CALL TO ORDER
ROLL CALL

UASI Chair        Anne Kronenberg, City and County of San Francisco
UASI Vice-Chair   Rich Lucia, County of Alameda
Member            Raymond Guzman, City and County of San Francisco
Member            Renee Domingo, City of Oakland
Member            David Hober, City of San Jose
Member            Ken Kehmna, County of Santa Clara
Member            Mike Casten, County of Contra Costa
Member            Bob Doyle, County of Marin
Member            Sherrie L. Collins, County of Monterey
Member            Carlos Bolanos, County of San Mateo
Member            Al Terrell, County of Sonoma
Member            Brendan Murphy, Cal OES

General Manager   Craig Dziedzic

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES (Discussion, Possible Action)
Discussion and possible action to approve the draft minutes from the March 13, 2014 regular meeting or take any other action related to the matter.
(Document for this item includes draft minutes from March 13, 2014.) 5 mins

GENERAL MANAGER’S REPORT
General Manager Craig Dziedzic will give an update regarding the following:
   a) UASI FY 2014 Grant Allocation (Discussion)
   b) Transit Security Grant Funds (Discussion)
   c) Management Team Update (Discussion)
(Document for this item is a report from Craig Dziedzic.) 10 mins

FY14 UASI GRANT ALLOCATIONS (Discussion, Possible Action)
Assistant General Manager Catherine Spaulding will present the funding allocations for UASI FY14. Possible action to support any recommendation(s) or take any other action related to this matter.
(Document for this item is a report from Catherine Spaulding.) 10 mins
5. **NCRIC FUNDING ALLOCATION CARRYOVERS** (Discussion, Possible Action)  
Assistant General Manager Catherine Spaulding and NCRIC Director Mike Sena will discuss  
NCRIC funding allocation carryovers. Possible action to support any recommendation(s) or take  
any other action related to this matter.  
(Document for this item is a report from Catherine Spaulding and Mike Sena.) 10 mins

6. **PUBLIC/PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP AND LOGISTICS PROJECTS COMPLETION** (Discussion, Possible Action)  
Interim Project Manager Caroline Thomas-Jacobs will present the completed public/private  
partnership and logistics projects. Possible action to support any recommendation(s) or take any  
other action related to this matter.  
(Documents for this item are a report and a PowerPoint from Caroline Thomas-Jacobs.) 10 mins

7. **RCPGP TABLETOP AFTER ACTION REPORT** (Discussion, Possible Action)  
Regional Program Manager Janell Myhre will present the RCPGP Tabletop After Action Report.  
Possible Action to support any recommendation(s) or take any other action related to this matter.  
(Document for this item is a report and an appendix from Janell Myhre.) 10 mins

8. **RCPGP SUSTAINMENT PLAN PROJECT COMPLETION** (Discussion, Possible Action)  
Regional Grants Manager Mary Landers will present the completed RCPGP Sustainment Plan.  
Possible Action to support any recommendation(s) or take any other action related to this matter.  
(Documents for this item are a report and two appendices from Mary Landers.) 10 mins

9. **RAD/NUC REGIONAL PROJECT** (Discussion)  
CBRNE Project Manager Bruce Martin will present on the RAD/NUC Regional Project. Possible  
action to support any recommendation(s) or take any other action related to this matter.  
(Document for this item is a report and a PowerPoint from Bruce Martin.) 10 mins

10. **BROWN ACT REFRESHER TRAINING** (Discussion, Action)  
Legal Counsel Robin P. Donoghue from Meyers Nave will provide a refresher course on the  
Brown Act. Action to support any recommendation(s) or take any other action related to this  
matter.  
(Document for this item is a report and handout from Robin Donoghue.) 10 mins

11. **REALLOCATION OF GRANT FUNDS** (Discussion, Possible Action)  
Chief Financial Officer Tristan Levardo will provide a report on the reallocation of grant funds.  
Possible action to support any recommendation(s) or take any other action related to this matter.  
(Document for this item is a report from Tristan Levardo.) 5 mins

12. **REPORT FROM THE BAY AREA REGIONAL INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY (BayRICS JPA)** (Discussion, Possible Action)  
Barry Fraser, BayRICS General Manager, will provide a report on the BayRICS JPA. Possible  
action to approve the report or take any other action related to this matter.  
(Document for this item is a report from Barry Fraser.) 10 mins

13. **TRACKING TOOL** (Discussion, Possible Action)  
Review the tracking tool for accuracy and confirmation of deadlines. Possible action to add or  
clarify tasks for the Management Team or take other action related to the tracking tool.  
(Document for this item is the UASI Approval Authority Tracking Tool.) 5 mins

14. **ANNOUNCEMENTS-GOOD OF THE ORDER**
15. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS (Discussion)

The Approval Authority members will discuss agenda items for future meetings.

16. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Members of the Public may address the Approval Authority for up to three minutes on items within the jurisdiction of the Bay Area UASI Approval Authority.

17. ADJOURNMENT

If any materials related to an item on this agenda have been distributed to the Approval Authority members after distribution of the agenda packet, those materials are available for public inspection at the Bay Area UASI Management Office located at 711 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 420, San Francisco, CA 94102 during normal office hours, 8:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m.

Public Participation:

It is the policy of the Approval Authority to encourage and permit public participation and comment on matters within the Approval Authority’s jurisdiction, as follows.

- **Public Comment on Agenda Items.** The Approval Authority will take public comment on each item on the agenda. The Approval Authority will take public comment on an action item before the Approval Authority takes action on that item. Persons addressing the Approval Authority on an agenda item shall confine their remarks to the particular agenda item. For each agenda item, each member of the public may address the Approval Authority once, for up to three minutes. The Chair may limit the public comment on an agenda item to less than three minutes per speaker, based on the nature of the agenda item, the number of anticipated speakers for that item, and the number and anticipated duration of other agenda items.

- **General Public Comment.** The Approval Authority shall include general public comment as an agenda item at each meeting of the Approval Authority. During general public comment, each member of the public may address the Approval Authority on matters within the Approval Authority’s jurisdiction. Issues discussed during general public comment must not appear elsewhere on the agenda for that meeting. Each member of the public may address the Approval Authority once during general public comment, for up to three minutes. The Chair may limit the total general public comment to 30 minutes and may limit the time allocated to each speaker depending on the number of speakers during general public comment and the number and anticipated duration of agenda items.

- **Speaker Identification.** Individuals making public comment may be requested, but not required, to identify themselves and whom they represent.

- **Designated Public Comment Area.** Members of the public wishing to address the Approval Authority must speak from the public comment area.
• **Comment, Not Debate.** During public comment, speakers shall address their remarks to the Approval Authority as a whole and not to individual Approval Authority representatives, the General Manager or Management Team members, or the audience. Approval Authority Representatives and other persons are not required to respond to questions from a speaker. Approval Authority Representatives shall not enter into debate or discussion with speakers during public comment, although Approval Authority Representatives may question speakers to obtain clarification. Approval Authority Representatives may ask the General Manager to investigate an issue raised during public comment and later report to the Approval Authority. The lack of a response by the Approval Authority to public comment does not necessarily constitute agreement with or support of comments made during public comment.

• **Speaker Conduct.** The Approval Authority will not tolerate disruptive conduct by individuals making public comment. Speakers who use profanity or engage in yelling, screaming, or other disruptive behavior will be directed to cease that conduct and may be asked to leave the meeting room.

**Disability Access**

The UASI Approval Authority will hold its meeting at the Alameda County Sheriff’s Office OES located at 4985 Broder Blvd. in Dublin, CA 94568.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, those requiring accommodations for this meeting should notify Waimen Chee, at least 24 hours prior to the meeting at (415) 353-5223.
1. Roll Call

Acting-Chair Renee Domingo called the meeting to order at 10:06 am. Subsequently, General Manager Craig Dziedzic took the roll call. Members Raymond Guzman, David Hober, Sherrie Collins, Mike Casten, Al Terrell, and Ken Kehmna were present. Chair Anne Kronenberg, Members Carlos Bolanos and Bob Doyle were absent, but their alternates, respectively Amiee Alden, Mark Wyss, and Dave Augustus were present. Vice-Chair Rich Lucia and Cal OES representative Brendan Murphy were absent.

2. Approval of the Minutes

Motion: Approval of the minutes from the February 13, 2014 Approval Authority meeting.

Moved: Alternate Member Alden  Seconded: Member Collins

Vote: The motion was passed unanimously.

3. General Manager’s Report

(a) Securing the Cities (STC) Grant

General Manager Craig Dziedzic stated that the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has released the FY 2014 Standing Funding Opportunity Announcement (SFOA) for the Securing the Cities (STC) grant. This is a five year grant designed to reduce the risk of a successful deployment of a nuclear terrorist weapon against a major metropolitan region in the United States. This grant will award one UASI recipient $5.6 million dollars in fiscal year 2014 and
upwards of $30 million dollars to the recipient over five consecutive fiscal years. There are currently eight UASI recipients eligible to apply: the Bay Area, Boston, Chicago, Dallas/Ft Worth/Arlington, Houston, National Capitol Region, Philadelphia, and San Diego. The application is extremely complex and requires the selection of 8-12 principal agencies as well as signed Letters of Commitment from these agencies which must be submitted along with the application. Bruce Martin and Mary Landers are taking the lead on the grant application process and they will be reaching out to partner jurisdictions in the coming weeks. The application must be submitted by May 16 with the anticipated grant selection date of August 15th.

(b) Trip to Washington, D.C.

Mr. Dziedzic stated that Approval Authority Members Alameda County Undersheriff Rich Lucia, Santa Clara County Fire Chief Ken Kehmna, Oakland OES/Homeland Security Director Renee Domingo, Alternate Approval Authority Member Amiee Alden, the Bay Area UASI General Manager, and NCRIC Director Mike Sena visited Washington, D.C. from February 24-26, 2014. There they met with key policy makers and provided information and educated them about how the UASI grants have built capabilities in the Bay Area. The group highlighted important and successful achievements of the Bay Area UASI.

The delegation met with the representatives from the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee and the House Homeland Security Committee as well as with staffers from the offices of Representatives Mike Honda, Zoe Lofgren, Anna Eshoo, Barbara Lee, and the Office of Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi. The group personally met Representative Eric Swalwell (D-Dublin) who was very interested in the goals and objectives of the BAUASI. The trip concluded with a meeting with representatives from the Department of Homeland Security & FEMA and staffers from the office of Senator Dianne Feinstein.

The delegation strengthened relationships with Congressional staff and Department of Homeland Security (DHS) officials. They also communicated the benefits of and need for continued UASI funding in the Bay Area. During a hearing of the House Homeland Security Committee on February 26, Congressman Swalwell directly engaged Secretary of Homeland Security Jeh Johnson and urged him to give extra consideration to the assets of the entire twelve-county Bay Area UASI footprint and not just the seven counties considered in the Relative Risk Score developed by DHS. This score is a prime factor in the determination of grant funding.

Mr. Dziedzic attempted to show a video clip of Congressman Swalwell’s exchange with Secretary Johnson.

Member Kehmna mentioned that the representatives were engaged with the delegation and knowledgeable about the Bay Area.

(c) Management Team Update

Mr. Dziedzic stated that the Management Team is in the final recruitment stage for the selection of the Resilience and Recovery Project Manager position. The position will be responsible for developing and implementing regional programs and for project planning with a focus on citizen preparedness, emergency planning, resiliency, recovery, and health and medical preparedness.
Jeff Blau, Project Manager for Interoperable Communications projects, no longer works for the Management Team. The Management Team is identifying next steps to best meet business needs and support the region. Mary Landers will be providing support to interoperability projects in the interim. Interoperability is and will continue to be a high priority.

The Bay Area UASI has been offered a City Hall Fellow in FY2015. Launched in 2008, the City Hall Fellows Program leverages talented, passionate, and well-trained young individuals to work in local government. It is a national and highly competitive program that operates in three cities (San Francisco, Houston and Baton Rouge). Many alumni continue in local public service immediately post-Fellowship and/or after graduate school. The Fellow will report to the Bay Area UASI Management Team project staff. He or she will start in August 2014 and work nearly full time through the end of the 2014-2015 and will assist jurisdictions to make asset updates in Digital Sandbox, support Yellow Command, and THIRA scenario development.

