



States and Water/Wastewater Agency Response Networks (WARNs) Working Together

State WARN Perspectives Study Highlights

These highlights from the Association of State Drinking Water Administrators (ASDWA) Security Committee 2014 project identify how states collaborate with and support their WARNs. These findings, taken from input provided by 32 states on their experiences with their state WARNs and a webinar that showcased five different state-WARN collaboration models, offer a series of examples and opportunities that may inspire other states and WARNs to work more closely in concert to create their own success stories. This project was completed through support from EPA's Water Security Division.

Inclusion in Emergency Operations Centers

- ▶ The California Division of Drinking Water has established a Water Sector-specific position at the State Emergency Operations Center (SEOC) to support coordination among utilities and other partners.
- ▶ The Florida Department of Environmental Protection established a position at the SEOC for a WARN liaison.
- ▶ In Maine, a Department of Health and Human Services representative deploys to the Emergency Operations Center (EOC), and the state primacy agency provides the representative with information.

Recruiting

- ▶ The New York Department of Health (DOH) at every opportunity — including meetings with local and state agencies — encourages utilities to join NYWARN and promotes it.
- ▶ The New Hampshire Drinking Water and Groundwater Bureau set up a “refer a friend” promotion to encourage WARN membership (annual fee waived for new members and those who referred new members).
- ▶ A letter sent by the Utah Division of Drinking Water Director to water utilities encouraging them to join UT WARN was instrumental to its founding.
- ▶ The Maryland Department of Environmental Protection actively promotes the state's WARN and encourages membership.

Advocacy and Communication

- ▶ Illinois, Montana, Oregon, Tennessee and Indiana all see their role as advocating for and coordinating between state WARNs and state Emergency Management Agencies and/or EOCs in times of crisis.
- ▶ Delaware and Maine both provide support for promotional materials such as brochures and information for new WARN members.
- ▶ South Carolina, Idaho, Iowa, Colorado and Oklahoma provide for at least one state WARN member to have access to WebEOC or other Web-based emergency operations software used by the state Emergency Operations Agency.
- ▶ Of the 32 responding states, Washington, Massachusetts, Kentucky and Missouri are among those with shared access to 24x7 emergency contact lists among WARN members.

Funding

- ▶ The New Hampshire Drinking Water and Groundwater Bureau used an EPA security grant to hire a circuit rider dedicated to promoting the WARN concept statewide and developing a WARN operations plan.
- ▶ The Florida Department of Environmental Protection used an EPA security grant to fund the management of FlaWARN, including its website.
- ▶ New Jersey has established a cost-sharing arrangement with NJ Rural Water, which administers the WARN.
- ▶ Interestingly, Pennsylvania reported that its state WARN is self-funded through member dues.

Training and Exercises

- ▶ The New York Department of Health (DOH) has encouraged NYWARN members to attend the SEOC orientation training.
- ▶ New York DOH conducted three training sessions for NYWARN members, including 22 operators from 11 counties, to teach them how to run filter units (as smaller systems might need the units but may not have the manpower to run them).
- ▶ The New Hampshire Emergency Management Agency and the Drinking Water and Groundwater Bureau are collaborating on plans to conduct exercises to improve their coordination.
- ▶ Hawaii provides support for WARN conference and workshop participation.

For More Information

Go to asdwa.org and click on the Security tab to see the webinar and survey results. Click on the Links tab to find Web addresses and contact information for all state drinking water programs.