nd week of October. This will be putting some pressure on everyone to compile updates quickly. Ideally, each jurisdiction will submit their updates electronically to a single point of contact for each county, likely the TCAT representative. The Excel file of critical facilities will be sent to the POC who will coordinate the effort within their county.

6. **Transportation Analysis Model:** Overview of presentation by Don Lewis of PBS&J will follow in a separate attachment. Don has been working with FEMA and the Corps of Engineers for many years to produce transportation models and hurricane study products for other states. We are tentatively shooting for the end of October to have meetings with each county to review evacuation zone options. More information will follow.

7. **Risk Areas vs. Evacuation Zones:** The methodology used for the transportation analysis usually defines the areas to be evacuated by geographic boundaries (streets, railroad tracks, rivers, etc.). Most other hurricane-prone states seem to be using this approach and one benefit is that it allows local coordinators to communicate the areas to be evacuated without citizens having to have a map. This approach would mean an end to the risk area method we have been using for the past 7+ years. The initial reaction of the attendees seemed to be one of acceptance. If the majority of jurisdictions has second thoughts when we get to the point of actually drawing these zones, PBS&J has indicated they can work with the risk area approach.

8. **Developing a Project Delivery Team:** In order to incorporate the most current and complete data into the restudy effort and to come up with a product that meets local users' needs, we (the State, Corps of Engineers, and PBS&J) will need involvement and input from impacted jurisdictions. With that in mind, we will be putting together some working teams, setting up some future meetings, and developing a web site through the Galveston Corps District site for posting study-related information. Mike Peacock announced that he would work initially through the TCAT members for each of the three counties that make up the GSA Study Area to start the critical facility review and to identify members for several teams that will be needed to work individual issues. He encouraged attendees to let these individuals know if they would like to be involved in any of the teams.