Several members of the Board expressed the importance of the Interoperable Communications Project Manager position. The members did not want to see the projects lose momentum in the process of transiting the position.

(d) The Statewide Data Sharing Coordinator Position Update

Mr. Dziedzic stated that the Statewide Data Sharing Coordinator position has been posted on the website of SRA International Inc. (Requisition Number: 45543BR) The Link is as follows: http://www.sra.com/careers/search.php

Mike Sena will be the lead on the recruitment. After the selection of a candidate pool, an interview panel, comprised of representatives from the Coalition of California UASIs (CCU), Cal Sheriffs, Cal Chiefs, the State Threat Assessment System's (STAS) Fusion Centers, the Cal Node Administrators, and Cal OES will interview the final candidates later this month.

4. Report from the Advisory Group

San Jose Deputy Chief Dave Hober presented the Advisory Group report on behalf of NCRIC Deputy Director Daniel J. Mahoney. Deputy Chief Hober stated that during the February 20, 2014 meeting, the UASI Advisory Group reviewed project requests from the four regional hubs. After discussion among the members, a motion was approved to forward the selected regional and sustainment projects to the Approval Authority for their approval.

The UASI Advisory Group also gave approval for the development of a Performance Review of UASI equipment purchases. Assistant General Manager Catherine Spaulding gave a presentation on a proposal to conduct a review of equipment that was purchased with UASI funding and was given approval to move forward with developing an evaluation plan.

5. FY14 Proposed Projects

Assistant General Manager Catherine Spaulding stated that in January 2014, the four planning hubs met to select projects from among those submitted by UASI stakeholders. Subject matter experts were available to present their proposals and answer questions. Members from each
planning hub reviewed, discussed, and ranked the proposed projects in prioritized order. Ms. Spaulding stated that on January 23rd, the Advisory Group met to select regional projects from among those submitted by UASI stakeholders and on February 20th, the Advisory Group met to review the hub-selected projects to reduce duplication of effort and confirm prioritization based on regional risk. The hub and regional projects are now presented to the Approval Authority for approval.

Member Casten mentioned that regional projects seem to take up a lot of money and would like to see projects sustain themselves. As BayRICS meetings have been canceled, Mr. Casten doesn’t see the need to award UASI funds to BayRICS.

**Motion:** Approve the FY14 Proposed Projects

**Moved:** Member Hober  
**Seconded:** Alternate Member Wyss  
**Vote:** Member Casten opposed. The motion passed with one objection.

### 6. FY14 Hub Funding Formula

Assistant General Manager Catherine Spaulding stated that the Bay Area UASI uses FEMA’s State and MSA Risk Formula to guide the portioning of grant dollars among the four hubs using risk criteria. Now that FEMA has released their FY14 formula, the Management Team can propose the hub funding formula for the FY14 grant.

FEMA’s updated risk formula has no significant changes, and so the proposed hub funding formula for FY14 is the same as last year. However, there is now more recent data to input into the formula, and so there are slight changes to the percentages among the hubs.

Digital Sandbox Client Service Manager Jason Carroll presented a PowerPoint on the FY14 Bay Area UASI hub funding formula. Mr. Carroll explained the allocations are determined by population risk, asset risk and economic risk.

**Motion:** Approve FY14 Hub Funding Formula

**Moved:** Member Kehmna  
**Seconded:** Member Casten  
**Vote:** The motion passed unanimously.

### 7. Risk Management Program, FY15 Grant Cycle

Assistant General Manager Catherine Spaulding stated that the Management Team has completed its planning for the FY15 Risk Management Cycle in close partnership with participating jurisdictions, the NCRIC, and Digital Sandbox.

The Approval Authority Bylaws specify that the Approval Authority must use a risk and capability-based methodology to apply for and allocate grant funds. This is consistent with guidance from DHS that states that all levels of government must establish a foundation to justify and guide preparedness activities and investments. In addition, DHS requires all grantees
to produce a Threat Hazard Identifications and Risk Assessment (THIRA).

Ms. Spaulding stated that there were changes to the UASI FY15 risk management program to improve efficiency. The Management Team will now implement a two year cycle for producing an updated regional capability assessment and Bay Area Homeland Security Strategy.

8. Regional Procurement

Assistant General Manager Catherine Spaulding stated that last minute funding has become available in prior years during the final months of grant performance periods. A process for regional procurement of equipment in anticipation of the closeout of the FY11 and FY12 UASI grant years was approved at the March 2013 Approval Authority meeting. In January 2014, the Management Team identified a total of $1,050,000 in returned FY11 and FY12 funds. The Management Team prepared a procurement process for P25 radios, body bags, personal protection equipment, cadaver racks and trays.

The Management Team proposes that we again prepare a regional procurement in preparation for the closeout of UASI FY13 in the anticipation of last minute unspent funds becoming available. The Management Team will again develop a menu of widely-needed equipment that fills critical gaps, including radios, body bags, and access and functional needs equipment.

The Management Team will implement the 2013 closeout process in the same manner as what just occurred for closing out UASI FY11 and UASI FY12. The Management Team will determine all unspent funds available at the end of January 2015 and then reallocate these funds by Operational Area based on the most recently-approved hub funding formula. The Management Team will then contact Approval Authority members for direction on which equipment to purchase and at what magnitude. Equipment procurement and the required follow-up monitoring will be performed by the City and County of San Francisco as the fiscal agent for the Bay Area UASI.

Members Collins and Wyss commented that they like the process and would like to see it expanded to include more items.

Motion: Approve the proposed regional procurement process for the closeout of UASI FY13

Moved: Alternate Member Alden  Seconded: Alternate Member Wyss

Vote: The motion passed unanimously.


Alameda County Sheriff’s Commander Dennis Houghtelling presented a PowerPoint on the Regional Training and Exercise Program Annual Report. The UASI Training and Exercise program is administered by the Alameda County Sheriff’s Office and serves the disciplines of law enforcement, fire/hazmat, emergency medical services, public health/health care and emergency management.
Commander Houghtelling stated that the program provided 226 training course and trained 6,353 students with over 8,500 registered users on the website. The training and exercise program will continue to assess the capabilities and training needs of the region.

10. Equipment Performance Review

Assistant General Manager Catherine Spaulding stated that the federal homeland security grant program remains under scrutiny at the federal level and that grant funds are continually declining. At the direction of the Approval Authority, the Bay Area UASI Management Team has continually examined grant investments to evaluate efficiency and effectiveness. A comprehensive Effectiveness Report was issued in both 2010 and 2012. For future efforts, the Management Team recommends taking a more focused look at particular investments along the POETE continuum (planning, organization, equipment, training, and exercises).

The Management Team proposed to undertake an equipment performance review given that most grant money is spent in this area. (The region spent $19 million on equipment from the UASI FY11 grant year and $13 million from UASI FY12). The purpose of the review will be to evaluate the region as a whole (not specific jurisdictions or agencies) and to develop policy-level recommendations for the region to consider so that we may improve the effectiveness of our grant spending in the future.

Member Wyss stated that the purchases meet the grant guidance and does not see the need for a performance review but would be open to further discussion.

Member Hober stated that the Advisory Group had similar feelings and would like to see if there is an actual need for a performance review.

Motion: Approve the proposed equipment performance review

Moved: Alternate Member Alden  Seconded: No Second
Vote: The motion failed.

11. Report on Activities in Other UASI Jurisdictions

Leidos’ Director of Emergency Management Christopher Godley presented a PowerPoint on his travels to other UASI jurisdictions. Mr. Godley shared the lessons he learned that could benefit the Bay Area UASI.

12. FY2012 UASI Spending Update

Chief Financial Officer Tristan Levardo stated that UASI has received an extension of the FY12 UASI grant performance period until July 31, 2014 to accomplish the regional procurement and complete the closeout of the projects.
The Management Team is still waiting for final claims from NCRIC and San Mateo. The remaining unspent funds for FY12 UASI grant of $562,506 will be used for the last minute regional purchases.

13. UASI Travel Expenditures

Chief Financial Officer Tristan Levardo stated that the travel expenses processed last quarter by the Bay Area UASI for the period of October 1 to December 31, 2013 was $7,628.86. The reported total only includes claims that were processed by UASI.

14. Tracking Tool

Acting Chair Domingo asked the Board for any questions or comments. There were no questions or comments.

15. Announcements—Good of the Order

Mr. Dziedzic thanked Acting Chair Domingo for chairing the meeting in the absence of Chair Kronenberg and Vice-Chair Lucia.

16. Future Agenda Items

Acting Chair Domingo asked the Board for questions or comments. There were no questions or comments.

17. General Public Comment

Acting Chair Domingo asked the Board for general public comments

The meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m.
To: Bay Area UASI Approval Authority
From: Craig Dziedzic, General Manager
Date: April 10, 2014
RE: Item 3: General Manager’s Report

**Recommendations:** Discussion only.

**Action or Discussion Items:**

(a) UASI FY 2014 Grant Allocation (Discussion Only)
(b) Transit Security Grant Funds (Discussion Only)
(c) Management Team Update (Discussion Only)

**Discussion/Description:**

(a) UASI FY 2014 Grant Allocation (Discussion Only)

The U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) released the FY 2014 Funding Opportunity Announcements for six DHS preparedness grant programs totaling over $1.6 billion.

Within the requirements of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2014, the FY 2014 grant guidance will continue to focus on the nation’s highest risk areas, including urban areas that face the most significant threats.

For FY 2014, the Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI) will enhance regional preparedness by funding 39 high-threat, high-density urban areas - increasing the number of UASI funded urban areas from 25 in FY 2013 to 39 in FY 2014, and funding the highest number of urban areas nation-wide since FY 2010.

For FY 2014, the BAUASI will receive $27,400,000, which is a modest .54% increase of $147,831 from the $27,252,169 awarded in FY 2013.

(b) Transit Security Grant Program (Discussion Only)

The Management Team has reached out to a few potential grantees of the Transit Security Grant Program (TSGP) to determine whether there may be projects that could be pursued under the TSGP that could benefit the entire Bay Area region.
One potential project proposed involves enhancing visual surveillance with live monitoring by placing facial recognition equipment on buses and trains. Such project would promote regional collaboration with the Northern California Regional Information Center (NCRIC) with collecting and disseminating real time information. The project would enhance the areas of a multi-user high-density key infrastructure protection. The proposal would involve the purchase of equipment and facial recognition software with an interface to WiFi capabilities.

The Management Team would propose assisting the grantee to apply for grant funding as well as the associated project management in consideration for the M&A portion of the grant funds.

(c) Management Team Update  (Discussion Only)

Waimen Chee, Emergency Services Assistant, will be leaving the Management Team at the end of April. He has accepted a law enforcement position with the UCSF campus. Mr. Chee was responsible for administrative support to the Bay Area UASI Management Team, assisting with the coordination of all documentation for the monthly Approval Authority meetings, and acting as a liaison to the general public.

We will be recruiting for Mr. Chee’s replacement. Mary Landers will be the lead in the recruitment process. Please refer potential candidates to Mary Landers.
To: Bay Area UASI Approval Authority
From: Catherine Spaulding, Assistant General Manager
Date: April 10, 2014
Re: Item #4: FY14 UASI Grant Allocations

**Staff Recommendation:**

Approve the proposed FY14 UASI grant allocations

**Action or Discussion Item:**

Action

**Discussion:**

On March 18th, FEMA released its 2014 Homeland Security Grant Program guidance, which includes the FY14 UASI award for the Bay Area. The Bay Area UASI grant allocation for FY14 is $27,400,000, an increase of $147,831 (0.5%) over the FY13 allocation of $27,252,169.

Proposed FY14 grant allocations are detailed below in Table 1. The FY13 amount is included (in blue font) for reference.

