

## Latrobe City Response to LGV Councils and Emergencies Directions Paper

### Comments

To be read in conjunction with the LGV directions paper.

#### **Planning**

1 – Councils often have difficulty in enlisting agency support to undertake risk assessments and planning, compliance with relevant legislation and policy is very open ended and needs clarifying. So in relation to this part it needs to identify the legislated requirements.

2 – This section is incorrect as the Emergency Management Act 1986 says:

- (1) A municipal council must prepare and maintain a municipal emergency plan. There is no mention of sub plans in this section of legislation, councils are not response agencies and do not possess the appropriate level of expertise to be subject matter experts on relevant risks as identified in the CERA process, sub plans need to be the responsibility of the lead agency as identified in part 7 of the EMMV.

3 – Agree

4 – Agree

5 – Replace lead with support as this is a multi-agency responsibility. Councils are not flood managers or fire managers

6 – Replace lead with support as this was a process imposed on councils by DHHS.

7 – Councils currently profile our communities for a number of reasons but we are yet to be involved recording what makes people vulnerable in emergencies, and for smaller councils this would be a huge impost on council's capacity and capability.

8 – Most council's will have business continuity plans which cover all of council's operations not just emergency management.

9 – Place (Where practicable) at the start of this point.

10 – Agree

11 – Agree, the Latrobe Planning Scheme MSS also recognises the need for risk management overlays and these overlays are included in the scheme. I would also make the comment that these risk management overlays should be updated regularly where reliable information is provided by the agency/ authority that is identifying the risk.

#### **During**

12 – Replace with:

Work with community and agencies to develop local recovery plans after emergencies.

13 – Agree

### **Community information and warning**

#### **Before**

14 – Agree

15 – Remove this point as it is duplication from (14)

16 – Remove this point as it is duplication from (14)

17 – Remove this point as it is duplication from (14)

18 – Agree

19 – Agree

#### **During**

20 – Agree

21 – Agree but this needs identify that this can only be done with the Incident controllers permission!

22 – Agree

#### **After**

23 – Agree

24 – Agree

25 – Agree

26 – Agree

27 – Agree

28 – Remove this point as it is duplication from (23)

29 – If evaluators and researchers are paid to undertake this work why would councils take staff away from their primary roles to support this? This would be an added burden for a lot of councils.

### **Operational management**

#### **Before**

30 – Agree

31 – Agree but this is not a legislated role.

32 – Agree

33 – Agree

34 – Agree

35 – Agree

36 – Agree

37 – I do not understand the intent of this point what activities is this referring too?

38 – This point belongs in the after an emergency impact area as recovery come after an event!

#### **After**

39 – Agree

40 – This point needs to be undertaken through the state arrangement process as the impact of a regional event can become confused and disjointed where resource allocation is undertaken outside of the ICC/IMT processes.

41 – Agree

42 – Response agencies have legislated powers to access affected areas why would they need council support in this during operational related issues.

43 – Agree

44 – Agree where council have the capability and capacity to do so as funding from government may be required.

45 – Agree

46 – Agree

47 – Duplication can be included in 48.

48 – Agree where council has the capacity to do so

49 – Agree where council has the capacity to do so

50 – Agree where council has the capacity to do so

51 – Agree where council has the capacity to do so.

52 – Agree

53 – Agree

54 – Agree

55 – Include: Where funded coordinate outreach. At the start of this section

56 – Include: Provide referrals for local services. At the start of this section

57 – Agree

58 – Agree where appropriate and in a timely manner.

59 – Agree

60 – Agree

61 – Agree

62 – Agree

63 – Agree

64 – Agree

### **Intelligence and information sharing**

#### **Before**

65/69 – Assumes that all councils have the same level of capacity to support these points.

#### **During**

70/71 – does not identify privacy issues associated with this information sharing or how councils are to capture large quantities of information.

#### **After**

72/ 73 – How are these to be achieved when rate capping will require the majority of council staff to perform their substantive roles?

### **Public order and community safety**

#### **Before, During & After**

74/75 – Include: where councils have the legislated authority to do so.

### **Building community resilience**

## Before

76/82 – this whole section requires specific, targeted roles to facilitate, implement and manage the desired outcomes as identified to build community resilience and again it does not identify the levels of council capacity and capability required to perform these tasks.

## During

83 – Include; under approval of the Incident controller support.

## After

84 – Include: Where appropriate conduct

85– Include: Where appropriate engage

## Fire Management and Suppression

Councils are not fire management or suppression agencies, so we do not provide firefighting capabilities.

## Before & after

86 – Councils no longer develop and maintain Municipal Fire Prevention Plans as this has transitioned to Municipal Fire Management Planning.

The requirements of the CFA Act 1958 are now deemed to be met as part of part 6A of the EMMV in accordance with S.21(5) of the emergency management Act 1986.

## Logistics and supply chain management

A liberal amount of interpretation has been included in the description of this section and it needs to be prefixed by “where appropriate and available”

## Before

87 – MAV has already take carriage of this initiative.

88 – Include: Where there is an identified need maintain

## During

89 – Agree

90 – Remove **best practice** as this is not something easily identified and assumes that all councils work on a level playing field.

## Impact assessment

As councils are not response agencies it is not safe to expect untrained council staff to access impacted locations to undertake impact assessment in the During stage.

