



**Dakota Floods
May – June 2011
ESF 11 After Action Report (AAR)**



Incident Summary

1984DR-SD-USDA-01 South Dakota Flooding
3318EM-ND-USDA-02 North Dakota Flooding

On 27 May, FEMA Region VIII mission assigned ESF 11 to support FEMA and South Dakota in response to severe flooding of the Missouri River and Oahe Reservoir. ESF 11 deployed desk officers to the FEMA Joint Field Office (JFO) in Pierre, SD and to the FEMA Regional Response Coordination Center (RRCC) in Denver, CO on 28 May. A second mission assignment for ESF 11 was issued for flooding in North Dakota on 1 June. An ESF 11 desk officer and a household pet subject matter expert were deployed to the FEMA JFO in Bismarck, ND on 1 June. Food Nutrition Service (FNS) made food commodities available for the response. Rural Development (RD) provided housing inventories for housing needs. Department of the Interior (DOI) and Food Safety Inspection Service (FSIS) did not have specific response activities but coordinated with ESF 11 throughout the activation. APHIS Veterinary Services (VS) and Plant Protection and Quarantine (PPQ) identified areas of concern regarding animal and plant issues. ESF 11 provided assistance with potential animal and public health diseases associated with flooding and with preparation for zoo and household pet evacuation and sheltering. All resources demobilized by 20 June.

Lessons Learned

Things that worked well:

1. APHIS dispatch, programs, and mission assignment manager provided timely assistance with identifying, dispatching, and tracking resources required to fulfill the mission assignment, as well as obtaining APHIS accounting codes to track reimbursable expenses.
2. ESF 11 partner agencies provided timely and effective response to needs requested by the states. Partner agency contacts stayed in close contact with the ESF 11 coordinator and proactively provided updates and valuable assistance.
3. ESF 11 desk officers at the two JFOs and the ESF 11 coordinator at the RRCC maintained effective communications across 3 different coordination centers throughout the incident.

Things that could use improvement:

4. Requesting Resources: Resources should be requested by position to avoid name requests if possible. This allows APHIS program contacts maximum flexibility to contact, consider, and identify appropriate resources. Identifying the recommended length of deployment for each resource requested is also helpful. It is understood by ESF 11 that resources may not be available for the requested length of deployment but including that information in the resource request may reduce the number of transitions during the activation.
5. Early development and maintenance of an electronic tracking system is critical for organizing and utilizing the volume of information involved in an ESF 11 response. Locating the ESF 11 coordinator at a JFO when the RRCC is not activated is recommended to reduce staffing.
6. Deactivation: Uncertainty regarding roles of FEMA operations staff in approval of the ESF 11 demobilization process duplicated effort and created confusion. The ESF 11 coordinator should begin coordinating the demobilization process early in the activation, speak with all relevant APHIS and FEMA parties to ensure roles are clear, and coordinate the successful completion of demobilization paperwork before employees return to their official duty station.