**Table 1: UASI FY13 and Proposed FY14 Allocations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Award</td>
<td>$27,252,169</td>
<td>$27,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Holdback (@17%)</td>
<td>$4,632,869</td>
<td>$4,658,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major City Allocation</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainment/Regional</td>
<td>$11,175,308</td>
<td>$10,941,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Team</td>
<td>$3,370,864</td>
<td>$3,376,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hub Projects</td>
<td>$5,073,128</td>
<td>$5,424,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,252,169</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,400,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Sustainment/Regional Projects:**

As noted in Table 1, there is a $10,941,093 million proposed FY14 allocation to sustainment and regional projects. These projects and the recommended allocations were individually vetted and recommended for approval by the Advisory Group. The list of projects and the proposed amounts are listed below in Table 2. The amount in FY13 (in blue font) is included for reference.

**Table 2: FY13 and Proposed FY14 Sustainment/Regional Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training and Exercise Program</td>
<td>$4,834,608</td>
<td>$4,901,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCRIC</td>
<td>$4,405,220</td>
<td>$4,687,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coplink South Node</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coplink West Node</td>
<td>$282,000</td>
<td>(in NCRIC allocation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aries</td>
<td>$354,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area Regional ALPR Project</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$132,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BayLoop Maintenance</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P25 Network Coordination</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional PH-M Coordination</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical-Health Incident Resp.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalWARN Web Portal</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery Planning and Prep.</td>
<td>$254,480</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Prophylaxis Regional Ex.</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay 72 Regional Expansion</td>
<td>$117,000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory Database</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Management</td>
<td>$88,000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11,175,308</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,941,093</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Hub Allocations:**

As noted in Table 1, there is $5,424,907 million available for allocation to hubs out of the FY14 grant award. This amount is distributed to the four hubs based on the risk allocation percentage approved by the Approval Authority in the March 2014 meeting (East = 25.27%; North = 7.5%; South = 25.77%; and West = 41.46%). Table 3 below shows FY14 hub allocations, with the FY13 allocation (in blue font) provided for reference.

**Table 3: FY13 and Proposed FY14 Hub Allocations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hub</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>$1,141,961</td>
<td>$1,370,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>$366,787</td>
<td>$406,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>$1,302,272</td>
<td>$1,397,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>$2,262,108</td>
<td>$2,249,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$5,073,128</td>
<td>$5,424,907</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: Bay Area UASI Approval Authority  
From: Catherine Spaulding, Assistant General Manager  
Date: April 10, 2014  
Re: Item #5: NCRIC Funding Allocation Carryover

Staff Recommendations:

Approve a policy to allow the NCRIC to carryover funding allocations

Action or Discussion Items:

Action

Discussion:

The Bay Area UASI Grants Manual specifies policies for when sub-recipients do not spend their grant allocations in the time or manner originally specified. The Manual states that if a sub-recipient is unable to spend as originally approved within the sub-recipient performance period, the grant dollars must be returned to fund next in line projects or be swapped against future grant allocations to extend the timeframe. The NCRIC has asked the Management Team to update this policy given their unique situation and role (see next section).

The NCRIC would like to be permitted to carryover grant allocations from one sub-recipient performance period to the next. This will allow the organization to maintain a buffer for salaries against unforeseen changes in future grant allocations as well as engage in complex procurement processes that extend beyond twelve months.

The Management Team recommends that the NCRIC be permitted to carryover funding allocations to future sub-recipient performance periods up to a total of six months, provided that this still falls at least three months before the end of the grant performance period provided by the state. The NCRIC will be required to keep the Bay Area UASI Management Team CFO apprised of funding sources and uses at all times. In addition, the NCRIC will be required to report the amount of its carryover balance to the Advisory Group and Approval Authority when requesting additional future funding allocations.
The Unique Situation and Role of the NCRIC

- **Lack of funding flexibility** – The NCRIC is reliant on the UASI funding stream for over half of their operating budget and does not have flexible funding streams like a general fund which allow for coverage of expenditures while awaiting reimbursement from federal sources.

- **Homeland Security Grant Program priority** – the role of the NCRIC is uniquely important as specified in repeated years in the Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) funding opportunity announcements. In the 2014 HSGP FOA, DHS states that the HSGP “plays an important role in the implementation of the National Preparedness System (NPS) by supporting the building, sustainment, and delivery of core capabilities essential to achieving the National Preparedness Goal (NPG) of a secure and resilient Nation. Delivering core capabilities requires the combined effort of the whole community, rather than the exclusive effort of any single organization or level of government. The FY 2014 HSGP’s allowable costs support efforts to build and sustain core capabilities across the Prevention, Protection, Mitigation, Response, and Recovery mission areas, including the following priorities: building and sustaining law enforcement terrorism prevention capabilities; and maturation and enhancement of state and major urban area fusion centers.”

- **Complex regional procurement** – the NCRIC must procure particularly complex and costly equipment on behalf of the region. Such systems require extensive requests for proposal, evaluation, development and implementation of technology to collect, analyze and share information across over 200 public safety agencies. The state typically allows special grant extensions to assist the NCRIC to make such procurements.
To: Bay Area UASI Approval Authority  
From: Caroline Thomas Jacobs, Resiliency and Recovery Project Manager (Interim)  
Date: April 10, 2014  
Re: Item 6: Regional Logistics and Public/Private Sector Partnership Projects Summary

Staff Recommendation:
Discussion only

Action or Discussion Item:

The Regional Logistics and Restoration of Critical Lifelines Project is complete and the Public/Private Sector Partnership Project will be completed by May 2, 2014.

Regional Logistics and Restoration of Critical Lifelines Project
The Regional Catastrophic Logistics Response Plan is the eighth and final plan funded through the Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Grant Program. At the direction of the Regional Catastrophic Planning Team (RCPT) Workgroup, with approval from the Approval Authority and California Office of Emergency Services, the Regional Catastrophic Plans were developed with the goal of strengthening regional coordination among the Bay Area UASI jurisdictions. The plans address eight (8) functional areas:

- Debris Removal
- Interim Housing
- Mass Care and Shelter
- Mass Transportation and Evacuation
- Mass Fatality
- Donations Management
- Volunteer Management
- Logistics

The Regional Logistics Plan and supporting documents were developed under the direction of the Logistics Plan Steering Committee comprising Operational Area and Core City representatives. Each product was distributed in draft form electronically for comments, updated and then presented for final review and validation at a stakeholder forum over the course of four years (2010-2014).

Each of the 14 Bay Area UASI jurisdictions will receive the following products:

- Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Logistics Plan with Restoration of Critical Lifelines Appendix
- Operational Area Response Annex or Core City Plan
- Points of Distribution (POD) Field Operations Guide (FOG)
- Points of Distribution (POD) Manual
- Logistics Staging Area (LSA) Field Operations Guide (FOG)
The above products will be distributed at the next RCPT Workgroup meeting on April 24 in Dublin. Jurisdictions may contact Caroline Thomas Jacobs at <caroline.thomasjacobs@sfgov.org>, if they would like to arrange an alternative delivery.

**Public/Private Sector Partnership Project**

The Public/Private Sector Partnership Project created three distinct Private Sector Advisory Committees for (1) San Jose & Santa Clara County, (2) San Mateo County and (3) the City of Oakland. The goal was to establish a sustainable forum in which private sector representatives collaborate with local public sector partners to strengthen the community’s resiliency and enhance their ability to respond and recover from catastrophic disasters. Private sector representatives were recruited to join their local Private Sector Advisory Committee and name a member as the designated Private Sector EOC Representative for the corresponding Operational Area Emergency Operations Center (EOC). Private Sector members were recruited from a broad spectrum of industries, including technology, hospitality, healthcare, manufacturing, logistics, real estate, commercial development and small business.

In addition, the following products were developed to support the implementation and ongoing operations of the Private Sector Advisory Committees, as well as, future development of public/private sector partnerships in additional Operational Areas:

- **Strategic Plan: Work Plan for Private Sector Advisory Committees**
- **Business Operations Center (BOC) Activation Guide: for Private Sector EOC Representatives**
- **Business Operations Center (BOC) Standard Operating Procedures (SOP): a Template for Operational Area Staff**
- **Training Videos**

Each product was distributed in draft form electronically for comments, updated and then presented for final review and validation with stakeholders. The documents were developed in alignment with CalOES’s Business Operations Center program which operates within the State Operations Center (SOC) and were reviewed by representatives of CalOES’s private sector program.

The Strategic Plan and Activation Guide will be distributed to the three Private Sector Advisory Committees. The Business Operations Center SOP will be distributed to the remaining UASI Operational Areas. The training videos will be posted online for universal availability.

Products from both projects will be available on the Bay Area UASI website [www.bayareausi.org](http://www.bayareausi.org).
Regional Logistics Plan and Public/Private Sector Partnership Projects

April 10, 2014

Caroline Thomas Jacobs
Resiliency & Recovery Project Manager (Interim)
Bay Area UASI
Goal:
Develop a regional plan along with supporting documents to coordinate logistic response to a catastrophic earthquake including a Restoration of Critical Lifelines Appendix.
Products Developed with the Region

• Regional Logistics Response Plan
• Operational Area Response Annex or Core City Plan
  – Points of Distribution Field Operations Guide (POD FOG)
  – Points of Distribution Manual
  – Logistics Staging Area Field Operations Guide (LSA FOG)
  – Logistics Staging Area Manual
  – Logistics Center Plan Template
• Gaps and Recommendation Report
• CD with electronic versions of all documents
• Train-the-Trainer CD
Project Launched

Logistics Capabilities Assessment Tool (LCAT) conducted with imbedded RCPGP-funded Planners.

LCAT Report produced for each OpArea

Regional & Local Plan Development

Stakeholder Review of Draft Regional Plan and Local OpArea Annexes (or Core City Plan)

(2) Regional Plan Validation Workshops

Companion Material Development

(3) Critical Lifeline Workshops

Final Products Developed

Final Products Distributed
Goal:

Create a Private Sector Advisory Committee for San Jose/Santa Clara County, San Mateo County, and the City of Oakland; develop sustaining documentation; and define a Standard Operating Procedure for use by other Operational Areas to develop their own Private Sector Advisory Committees.
Project Launched

Recruited Private Sector Advisory Committee Members

Initial Advisory Committee Meetings

Strategic Plan, BOC Activation Guide & SOP Development

(3) Stakeholder Public/Private Sector Partnership Launch Meetings

Document Review Cycle

Training Videos Development

Final Products Developed

Final Products Distributed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South Bay</th>
<th>Oakland</th>
<th>San Mateo County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>Kaiser Permanente</td>
<td>Stanford Linear Accelerator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comerica Bank</td>
<td>AMTRAK</td>
<td>PG&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Fargo</td>
<td>Dept of Economic Workforce Development</td>
<td>Adobe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisco Systems</td>
<td>Community Benefits District Services</td>
<td>Gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>East Bay Municipal Utilities District</td>
<td>Electronic Arts (EA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockheed Martin</td>
<td>(EBMUD)</td>
<td>Intel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EORM</td>
<td></td>
<td>BOMA Silicon Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merck</td>
<td>FedEx</td>
<td>Facebook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palantir</td>
<td>Portfolio Property Investors</td>
<td>Federal Express</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FedEx</td>
<td>Rockridge Business Improvement District Assn</td>
<td>Half Moon Bay Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford Hospital</td>
<td>Jack London Square Universal Protection Svc</td>
<td>Mills-Peninsula Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lam Research</td>
<td>Oakland Group Universal Protection Services</td>
<td>Pacifica Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA Med Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Salesforce.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAMCEDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td>San Bruno Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Digital</td>
<td></td>
<td>Virgin America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevron</td>
<td></td>
<td>Visa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symantec</td>
<td></td>
<td>Walgreens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comcast</td>
<td></td>
<td>PG&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moffett Business Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TiVo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Products Developed with the Region

- Advisory Committee Strategic Plan
- Business Operations Center (BOC) Activation Guide
- BOC Standard Operating Procedure (SOP)
- (6) Training Videos (4-6 minute Just-in-Time videos)
Questions?
To: Bay Area UASI Approval Authority  
From: Janell Myhre, Regional Program Manager  
Date: April 10th, 2014  
Re: Item 7: RCPGP Tabletop After Action Report

Staff Recommendation:
Discussion only

Action or Discussion Items:
Discussion only.