This should/may be a trigger to have some council staff trained in this area eg building surveyors, EHOs fire ground training etc to undertake rapid assessment; question is whether this should be part of standard funding for training provided by Council or access to training by state government eg asbestos, water quality assessment; septic tanks and wastewater, this is relevant for some areas within Council operations.

### **Before**

91 – Include: develop **secondary** impact-assessment processes

92 – Include: lead councils **secondary** impact-assessment processes

### **During**

93/96 – Agree

### **After**

97 – Agree

98 – Remove this totally as it not relevant.

### **Health protection**

#### **Before, During & After**

99/103 – Agree

### **Relief assistance**

#### **Before**

104/114 – Agree

#### **During**

115/121 – Agree but include catering in 116 as Red Cross only supply food and water, where some councils will cater for their community's needs.

### **Economic recovery**

#### **After**

122/125 – Agree

### **Natural and cultural heritage rehabilitation**

**Note** - This section needs to clarify that these responsibilities are only for council controlled land and not public land or where response agencies have facilitated damage that require rehabilitation works.

### **Before**

126 – Agree

### **After**

127/132 – see note.

### **Built recovery**

#### **Before**

133/135 – this area become very difficult to when we are dealing with the unknown and the level of impacts associated with various emergencies. Thus how can we ensure adequate resourcing?

Doesn't this form part of the community development officer role and/or the recovery team within council (and assets team within Council) etc and done when attending community recovery committee meeting etc?

#### **After**

136/146 – depending on the level of impact and the availability of funding will determine council's ability to conduct support coordinate restore and establish these points.

### **Social recovery**

#### **After**

147 – Include: Where funded assist to Coordinate health programs

148 – Include: Support agencies to deliver

149 – Include: Assist in providing

150– Include: Provide referrals for the delivery of

151– Agree

### **Assurance and learning**

This area falls under the risk assessment review that should be done post an event to see if these need to be adjusted as a result of debriefing review of MEMPs and associated plans

152 – Conduct after action review is an agency term not currently adopted by councils, we have a role to undertake debriefs under the direction of the MERC.

153 – Councils are not incident managers so why would we perform this task; I would say assist or be involved in to inform council plans.

154 – Include: improve community planning outcomes.

**This whole document assumes that all councils have the same level of capacity and capability and does not identify funding and budgetary issues associated with non-funded Council Emergency Management roles.**

**Latrobe City also strongly supports the following Gippsland MEMEG submission**

### **Councils and Emergencies Directions Paper – Submission**

Feedback provided at these consultation sessions have formed a MAV draft submission which **Gippsland MEMEG and Latrobe City strongly supports**. However, this is subject, to feedback provided to MAV by MEMEG Gippsland concerning the five listed recommendations within their draft submission. A summary of which is as follows:

*Recommendation: if the final role description is to delineate core requirements and non-core tasks, the core requirements descriptors should be specific, not general statements or policies or plans with a lesser status. Furthermore, they should be quoted verbatim so there is less chance of misinterpretation.*

- Strongly supported by Gippsland MEMEG and Latrobe City

*Recommendation: Core requirements should be achievable, irrespective of the size or resources available to the council. Compliance should not be reliant on grant funding.*

- Strongly supported by Gippsland MEMEG and Latrobe City

*Recommendation: That LGV works with the MAV and councils to develop agreed descriptions of council's responsibilities under each of the Core Capabilities categorisation.*

Strongly supported by Gippsland MEMEG however suggest clarity around the roles of LGV, MAV and council for the process in achieving this recommendation. It is also identified that using terminology such as 'agreed descriptions' in the recommendation is confusing as it may assume that it is referring to the descriptions used to describe the Victoria Preparedness Goal 21 Core Capabilities.

- *Recommendation: that LGV works with MAV and councils to further develop the maturity model proposal.*

Strongly supported by Gippsland MEMEG. MEMEG also identifies that the model provides opportunities for further improvement of emergency management responsibilities and practices for councils. MEMEG would also like to understand if other emergency services and agencies are considering the 21 core capabilities identified in the Victoria Preparedness Goal and how this is been achieved. This would assist to support and further enhance collaboration to ensure multi-agency Municipal Emergency Management Plans.

- *Recommendation: If a maturity model approach is adopted, the MAV could work with LGV, Inspector General Emergency Management and councils to develop a self-audit and quality assurance framework.*

Strongly supported by Gippsland MEMEG and Latrobe City, however recommends that the word 'could' needs to be replaced with 'will'.

MEMEG Gippsland and Latrobe City strongly supports the conclusion within the current MAV draft submission. However it is identified that neither the Directions Paper nor the MAV draft submission to the Direction Paper have acknowledged the required training and development to support a maturity model approach or more broadly the role of councils in an emergency.

For example; training is provided for Council officers to undertake Municipal Fire Prevention Officer (MFPO) training which the CFA has developed to meet current legislative requirements. Gippsland MEMEG strongly recommends the development of a specific course for core emergency management roles within council as a matter of priority.

Lastly, MEMEG Gippsland and Latrobe City recognises the principles of a Councils and Emergencies Directions Paper however strongly supports MAV's position that council's need be provided an updated role description of councils in the broader emergency management arrangements before the final paper is produced.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
Latrobe City Council

mailto:[REDACTED]@latrobe.vic.gov.au

Direct: [REDACTED]

Mobile [REDACTED]

Fax: [REDACTED]