Discussion:
In the summer of 2013, the UASI Management Team worked with Bay Area stakeholders, the California Office of Emergency Services (CalOES), and FEMA Region IX to train on and validate the Bay Area Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Grant Program (RCPGP) regional plans. The Management Team held six Tabletop Exercises (TTX) to discuss the status of the plans, identify strengths and areas of improvement, and discuss next steps. Approximately 300 stakeholders attended the TTX series, representing Federal, State, and Bay Area government as well as the private and non-profit sectors.

The RCPGP TTX series had the following objectives:

1. Review the major components of the plans to vet and align local, region, Bay Area, State and Federal government roles and responsibilities as well as notification and activation procedures.
2. Discuss critical elements identified during Golden Guardian 2013, such as federal, state, regional and local OES roles and responsibilities, EOC coordination and information sharing.
3. Identify gaps and develop recommendations for adoption of the plans as annexes to the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Emergency Coordination Plan and operational and core city emergency operations plans.

The After Action Report (AAR) (see Appendix) noted that the Bay Area RCPGP plans are aligned with local government, Operational Area, State, and Federal roles and responsibilities and follow Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS) regulations and guidelines. Despite needed updates, the plans are ready to be approved and adopted by CalOES.
The primary corrective action items in the AAR were answered by CalOES accepting the Bay Area RCPGP plans as working drafts to be included into the upcoming revision to the CalOES and FEMA Region IX Bay Area Catastrophic Earthquake Plan (CONPLAN). The Bay Area UASI and RCPT Workgroup are coordinating with the CalOES Coastal Region and FEMA Region IX to ensure the sustainability of the RCPGP plans. The UASI Management Team, RCPT Workgroup, and Cal OES Coastal Region are currently developing a scope of work to hire subject matter experts to coordinate the Bay Area RCPGP plan information with the upcoming revision of the CONPLAN. This will support the collaboration of three levels of government in the completion of all the RCPGP TTX AAR corrective action items.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Grant Program (RCPGP) Tabletop Exercise (TTX) Series was developed to provide a forum to discuss the status of the RCPGP Regional Catastrophic Earthquake plans, identify strengths and areas of improvement within the plans and discuss next steps. The overarching goal of the exercise series was to bring together all levels of government and private sector stakeholders to have a positive, no-fault, open discussion on current and future Regional Catastrophic Earthquake planning efforts. The six TTXs were conducted in Dublin, California at the Alameda County Office of Emergency Services (OES) between July 9, 2013 and August 21, 2013.

Based on the exercise planning team’s deliberations, the following overarching objectives were developed for the RCPGP TTX Series:

1. Review the major components of the Plan to vet and align local, region, Bay Area, State and Federal government roles and responsibilities, notification and activation procedures.
2. Discuss critical elements identified during Golden Guardian 2013.
3. Identify gaps and develop recommendations for adoption of the RCPGP plans as Annexes to the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Emergency Coordination Plan (RECP) and Operational and Core City Emergency Operations Plans (EOPs).

The purpose of this report is to analyze exercise results, identify strengths to be maintained and built upon, identify potential areas for further improvement, and support development of corrective actions.

The major strengths identified during the TTX Series are as follows:

- The plans have been reviewed and validated in recent years through vetting sessions and workshops which were attended by many of the TTX participants. These TTX participants provide a unique and important perspective on plan content and operations in the private sector and at all levels of government.
- Participants noted that the regional plans, as currently developed, are aligned with local government, Operational Area, State and Federal roles and responsibilities and follow Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS) regulations and guidelines. Despite the areas that need updating, the regional plans are in a position to be approved and adopted by the California Governor’s Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES).
- The TTXs provided a forum to identify necessary updates and new information that should be considered for inclusion in future iterations of the RCPGP Regional Catastrophic Earthquake plans.
- Each TTX began with an educational session titled, “Comprehensive Plan Review” that provided an overview of the applicable Federal, State, regional, Operational Area and Core City planning efforts. These educational sessions were generally met with positive feedback – and participants requested additional information about the plan relationships to be included in this After-Action Report (AAR).

Throughout the TTX Series, several opportunities for improvement were identified. The primary areas for improvement are as follows:
The level of knowledge and understanding of the RCPGP Regional Catastrophic Earthquake plans, RECP Base Plan and supporting plans was remarkably diverse.

- **Corrective Action:** Continue to train on the plan integration and coordination aspect, including adding additional information in this AAR, distributing of the RCPGP Plan Analysis Report and evaluating plans in upcoming exercise opportunities.

The current unapproved status of the RCPGP Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Plans by Cal OES puts the local governments and Operational Areas in a difficult planning posture without the ability to clearly move forward utilizing these important tools.

- **Corrective Action:** Cal OES Coastal Region will accept the Regional Catastrophic Earthquake plans as working drafts and work with the Bay Area Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI) jurisdictions and the Cal OES Preparedness Branch to complete a plan review and revision process using identified RCPGP plan AAR gaps with the ultimate goal of plan approval and adoption by mid-late 2015.

The TTXs identified opportunities for plan updates, including the use of the term “people with disabilities and others with access and functional needs”, referencing the California Department of Public Health (CDPH) Emergency Operations Manual (EOM) and the RCPGP Logistics and Restoration of Critical Lifelines Plan operations when completed.

- **Corrective Action:** Cal OES Coastal Region will accept the Regional Catastrophic Earthquake plans as working drafts and work with the Bay Area UASI jurisdictions and the Cal OES Planning and Preparedness Branch to complete a plan review and revision process using identified RCPGP plan AAR gaps, including items related to people with disabilities and those with access and functional needs, the CDPH EOM and the RCPGP Logistics and Restoration of Critical Lifelines plans with the ultimate goal of plan approval and adoption by mid-late 2015.
EXERCISE OVERVIEW

**Exercise Name**
Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Grant Program (RCPGP) Tabletop Exercise (TTX) Series

**Exercise Dates**
- Debris Removal TTX – July 9, 2013
- Mass Care and Sheltering TTX – July 23, 2013
- Volunteer Management TTX – August 1, 2013
- Interim Housing TTX – August 6, 2013
- Donations Management TTX – August 13, 2013
- Mass Transportation/Evacuation TTX – August 21, 2013

**Scope**
The RCPGP TTX Series included six discussion-based exercises. Each exercise was six-hours in duration and included an overview of the associated plans followed by a group or facilitated discussion session. The exercises took place in Dublin, California at the Alameda County Office of Emergency Services (OES). The RCPGP TTX Series followed the Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program methodology and documentation.

**Mission Area(s)**
- Response
- Recovery

**Core Capabilities**
- Critical Transportation
- Housing
- Intelligence and Information Sharing
- Mass Care Services
- Operational Coordination
- Planning
- Public and Private Services and Resources
- Situational Assessment

**Overarching Exercise Objectives:**
1. Review the major components of the Plan to vet and align local government, Bay Area region, State and Federal roles and responsibilities, notification and activation procedures.
2. Discuss critical elements identified during Golden Guardian 2013.
3. Identify gaps and develop recommendations for adoption of the RCPGP plans as Annexes to the Coastal Region Regional Emergency Coordination Plan (RECP) and Operational and Core City Emergency Operations Plans (EOPs).
Debris Removal TTX Objectives:
1. Develop a better understanding of the relationships between debris removal/management plans at the local, regional, State and Federal levels.
2. Review key aspects of the Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Debris Removal Plan, discuss issues, and make specific recommendations.
3. Examine the Debris Task Force identified in the Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Debris Removal Plan, discuss issues, and make specific recommendations.
4. Discuss debris clearance priorities defined in the Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Debris Removal Plan, identify gaps, and make specific recommendations.
5. Evaluate staging and disposal operations defined in the Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Debris Removal Plan, discuss issues, and make specific recommendations.

Mass Care and Sheltering TTX Objectives:
1. Review the roles and responsibilities of critical agencies and organizations identified in the Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Mass Care and Sheltering Plan.
2. Identify the sources of information necessary to build and maintain situational awareness across vertical and horizontal response levels during the first 72 hours after the event.
3. Review the effectiveness of information sharing between entities at various levels of government.

Volunteer Management TTX Objectives:
1. Review the roles and responsibilities of critical agencies and organizations identified in the Regional Volunteer Management Plan.
2. Review and assess the communication and coordination capabilities for volunteer management at all levels of government.
3. Review the effectiveness of information sharing between entities at various levels of government.

Interim Housing TTX Objectives:
1. Review the roles and responsibilities of critical agencies and organizations identified in the Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Interim Housing Plan.
2. Describe how interim housing activities are coordinated from initial activation to one year, as response shifts from meeting immediate needs to supporting long-term recovery.
### Donations Management TTX Objectives:

1. Review the roles and responsibilities of critical agencies and organizations identified in the *Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Donations Management Plan*.
2. Review and assess the communication and coordination capabilities for donations management at all levels of government and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) involved in donations management.

### Mass Transportation/Evacuation TTX Objectives:

1. Review the roles and responsibilities of critical agencies and organizations identified in the *Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Mass Transportation/Evacuation Plan*.
2. Review and assess the communication and coordination capabilities for mass transportation and evacuation at all levels of government.
3. Review the effectiveness of information sharing among entities at various levels of government.

### Natural Disaster (Earthquake)

The exercise series utilized the planning scenario and assumptions located in each of the specific RCPGP plans. The scenario is based on a moment magnitude (M) 7.9 earthquake on the northern segment of the San Andreas fault. The earthquake’s impacts include 300,000 people seeking shelter; 500,000 households without electricity; 1.8 million households without potable water; 7,000 fatalities; 50 million tons of debris; and over one million people requiring transportation assistance because of hazardous conditions or dislocation.

### Sponsor

The Bay Area Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI) has allocated Federal RCPGP funds to develop plans in the following functional areas: Debris Removal, Donations Management, Interim Housing, Mass Care and Sheltering, Mass Fatality, Mass Transportation/Evacuation, and Volunteer Management. For each functional area, a Regional Plan has been developed, as well as local plans for the RCPGP 12 counties and two cities (jurisdictions include Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Monterey, Napa, San Benito, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Solano, and Sonoma counties and the cities of Oakland and San Jose).
The target audience for the TTX Series included Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Region IX, California Governor’s Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES) Coastal Region, Bay Area UASI Operational Areas, Core Cities and our non-governmental partners. A full list of participating agencies can be found in Appendix B.

Janell Myhre  
UASI Regional Program Manager  
(415) 353-5244  
Janell.Myhre@sfgov.org  
Bay Area UASI  
711 Van Ness Avenue, STE 420  
San Francisco, CA 94102

James Godfrey  
Project Manager  
(510) 874-3139  
James.Godfrey02@urs.com  
URS Corporation  
1333 Broadway, STE 800  
Oakland, CA 94612
ANALYSIS OF CORE CAPABILITIES

Aligning exercise objectives and core capabilities provides a consistent taxonomy for evaluation that transcends individual exercises to support preparedness reporting and trend analysis. Table 1 includes the exercise objectives, aligned core capabilities, and performance ratings for each core capability as observed during the exercise and determined by the evaluation team.

Table 1. Summary of Core Capability Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Core Capability</th>
<th>Performed without Challenges (P)</th>
<th>Performed with Some Challenges (S)</th>
<th>Performed with Major Challenges (M)</th>
<th>Unable to be Performed (U)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overarching Exercise Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review the major components of the Plan to vet and align local government, Bay Area region, State and Federal roles and responsibilities, notification and activation procedures.</td>
<td>• Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss critical elements identified during Golden Guardian 2013.</td>
<td>• N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify gaps and develop recommendations for adoption of the RCPGP plans as Annexes to the Coastal Region RECP and Local Government Emergency Operations Plans (EOPs).</td>
<td>• Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debris Removal TTX Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a better understanding of the relationships between debris removal/management plans at the local, regional, State and Federal levels.</td>
<td>• Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review key aspects of the <em>Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Debris Removal Plan</em>, discuss issues, and make specific recommendations.</td>
<td>• Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1. Summary of Core Capability Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Core Capability</th>
<th>Performed without Challenges (P)</th>
<th>Performed with Some Challenges (S)</th>
<th>Performed with Major Challenges (M)</th>
<th>Unable to be Performed (U)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Examine the Debris Task Force identified in the *Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Debris Removal Plan*, discuss issues, and make specific recommendations. | • Planning  
• Operational Coordination          |                                  |                                    | X                                   |                          |
| Discuss debris clearance priorities defined in the *Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Debris Removal Plan*, identify gaps, and make specific recommendations. | • Planning  
• Operational Coordination          |                                    | X                                  |                                      |                          |
| Evaluate staging and disposal operations defined in the *Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Debris Removal Plan*, discuss issues, and make specific recommendations. | • Planning  
• Operational Coordination          |                                    | X                                  |                                      |                          |
| **Mass Care and Sheltering TTX Objectives**                             |                                        |                                  |                                    |                                      |                          |
| Review the roles and responsibilities of critical agencies and organizations identified in the *Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Mass Care and Sheltering Plan*. | • Mass Care Services                   |                                  | X                                  |                                      |                          |
| Identify the sources of information necessary to build and maintain situational awareness across vertical and horizontal response levels during the first 72 hours after the event. | • Situational Assessment              |                                  | X                                  |                                      |                          |
| Review the effectiveness of information-sharing between entities at various levels of government. | • Intelligence and Information Sharing |                                  | X                                  |                                      |                          |
Table 1. Summary of Core Capability Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Core Capability</th>
<th>Performed without Challenges (P)</th>
<th>Performed with Some Challenges (S)</th>
<th>Performed with Major Challenges (M)</th>
<th>Unable to be Performed (U)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volunteer Management TTX Objectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review the roles and responsibilities of critical agencies and organizations identified in the <em>Regional Volunteer Management Plan</em>.</td>
<td>• Public and Private Services and Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and assess the communication and coordination capabilities for volunteer management at all levels of government.</td>
<td>• Operational Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review the effectiveness of information sharing between entities at various levels of government.</td>
<td>• Intelligence and Information Sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interim Housing TTX Objectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review the roles and responsibilities of critical agencies and organizations identified in the <em>Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Interim Housing Plan</em>.</td>
<td>• Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe how interim housing activities are coordinated from initial activation to one year, as response shifts from meeting immediate needs to supporting long-term recovery.</td>
<td>• Operational Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Donations Management TTX Objectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review the roles and responsibilities of critical agencies and organizations identified in the <em>Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Donations Management Plan</em>.</td>
<td>• Public and Private Services and Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and assess the communication and coordination capabilities for donations management at all levels of government and (NGOs involved in donations management.</td>
<td>• Operational Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Summary of Core Capability Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Core Capability</th>
<th>Performed without Challenges (P)</th>
<th>Performed with Some Challenges (S)</th>
<th>Performed with Major Challenges (M)</th>
<th>Unable to be Performed (U)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review the roles and responsibilities of critical agencies and organizations identified in the <em>Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Mass Transportation/ Evacuation Plan</em>.</td>
<td>Critical Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and assess the communication and coordination capabilities for mass transportation/ evacuation at all levels of government.</td>
<td>Operational Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review the effectiveness of information sharing among entities at various levels of government.</td>
<td>Intelligence and Information Sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ratings Definitions:**

- **Performed without Challenges (P):** The targets and critical tasks associated with the core capability were completed in a manner that achieved the objective(s) and did not negatively impact the performance of other activities. Performance of this activity did not contribute to additional health and/or safety risks for the public or for emergency workers, and it was conducted in accordance with applicable plans, policies, procedures, regulations, and laws.

- **Performed with Some Challenges (S):** The targets and critical tasks associated with the core capability were completed in a manner that achieved the objective(s) and did not negatively impact the performance of other activities. Performance of this activity did not contribute to additional health and/or safety risks for the public or for emergency workers, and it was conducted in accordance with applicable plans, policies, procedures, regulations, and laws. However, opportunities to enhance effectiveness and/or efficiency were identified.

- **Performed with Major Challenges (M):** The targets and critical tasks associated with the core capability were completed in a manner that achieved the objective(s), but some or all of the following were observed: demonstrated performance had a negative impact on the performance of other activities; contributed to additional health and/or safety risks for the public or for emergency workers; and/or was not conducted in accordance with applicable plans, policies, procedures, regulations, and laws.

- **Unable to be Performed (U):** The targets and critical tasks associated with the core capability were not performed in a manner that achieved the objective(s).
STRENGTHS AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

The strengths and areas for improvement for each core capability are described in this section. They are broken down by overarching comments; those areas that can apply to all of the Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Plans; and followed by plan-specific comments.

CORE CAPABILITY: CRITICAL TRANSPORTATION

Definition: Provide transportation (including infrastructure access and accessible transportation services) for response priority objectives, including the evacuation of people and animals, and the delivery of vital response personnel, equipment, and services into the affected areas.

Overarching Strengths

N/A

Plan Specific Strengths

Strength 1: The Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Logistics Response Plan covers many areas that are not addressed in the Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Mass Transportation/Evacuation Plan including fuel allocation.

Strength 2: The availability of the 511 system is a positive allowing public and transit agencies to gather information about current transit capabilities.

Strength 3: The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is a well-established information collection and sharing entity- providing important situational awareness within the region.

Areas for Improvement

Area for Improvement 1: The registration of evacuees needs to be further developed in the Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Mass Transportation/Evacuation Plan.

Reference: Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Mass Transportation/Evacuation Plan

Analysis: At this point, the evacuee registration process is not well documented or understood but participants had some suggestions for continued planning. They discussed the registration of evacuees at the reception or destination location and not during the initial evacuation, which would allow more planning time to establish and implement procedures for evacuee registration upon arrival at these destination points.

Area for Improvement 2: There is a significant amount of confusing message overlap between shelter and transportation operations.

Reference: Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Mass Transportation/Evacuation Plan

Analysis: Communication with individuals in the shelters is important to ensure that they do not leave shelters too early, therefore becoming burdensome to their home communities by requiring services that may not yet be available. There is a great deal of overlap and coordination necessary between the various RCPGP Regional Plans but specifically in relation to the coordination of the Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Mass Care and Sheltering Plan and the Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Mass Transportation/Evacuation Plan.
Plan. Further, the re-entry procedures for the displaced population should be included as a transition issue.

**CORE CAPABILITY: HOUSING**

**Definition:** Implement housing solutions that effectively support the needs of the whole community and contribute to its sustainability and resilience.

**Overarching Strengths**

N/A

**Plan Specific Strengths**

**Strength 1:** The Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Interim Housing Plan is an important starting point for the ongoing interim housing planning process in the Bay Area.

**Areas for Improvement**

**Area for Improvement 1:** The Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Interim Housing Plan requires some updating to include agencies and organizations not listed in the plan, and important changes in Federal planning guidance.

**Reference:** Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Interim Housing Plan

**Analysis:** There were a number of agencies and organizations not listed or included in planning responsibilities including the California Resiliency Agency, Coastal Commission, California Department of Water Resources, California and Federal Environmental Protection Agency, California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), California Animal Response in Emergency System (CARES) and the American Red Cross (ARC). Additionally, organizations representing or working with people with disabilities and those with access and functional needs should be included with responsibilities and roles identified accordingly. This list does not automatically imply there is a specific role for these groups listed above, but that participants identified them in discussions. On a positive note, there are more potential partners and stakeholders currently than when the plan was written, so updated information will be required. There have been significant improvements in planning for disaster housing in recent years, with the addition of the National Disaster Housing Strategy and on-line resource center and the National Disaster Recovery Framework with accompanying Recovery Support Functions that should be incorporated into the plan revisions. Some participants also suggested that it is very important to incorporate mitigation into interim housing planning, especially when considering the potential for significant earthquake aftershocks.

**Area for Improvement 2:** It is unclear how the current Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Interim Housing Plan will support people with disabilities and others with access and functional needs within the region.

**Reference:** Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Interim Housing Plan

**Analysis:** The Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Interim Housing Plan does not address the significant number of at-risk populations, and how best to support housing needs for these groups in a catastrophic event. Participants discussed that local government and NGO
representatives are the best resource and knowledge base, since they know their populations and what challenges might arise regarding interim housing needs.

**CORE CAPABILITY: INTELLIGENCE AND INFORMATION SHARING**

**Definition:** Provide timely, accurate, and actionable information resulting from the planning, direction, collection, exploitation, processing, analysis, production, dissemination, evaluation, and feedback of available information concerning threats to the United States, its people, property, or interests; the development, proliferation, or use of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMDs); or any other matter bearing on U.S. national or homeland security by local, State, Federal and other stakeholders. Information sharing is the ability to exchange intelligence, information, data, or knowledge among local, State, Federal or private sector entities, as appropriate.

**Overarching Strengths**

**Strength 1:** Coordination through the regional function is especially critical for public information to have consistent messaging to the public across county lines. Utilization of the Joint Information Center (JIC) and integration of 2-1-1 information and referral services as reflected in several of the plans will help tremendously with effective messaging at local, Operational Area, regional, State and Federal levels.

**Strength 2:** The use of WebEOC® will significantly help information sharing and coordination in an emergency between State, regional and Operational Area representatives. Information will be available to all jurisdictions at the same time – a key milestone in decision making, situational awareness and acquiring a common operating picture.

**Plan Specific Strengths**

**Strength 3:** The Regional Coordination Group (RCG) calls will address sheltering needs and operations as part of the information-sharing process.

**Strength 4:** The use of web-based incident management systems (e.g., WebEOC® in the case of many Bay Area Operational Areas and some local governments), will greatly help the coordination and communication specifically in relationship to sheltering functions.

**Strength 5:** The use and availability of Functional Assessment Service Teams (FAST) will facilitate the sharing of information among all levels of government, private resources and NGOs. FAST, which is administered by the California Department of Social Services, work with shelter providers and other emergency responders to assist in identifying and meeting essential functional needs so that people with disabilities and others with access and functional needs can maintain their, health, safety and independence during disasters.

**Strength 6:** Participants noted that the exercise itself provided a great forum for networking and information sharing. Some requested additional exercises including a multi-jurisdictional Emergency Volunteer Centers (EVC) operations-based exercise, possibly a functional exercise, as a next step after the approval of the Regional Volunteer Management Plan.
Areas for Improvement

Area for Improvement 1: The use of amateur radio (HAM, Radio Amateur Civil Emergency Service [RACES]) is not well-defined in the Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Mass Care and Sheltering Plan, although local governments and Operational Areas use these resources throughout the region.

Reference: Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Mass Care and Sheltering Plan

Analysis: Exercise participants discussed shelter operations using backup communication methods if available. The use of amateur radio was noted as a best practice to support the flow of information from the shelter to Operational Areas in the event first-line communications may be inoperable or even as a backup with normal operations intact. This is often done in the hospital setting during an emergency and has proven to be valuable for coordinating other types of information as well.

Area for Improvement 2: Participants were unclear about recent changes to 2-1-1 staffing and procedures.

Reference: Regional Volunteer Management Plan

Analysis: 2-1-1 California provides a statewide network of local information and referral providers and is a collaboration between the United Ways of California and the California Alliance of Information and Referral Services. The 2-1-1 system plays a crucial role in providing information and support to survivors during disasters, particularly for evacuation and shelter operations. Participants noted that they do not know who is currently in a leadership role for the State’s 2-1-1 system after recent changes, and it is now unclear as to where a 2-1-1 representative will be located during a catastrophic event.

Area for Improvement 3: Public information and messaging is a key area in all the Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Plans and needs to be further developed.

Reference: Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Plans

Analysis: Public information is a critical element of these plans and preemptive public messaging will greatly assist Operational Areas and local governments. The regional function will provide a coordination point between the Operational Areas and the State, ensuring messaging continuity. The templates provided in the Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Donations Management Plan are useful and should be considered a best practice for the other Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Plans. Exercise participants noted that the plans need to emphasize pre-incident communication with key players, and also suggested possibly utilizing the RCG to assist in establishing a common regional message. The use of social media to support plan functions should also be further developed in the other Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Plans.

CORE CAPABILITY: MASS CARE SERVICES

Definition: Provide life-sustaining services to the affected population with a focus on hydration, feeding, and sheltering to those who have the most need, as well as support for reunifying families.

Overarching Strengths

N/A
Plan Specific Strengths

Strength 1: The California Emergency Function 6 Mass Care and Shelter (EF-6) provides coordination and planning assistance to address the management and coordination of the State’s Mass Care and Shelter function. EF-6 was completed recently by the California Department of Social Services and should be incorporated into the Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Mass Care and Sheltering Plan.

Strength 2: The Bay Area UASI developed a Guide for Shelter Operations (2008) which should be considered an additional planning resource, specifically addressing companion animal considerations.

Areas for Improvement

Area for Improvement 1: The Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Mass Care and Sheltering Plan currently does not include references to the Emergency Operations Manual (EOM) developed by the California Department of Public Health (CDPH), or the Guidance for Sheltering People with Medical Needs (2011), its toolkit and the Medical Shelter Plan.


Analysis: The Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Plans were developed primarily from 2008 to 2010 and did not include the information contained in the above-referenced CDPH documents that were issued in 2011. Any future update of the Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Mass Care and Sheltering Plan should incorporate information from these new plans and areas of coordination between the plans should be highlighted.

Area for Improvement 2: The Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Mass Care and Sheltering Plan does not adequately address companion animals in shelter planning.

Reference: Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Mass Care and Sheltering Plan

Analysis: Currently, the plan includes shelter planning for service animals, but does not include any planning guidance for companion animals. This is a topic that should be included in future iterations of the plan.

CORE CAPABILITY: OPERATIONAL COORDINATION

Definition: Establish and maintain a unified and coordinated operational structure and process that appropriately integrates all critical stakeholders and supports the execution of core capabilities.

Overarching Strengths

Strength 1: The RCG, as established in the RECP, provides an effective communication and coordination mechanism for region-level communication, priority setting, and decision-making.

Plan Specific Strengths

Strength 2: The Debris Task Force can support the strategy and decision-making function of the RCG in regards to debris management issues.
Strength 3: Since plan development, there are many new players coming into the field to staff EVCs and enhance capacity to run EVCs. Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) volunteers and the California Volunteers Disaster Corps program are being used by many jurisdictions to augment EVC staffing.

Strength 4: Volunteer coordination in EOCs has progressed and is becoming more recognized as more incident activations occur and volunteer management functions are integrated into exercises such as Golden Guardian 2013. There is still a need for a better understanding of this function within other sectors of emergency operations centers at all Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS) levels.

Strength 5: In current plans, the Joint Field Office (JFO) will create a Joint Housing Task Force to support the survivor housing needs of affected jurisdictions. It is important that this task force have strong local representation to assist with decision-making regarding interim housing issues.

Areas for Improvement

Area for Improvement 1: Some of the current Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Plans do not accurately describe how region-level coordination functions will be executed in response to a catastrophic earthquake incident.

Reference: Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Plans

Analysis: Other catastrophic planning documents such as the San Francisco Bay Area Readiness Response: Concept of Operations Plan (CONPLAN) and the California Catastrophic Incident Base Plan: Concept of Operations (CONOP) assumes that joint Federal/State operations will be conducted at a JFO under the leadership of the Unified Coordination Group (UCG). FEMA plans anticipate the establishment of a JFO within 72-96 hours from the occurrence of a catastrophic incident and the CONOP specifies that response strategy will be implemented using a combined geographic and functional organization to support decision-making and resource integration at the lowest operational level. To accomplish this strategy, an affected area will be subdivided into divisions or branches, subject to the requirements of the incident. Although the Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Plans mention that the REOC may not be functional under the planning scenario, the plans, for the most part, describe coordination activities occurring at the REOC. As one participant noted, most of the plans cite the REOC several hundred times, which would appear to conflict with Federal and State doctrine as established in the CONPLAN and the CONOP, which assume that regional coordination activities will be conducted at the JFO. The plan should more accurately describe the role of the JFO pertaining to regional coordination activities and, more specifically, the relationship of the RCG to the UCG.

Area for Improvement 2: The Debris Task Force as currently described does not identify the most effective methods to collect information and data from regional representatives.

Reference: Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Debris Removal Plan, WebEOC Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs)

Analysis: Bay Area jurisdictions are implementing a new Emergency Operations Center (EOC) management software system based on WebEOC®, which will significantly affect how information is shared and decision-making is coordinated throughout the Region. WebEOC® and other web-based management systems have the ability to support the data collection and information-gathering process on which the Debris Task Force and the RCG
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will rely. Exercise participants suggested posting data collecting tools or templates on the Cal EOC system, which will make certain WebEOC® is considered a support structure for the Debris Task Force.

**Area for Improvement 3:** Operational Areas have varied levels of capabilities and capacities to operate EVCs making it difficult to anticipate their need for assistance.

**Reference:** Regional Volunteer Management Plan

**Analysis:** There is considerable diversity among Operational Areas in terms of readiness and capacity for volunteer coordination and management of EVCs. Some Operational Areas have tested plans for EVCs, even down to the city level, while others have barely started to develop plans or lack resources to implement their plans. Many Operational Areas and local government emergency managers would look to the State for assistance in staffing EVCs if they cannot be staffed with local resources.

**Area for Improvement 4:** It is unclear how Northern California Voluntary Organizations Active in Disasters (VOAD) will support region-level operations, particularly in volunteer and donations management.

**Reference:** Regional Volunteer Management Plan and Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Donations Management Plan

**Analysis:** Local VOADs and intermediary organizations representing NGOs have a key role in addressing service gaps and providing critical post-disaster services to survivors and especially to those with disabilities and others with access and functional needs. These organizations also assist local governments with activities related to donations and volunteer management. Northern California VOAD represents these organizations at the regional and State levels, but the Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Plans do not clearly describe how coordination will occur at either the REOC or the JFO.

**Area for Improvement 5:** The role of the Volunteer Center is not adequately addressed in the current Regional Volunteer Management Plan.

**Reference:** Regional Volunteer Management Plan

**Analysis:** CaliforniaVolunteers is responsible for volunteer coordination at the State level and will, if requested, deploy staff to the regional level to assist with coordination. CaliforniaVolunteers works and communicates with volunteer centers throughout the State on a regular basis and during emergencies. At the State or regional level, the role of Volunteer Centers needs further clarification, particularly in light of the dormant state of the California Association of Volunteer Centers. As a possible next step, the method for Volunteer Center communication and coordination with the regional and State levels should be reviewed and explained.

**Area for Improvement 6:** The information regarding the State Coordinated Housing Task Force (now the Joint Housing Task Force) should be updated, based on more recent Federal housing guidance.

**Reference:** Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Interim Housing Plan

**Analysis:** Since Hurricane Katrina and other recent large-scale disaster incidents, the Federal government has sought to continuously improve its disaster housing operations. FEMA has updated its National Disaster Housing Strategy, created a National Disaster Housing Strategy...
Resource Center website, and created a Housing Recovery Support Function as part of the new National Disaster Recovery Framework. Further, the RECP Recovery Subsidiary Plan establishes a Housing Working Group convened by the Regional Recovery Task Force and it is unclear how this working group would coordinate with a Joint Housing Task Force established as part of the JFO.

**Area for Improvement 7:** There is a lack of knowledge regarding the types of assistance that could be provided by the Federal government under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (Stafford Act) to support interim housing activities.

**Reference:** Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Interim Housing Plan

**Analysis:** Many emergency managers at the local and regional levels have not had recent significant experience dealing with housing programs implemented after a major disaster or emergency under the Stafford Act. Things have changed in the housing area, most significantly after Hurricane Katrina, with the development of the National Disaster Housing Strategy and, more recently, with the creation of the National Disaster Recovery Framework. State and local emergency management personnel need education and training on new disaster housing programs and the Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Interim Housing Plan should be updated to incorporate current guidance.

**Area for Improvement 8:** There is a need for clarification of roles and responsibilities of the Donations Coordination Team (DCT).

**Reference:** Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Donations Management Plan

**Analysis:** More clarification is needed on whether and how a Regional DCT will function, especially in coordination with the State Operations Center (SOC). For example, will there be Regional and State level DCTs? As California Emergency Function 17 Volunteer and Donations Management (EF-17) is developed, there may be some changes in how this concept is implemented.

**CORE CAPABILITY: PLANNING**

**Definition:** Conduct a systematic process engaging the whole community as appropriate in the development of executable strategic, operational, and/or community-based approaches to meet defined objectives.

**Over arching Strengths**

**Strength 1:** A majority of exercise participants noted that the plan review sessions were helpful and provided an opportunity to better understanding the relationship among Federal, State, Regional, Operational Area and local plans. Many participants noted that these sessions were a good refresher on the numerous plans.

**Strength 2:** The plan review sessions (specifically the first half of agenda) were tailored and adjusted for each exercise based on current planning efforts, information shared from stakeholder groups and with input from plan subject matter experts (SMEs). This allowed participants to receive updated information for plans that were of particular concern to their area of expertise.
Strength 3: The Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Plans were reviewed and validated in recent years and many exercise participants were part of the planning efforts, vetting sessions and workshops, providing their unique perspective.

Strength 4: Participants noted that the Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Plans represent good frameworks, even if some portions require updating, and, as such, should be approved and adopted by Cal OES.

Strength 5: The exercises themselves provided a forum to review plans, gather feedback, and identify areas that may require updates or changes based on newer information, plans and Federal and State guidance.

Plan Specific Strengths

Strength 6: Participants support the purpose of the Debris Task Force as depicted in the Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Debris Removal Plan however; the task force participants, structure and meeting/call frequency and other operational protocols should be further defined.

Strength 7: Participants viewed the RCG as the body to identify debris clearance priorities within the plan to ensure the flow of information and that regional priorities are properly coordinated.

Strength 8: The State and Region have some resources available to support staging and disposal of debris.

Strength 9: The Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Donations Management Plan components and structure were generally reviewed with input from local, regional, and State level representatives, as well as NGOs. Roles and responsibilities were agreed to generally, and there are good relationships among all levels of government. The plan “came alive” in the Donations Management TTX and many participants’ gained a better understanding of plan components and of the connection with other key players and sectors.

Strength 10: The successful use of two exercise scenario timeframes underscored the fact that donations management operational challenges are likely to change over time.

Areas for Improvement

Area for Improvement 1: The level of knowledge and understanding of the Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Plans, RECP and supporting plans was remarkably uneven among the participants.


Analysis: Some exercise participants were very familiar with the plans, either from being part of a stakeholder group, or by their role representing key agencies. On the other hand, a significant number of exercise participants were very unfamiliar with some key SEMS concepts, State and Federal catastrophic planning guidance, and the purpose of the Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Plans. More training needs to be developed and provided on the
Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Plans and other foundational Federal and State plans and guidance documents.

**Area for Improvement 2:** The failure of Cal OES to approve and adopt these plans causes plan approval and adoption problems for the Operational Areas and Core Cities.

**Reference:** Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Plans, Operational Area and Core City Plans

**Analysis:** The current unapproved status of the Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Plans impedes the Operational Areas from making the necessary updates to supporting plans to include EOPs, annexes, and SOPs. Although some jurisdictions do not anticipate adopting and using the RCPGP functional annexes as part of their EOPs, more than half of the Operational Areas and core cities intend to include and use them. Many exercise participants urge Cal OES to approve and adopt the plans to facilitate their use during a catastrophic earthquake event, and, more immediately, the training and education that needs to go along with their adoption. As noted previously in this report, many Bay Area stakeholders do not know about these plans and will not be able to properly implement them during an emergency. There is a significant need for a Bay Area-wide “unveiling” of these plans following their approval. Additionally, during Golden Guardian 2013 some jurisdictions utilized the Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Plans while others were unaware of them entirely, which creates a challenging response environment negatively affecting communication and coordination.

**Area for Improvement 3:** The definitions and planning considerations for people with disabilities and others with access and functional needs are not up-to-date in the plans, or with existing Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs).

**Reference:** Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Plans

**Analysis:** As noted in this report, the Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Plans were developed primarily from 2008 to 2010. There have been changes to terminology, definitions, and planning approaches that need to be incorporated moving forward. Additionally, new planning guidance and best practices can be utilized.

**Area for Improvement 4:** The roles, responsibilities, and operating protocols for the Debris Task Force are not well-defined in the plan, nor are the process by which the Debris Task Force de-mobilizes and its functions transfer to the Debris Management Working Group that reports to the Regional Recovery Task Force.

**Reference:** Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Debris Removal Plan, Regional Emergency Coordination Plan, RECP Recovery Subsidiary Plan

**Analysis:** There is a need for clarification of the Debris Task Force specifically the roles and responsibilities, participating agencies and frequency of interaction. Some participants noted that the language itself - “task force” - lends itself to describe an actionable or boots-on-the-ground group even though this is not the intention of this group. A participant suggested that a better term would be “task group,” to differentiate these groups from task forces that are used at the field level. Most likely, the task force will be held via conference call and not in person. The protocols outlined for the RCG have been identified as a potential initial solution since they are clearly identified in current planning documents such as the RECP. Further, the RECP Recovery Subsidiary Plan authorizes the convening of a Debris Management Working Group under the authority of the Regional Recovery Task Force. Additionally, there is a lack of a regional solution in respect to the final processing and disposal of debris, and
that should be addressed at the region-level by the Debris Task Force or other group established to coordinate regional debris management issues. Although this working group assumes responsibility for coordinating debris management activities during the recovery phase, which is beyond the response timeline in the Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Debris Removal Plan, the plan should address how a hand-off of responsibilities will occur between the Debris Task Force and the Debris Management Working Group.

**Area for Improvement 5:** The Catastrophic Earthquake Debris Removal Plan does not provide guidance on how to identify priority routes for debris clearance.

**Reference:** Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Debris Removal Plan

**Analysis:** Participants discussed the need for a planning checklist or guidance to assist with the identification of debris clearance routes following a catastrophic event. This information needs to be included in future iterations of the plan.

**Area for Improvement 6:** The Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Debris Removal Plan should include some general criteria to assist in site selection.

**Reference:** Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Debris Removal Plan

**Analysis:** The pre-incident identification of staging and new disposal sites will most likely trigger review under the California Environmental Quality Act, which most jurisdictions prefer to avoid. However, it would be appropriate and prudent to establish some criteria to assist in the identification of staging and disposal sites, if not already done, to expedite the post-disaster identification of these sites. This list should include characteristics that make a good site and those that do not – even if the information is somewhat generic, it will allow jurisdictions to better understand what to look for in site selection.

**Area for Improvement 7:** Recovery aspects of donations management is not addressed in the current Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Donations Management Plan.

**Reference:** Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Donations Management Plan, RECP, RECP Recovery Subsidiary Plan

**Analysis:** Donations (both monetary and in-kind) are a critical resource for long-term recovery. Because of the E+60 day timeframe of the plan, donations management should be a key component and addressed as part of regional recovery planning and, as such, be incorporated into updates of the RECP and its Recovery Subsidiary Plan.

**CORE CAPABILITY: PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SERVICES AND RESOURCES**

**Definition:** Provide essential public and private services and resources to the affected population and surrounding communities, to include emergency power to critical facilities, fuel support for emergency responders, and access to community staples (e.g., grocery stores, pharmacies, and banks) and fire and other first response services.

**Overarching Strengths**

**Strength 1:** The role of the Business Operations Center (BOC) at the SOC will now take on a larger role with the implementation of the UCG and having one centralized coordination location encompassing both State and regional levels. This is considered a positive aspect but should be better incorporated into future revisions.
**Plan Specific Strengths**

**Strength 2:** The exercise brought together the appropriate mix of participants who work in the area of volunteer management. There was a high level of discussion and problem solving.

**Strength 3:** The existence of the Regional Volunteer Management Plan enabled participants to have a valuable discussion of the plan - not just a theoretical discussion.

**Strength 4:** The Regional Volunteer Management Plan lays the foundation for CaliforniaVolunteers to work with the region and the Operational Areas for effective overall communication and coordination in the Bay Area on volunteer management.

**Strength 5:** At the State level, CaliforniaVolunteers is the lead for the volunteer management function and will coordinate with California EF-17. CaliforniaVolunteers has the experience and expertise providing this critical support to the Operational Areas and local governments.

**Strength 6:** Although short-staffed, CaliforniaVolunteers has the ability to support volunteer management coordination at various SEMS levels by using its own staff or other resources such as the Disaster Corps, CERT, Emergency Managers Mutual Aid (EMMA), and the Emergency Management Assistance Compact (EMAC).

**Areas for Improvement**

**Area for Improvement 1:** There is some confusion over NGOs’ roles and responsibilities in support of volunteer management activities at the Operational Area level.

  **Reference:** Regional Volunteer Management Plan

  **Analysis:** While NGOs play critical operational roles, their methods of operation as well as communication and coordination at the regional-level need further examination.

**Area for Improvement 2:** The role and volunteer assets of private business need to be further examined.

  **Reference:** Regional Volunteer Management Plan

  **Analysis:** The private sector is becoming more integrated into emergency planning and may be a source for volunteers as businesses become more interested in finding opportunities for employees to volunteer after disasters. As a potential next step, the role of private business should be discussed further and included into the planning process for volunteer management.

**Area for Improvement 3:** The Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Interim Housing Plan does not address potential housing resources that regional businesses may be able to provide during a catastrophic event.

  **Reference:** Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Interim Housing Plan

  **Analysis:** There are many large corporations within the Bay Area, including tech companies that may be a resource for housing employees displaced by an event. Planners should identify the feasibility of leveraging these resources and discuss with local corporations.

**Area for Improvement 4:** There is inadequate staffing to successfully support donations management capabilities at the Operational Area level.
**Reference:** Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Donations Management Plan

**Analysis:** Capacity, especially staffing, continues to be an issue at the Operational Area/local government level. Future planning efforts should continue to identify staffing pools and needs. The feasibility of utilizing EMMA and EMAC to support donations management capabilities should be determined.

---

**CORE CAPABILITY: SITUATIONAL AWARENESS**

**Definition:** Provide all decision makers with decision-relevant information regarding the nature and extent of the hazard, any cascading effects, and the status of the response.

**Overarching Strengths**

N/A

**Plan Specific Strengths**

**Strength 1:** There are existing sheltering populations tracking systems, including a Federal system called National Shelter System and is maintained by FEMA and the ARC. A Fact Sheet on the National Shelter System can be viewed at: [http://www.fema.gov/public-assistance-local-state-tribal-and-non-profit/recovery-directorate/fema-national-shelter](http://www.fema.gov/public-assistance-local-state-tribal-and-non-profit/recovery-directorate/fema-national-shelter)

**Areas for Improvement**

**Area for Improvement 1:** The Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Mass Care and Sheltering Plan updates should include the use of social media to assist with pushing out shelter information, as well as to support family welfare and reunification efforts.

**Reference:** Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Mass Care and Sheltering Plan

**Analysis:** The increase in social media (Twitter, Facebook, etc.) can be utilized to gather needed information about affected populations and survivors and push out sheltering information. The use of social media should also be considered in reunification efforts.
APPENDIX A: IMPROVEMENT PLAN

This IP has been developed specifically for the San Francisco Bay Area Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI) as a result of the RCPGP TTX Series conducted July 9-August 21, 2013.

Table 2. Improvement Plan

| Core Capability | Issue/Area for Improvement | Corrective Action | Capability Element | Primary Responsible Organization | Organization POC | Start Date | Completion Date |
|-----------------|---------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|------------|----------------|---|
| Critical Transportation | 1. The registration of evacuees needs to be further developed in the Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Mass Transportation/Evacuation Plan. | 1. Cal OES accepts current RCPGP plans as draft. | Planning | Cal OES | • Coastal Region Administrator<br>• Planning & Preparedness Branch | January 2014<br>June 2014 |
| | | | | | | |
| | 2. Bay Area counties and core cities move forward with plan adoption. | Planning | BAUASI, Operational Areas and Core Cities | • Coastal Region Administrator<br>• Planning & Preparedness Branch | January 2014<br>December 2014 |
| | | | | | |
| | 3. Cal OES updates RCPGP Regional Plans based on AAR findings and in conjunction with CONPLAN revisions. | Planning | Cal OES | • Coastal Region Administrator<br>• Planning & Preparedness Branch | January 2014<br>June 2015 |
| | | | | | |
| | 4. Cal OES provides final acceptance of the RCPGP Regional Plans. | Planning | Cal OES | • Coastal Region Administrator<br>• Planning & Preparedness Branch | June 2015<br>December 2015 |

1 Capability Elements are: Planning, Organization, Equipment, Training, or Exercise.
### Table 2. Improvement Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Capability</th>
<th>Issue/Area for Improvement</th>
<th>Corrective Action</th>
<th>Capability Element</th>
<th>Primary Responsible Organization</th>
<th>Organization POC</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>2. There is a significant</td>
<td>1. Cal OES accepts</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td>Coastal Region</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>amount of confusing</td>
<td>current RCPGP plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(cont.)</td>
<td>message overlap between</td>
<td>as draft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shelter and transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preparedness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>operations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Branch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Bay Area counties</td>
<td>2. Bay Area counties</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>BAUASI, Operational</td>
<td>Coastal Region</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and core cities move</td>
<td>and core cities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Areas and Core Cites</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>forward with plan</td>
<td>move forward with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adoption.</td>
<td>plan adoption.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preparedness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RCPGP Regional Plans</td>
<td>RCPGP Regional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>based on AAR findings</td>
<td>Plans based on AAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and in conjunction with</td>
<td>and in conjunction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preparedness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONPLAN revisions.</td>
<td>with CONPLAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Branch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>final acceptance of the</td>
<td>final acceptance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RCPGP Regional Plans</td>
<td>of the RCPGP Regional Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preparedness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Core Capability: Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Capability</th>
<th>Issue/Area for Improvement</th>
<th>Corrective Action</th>
<th>Capability Element</th>
<th>Primary Responsible Organization</th>
<th>Organization POC</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>1. The Regional Catastrophic</td>
<td>1. Cal OES accepts</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td>Coastal Region</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earthquake Interim Housing</td>
<td>current RCPGP plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan requires some</td>
<td>as draft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>updating to include</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preparedness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agencies and organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Branch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not listed in the plan,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and important changes in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal planning guidance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2. Improvement Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Capability</th>
<th>Issue/Area for Improvement</th>
<th>Corrective Action</th>
<th>Capability Element</th>
<th>Primary Responsible Organization</th>
<th>Organization POC</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing (cont.)</td>
<td>1. cont. The Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Interim Housing Plan requires some updating to include agencies and organizations not listed in the plan, and important changes in Federal planning guidance.</td>
<td>2. Bay Area counties and core cities move forward with plan adoption.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>BAUASI, Operational Areas and Core Cities</td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. It was unclear how the current Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Interim Housing Plan will support people with disabilities and others with access and functional needs within the region.</td>
<td>1. Cal OES accepts current RCPGP plans as draft.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BAUASI, Operational Areas and Core Cities</td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2. Improvement Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Capability</th>
<th>Issue/Area for Improvement</th>
<th>Corrective Action</th>
<th>Capability Element</th>
<th>Primary Responsible Organization</th>
<th>Organization POC</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing (cont.)</td>
<td>2. cont. It was unclear how the current Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Interim Housing Plan will support people with disabilities and others with access and functional needs within the region.</td>
<td>3. Cal OES updates RCPGP Regional Plans based on AAR findings and in conjunction with CONPLAN revisions.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator • Planning &amp; Preparedness Branch</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Cal OES provides final acceptance of the RCPGP Regional Plans.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator • Planning &amp; Preparedness Branch</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Core Capability: Intelligence and Information Sharing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Capability: Intelligence and Information Sharing</th>
<th>Issue/Area for Improvement</th>
<th>Corrective Action</th>
<th>Capability Element</th>
<th>Primary Responsible Organization</th>
<th>Organization POC</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. The use of amateur radio (HAM, Radio Amateur Civil Emergency Service [RACES]) is not well-defined in the Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Mass Care and Sheltering Plan, although local governments and Operational Areas use these resources throughout the region.</td>
<td>1. Cal OES accepts current RCPGP plans as draft.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator • Planning &amp; Preparedness Branch</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Bay Area counties and core cities move forward with plan adoption.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>BAUASI, Operational Areas and Core Cities</td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator • Planning &amp; Preparedness Branch</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2. Improvement Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Capability</th>
<th>Issue/Area for Improvement</th>
<th>Corrective Action</th>
<th>Capability Element</th>
<th>Primary Responsible Organization</th>
<th>Organization POC</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence and Information Sharing (cont.)</td>
<td>1. cont. The use of amateur radio (HAM, Radio Amateur Civil Emergency Service [RACES]) is not well-defined in the Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Mass Care and Sheltering Plan, although local governments and Operational Areas use these resources throughout the region.</td>
<td>Planning Cal OES updates RCPGP Regional Plans based on AAR findings and in conjunction with CONPLAN revisions.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Participants were unclear about recent changes to 2-1-1 staffing and procedures.</td>
<td>1. Provide guidance and information on the current 2-1-1 staffing and procedures to Operational Areas and cities.</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>2-1-1 Bay Area Counties and Cities Bay Area United Way</td>
<td>• OES Manager</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Public information and messaging is a key area in all the Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Plans and needs to be further developed.</td>
<td>Planning Cal OES accepts current RCPGP plans as draft.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Bay Area counties and core cities move forward with plan adoption.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>BUAASI, Operational Areas and Core Cites</td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Capability</td>
<td>Issue/Area for Improvement</td>
<td>Corrective Action</td>
<td>Capability Element</td>
<td>Primary Responsible Organization</td>
<td>Organization POC</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>Completion Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence and Information Sharing (cont.)</td>
<td>3. cont. Public information and messaging is a key area in all the Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Plans and needs to be further developed.</td>
<td>3. Cal OES updates RCPGP Regional Plans based on AAR findings and in conjunction with CONPLAN revisions.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td>Coastal Region Administrator, Planning &amp; Preparedness Branch</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Care Services</td>
<td>1. The Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Mass Care and Sheltering Plan currently does not include references to the Emergency Operations Manual (EOM) developed by the California Department of Public Health (CDPH), or the Guidance for Sheltering People with Medical Needs (2011), its toolkit and the Medical Shelter Plan.</td>
<td>1. Cal OES accepts current RCPGP plans as draft.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td>Coastal Region Administrator, Planning &amp; Preparedness Branch</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Bay Area counties and core cities move forward with plan adoption.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>BAUASI, Operational Areas and Core Cities</td>
<td>Coastal Region Administrator, Planning &amp; Preparedness Branch</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Capability</td>
<td>Issue/Area for Improvement</td>
<td>Corrective Action</td>
<td>Capability Element</td>
<td>Primary Responsible Organization</td>
<td>Organization POC</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>Completion Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Mass Care       | 1. cont. The Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Mass Care and Sheltering Plan currently does not include references to the Emergency Operations Manual (EOM) developed by the California Department of Public Health (CDPH), or the Guidance for Sheltering People with Medical Needs (2011), its toolkit and the Medical Shelter Plan. | Planning | Cal OES | • Coastal Region Administrator  
• Planning & Preparedness Branch | January 2014 | June 2015 |
| Services (cont.) | 2. The Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Mass Care and Sheltering Plan does not adequately address companion animals in shelter planning. | Planning | Cal OES | • Coastal Region Administrator  
• Planning & Preparedness Branch | January 2014 | June 2014 |
|                 | 1. Cal OES accepts current RCPGP plans as draft. | Planning | BAUASI, Operational Areas and Core Cites | • Coastal Region Administrator  
• Planning & Preparedness Branch | January 2014 | December 2014 |
|                 | 2. Bay Area counties and core cities move forward with plan adoption. | Planning | Cal OES | • Coastal Region Administrator  
• Planning & Preparedness Branch | January 2014 | December 2014 |
|                 | 3. Cal OES updates RCPGP Regional Plans based on AAR findings and in conjunction with CONPLAN revisions. | Planning | Cal OES | • Coastal Region Administrator  
• Planning & Preparedness Branch | January 2014 | June 2015 |
### Table 2. Improvement Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Capability</th>
<th>Issue/Area for Improvement</th>
<th>Corrective Action</th>
<th>Capability Element</th>
<th>Primary Responsible Organization</th>
<th>Organization POC</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mass Care Services (cont.)</td>
<td>2. cont. The Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Mass Care and Sheltering Plan does not adequately address companion animals in shelter planning.</td>
<td>4. Cal OES provides final acceptance of the RCPGP Regional Plans.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Coordination</td>
<td>1. Some of the current Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Plans do not accurately describe how region-level coordination functions will be executed in response to a catastrophic earthquake incident.</td>
<td>1. Cal OES accepts current RCPGP plans as draft.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Bay Area counties and core cities move forward with plan adoption.</td>
<td>2. Bay Area counties and core cities move forward with plan adoption.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>BAUASI, Operational Areas and Core Cites</td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Cal OES updates RCPGP Regional Plans based on AAR findings and in conjunction with CONPLAN revisions.</td>
<td>3. Cal OES updates RCPGP Regional Plans based on AAR findings and in conjunction with CONPLAN revisions.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Cal OES provides final acceptance of the RCPGP Regional Plans.</td>
<td>4. Cal OES provides final acceptance of the RCPGP Regional Plans.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 2. Improvement Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Capability</th>
<th>Issue/Area for Improvement</th>
<th>Corrective Action</th>
<th>Capability Element</th>
<th>Primary Responsible Organization</th>
<th>Organization POC</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Operational Coordination (cont.)| 2. The Debris Task Force as currently described does not identify the most effective methods to collect information and data from regional representatives. | 1. Cal OES accepts current RCPGP plans as draft.                                    | Planning           | Cal OES                          | • Coastal Region Administrator  
  • Planning & Preparedness Branch                                                 | January 2014       | June 2014                     |
|                                 |                                                                                              | 2. Bay Area counties and core cities move forward with plan adoption.              | Planning           | BAUASI, Operational Areas and Core Cities  
                                                                      |                                                                | • Coastal Region Administrator  
  • Planning & Preparedness Branch                                                 | January 2014       | December 2014                  |
|                                 |                                                                                              | 3. Cal OES updates RCPGP Regional Plans based on AAR findings and in conjunction with CONPLAN revisions. | Planning           | Cal OES                          | • Coastal Region Administrator  
  • Planning & Preparedness Branch                                                 | January 2014       | June 2015                     |
|                                 |                                                                                              | 4. Cal OES provides final acceptance of the RCPGP Regional Plans.                  | Planning           | Cal OES                          | • Coastal Region Administrator  
  • Planning & Preparedness Branch                                                 | June 2015          | December 2015                  |
|                                 | 3. Operational Areas have varied levels of capabilities and capacities to operate EVCs making it difficult to anticipate their need for assistance. | 1. Cal OES accepts current RCPGP plans as draft.                                    | Planning           | Cal OES                          | • Coastal Region Administrator  
  • Planning & Preparedness Branch                                                 | January 2014       | June 2014                     |
|                                 |                                                                                              | 2. Bay Area counties and core cities move forward with plan adoption.              | Planning           | BAUASI, Operational Areas and Core Cities  
                                                                      |                                                                | • Coastal Region Administrator  
  • Planning & Preparedness Branch                                                 | January 2014       | December 2014                  |
### Table 2. Improvement Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Capability</th>
<th>Issue/Area for Improvement</th>
<th>Corrective Action</th>
<th>Capability Element</th>
<th>Primary Responsible Organization</th>
<th>Organization POC</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                 |                           | 3. cont. Operational Areas have varied levels of capabilities and capacities to operate EVCs making it difficult to anticipate their need for assistance. | Planning | Cal OES | • Coastal Region Administrator  
• Planning & Preparedness Branch | January 2014 | June 2015 |
|                 |                           | 4. Cal OES updates RCPGP Regional Plans based on AAR findings and in conjunction with CONPLAN revisions. | Planning | Cal OES | • Coastal Region Administrator  
• Planning & Preparedness Branch | January 2014 | June 2015 |
| Operational Coordination (cont.) |                           | 4. Cal OES provides final acceptance of the RCPGP Regional Plans. | Planning | Cal OES | • Coastal Region Administrator  
• Planning & Preparedness Branch | June 2015 | December 2015 |
|                           |                           | 1. Cal OES accepts current RCPGP plans as draft. | Planning | Cal OES | • Coastal Region Administrator  
• Planning & Preparedness Branch | January 2014 | June 2014 |
|                           |                           | 2. Bay Area counties and core cities move forward with plan adoption. | Planning | BAUASI, Operational Areas and Core Cities | • Coastal Region Administrator  
• Planning & Preparedness Branch | January 2014 | December 2014 |
|                           |                           | 3. Cal OES updates RCPGP Regional Plans based on AAR findings and in conjunction with CONPLAN revisions. | Planning | Cal OES | • Coastal Region Administrator  
• Planning & Preparedness Branch | January 2014 | June 2015 |
|                           |                           | 4. Cal OES provides final acceptance of the RCPGP Regional Plans. | Planning | Cal OES | • Coastal Region Administrator  
• Planning & Preparedness Branch | June 2015 | December 2015 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Capability</th>
<th>Issue/Area for Improvement</th>
<th>Corrective Action</th>
<th>Capability Element</th>
<th>Primary Responsible Organization</th>
<th>Organization POC</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Operational Coordination (cont.) | 5. The role of the Volunteer Center is not adequately addressed in the current Regional Volunteer Management Plan. | 1. Cal OES accepts current RCPGP plans as draft. | Planning | Cal OES | • Coastal Region Administrator  
• Planning & Preparedness Branch | January 2014 | June 2014 |
| | 2. Bay Area counties and core cities move forward with plan adoption. | Planning | BAUASI, Operational Areas and Core Cites | Cal OES | • Coastal Region Administrator  
• Planning & Preparedness Branch | January 2014 | December 2014 |
| | 3. Cal OES updates RCPGP Regional Plans based on AAR findings and in conjunction with CONPLAN revisions. | Planning | Cal OES | Cal OES | • Coastal Region Administrator  
• Planning & Preparedness Branch | January 2014 | June 2015 |
| | 4. Cal OES provides final acceptance of the RCPGP Regional Plans. | Planning | Cal OES | Cal OES | • Coastal Region Administrator  
• Planning & Preparedness Branch | June 2015 | December 2015 |
| | 6. The information regarding the State Coordinated Housing Task Force (now the Joint Housing Task Force) should be updated, based on more recent Federal housing guidance. | 1. Cal OES accepts current RCPGP plans as draft. | Planning | Cal OES | • Coastal Region Administrator  
• Planning & Preparedness Branch | January 2014 | June 2014 |
## Table 2. Improvement Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Capability</th>
<th>Issue/Area for Improvement</th>
<th>Corrective Action</th>
<th>Capability Element</th>
<th>Primary Responsible Organization</th>
<th>Organization POC</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6. cont.                         | The information regarding the State Coordinated Housing Task Force (now the Joint Housing Task Force) should be updated, based on more recent Federal housing guidance. | 2. Bay Area counties and core cities move forward with plan adoption.             | Planning           | BAUASI, Operational Areas and Core Cites | • Coastal Region Administrator  
                                 |                                                                              |                                                                   |                    | Planning & Preparedness Branch | January 2014 | December 2014 |
| 3. cont.                         | 3. Cal OES updates RCPGP Regional Plans based on AAR findings and in conjunction with CONPLAN revisions. | Planning Cal OES                                                                  |                    | Cal OES                          | • Coastal Region Administrator  
                                 |                                                                              |                                                                   |                    |                                  | Planning & Preparedness Branch | January 2014 | June 2015      |
| 4. cont.                         | 4. Cal OES provides final acceptance of the RCPGP Regional Plans.                          | Planning Cal OES                                                                  |                    | Cal OES                          | • Coastal Region Administrator  
                                 |                                                                              |                                                                   |                    |                                  | Planning & Preparedness Branch | June 2015     | December 2015  |
| 7. cont.                         | 7. There is a lack of knowledge regarding the types of assistance that could be provided by the Federal government under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (Stafford Act) to support interim housing activities. | 1. Cal OES accepts current RCPGP plans as draft.                                  | Planning           | Cal OES                          | • Coastal Region Administrator  
                                 |                                                                              |                                                                   |                    |                                  | Planning & Preparedness Branch | January 2014 | June 2014      |
|                                  |                                                                                            | 2. Bay Area counties and core cities move forward with plan adoption.             | Planning           | BAUASI, Operational Areas and Core Cites | • Coastal Region Administrator  
                                 |                                                                              |                                                                   |                    |                                  | Planning & Preparedness Branch | January 2014 | December 2014  |
### Table 2. Improvement Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Capability</th>
<th>Issue/Area for Improvement</th>
<th>Corrective Action</th>
<th>Capability Element</th>
<th>Primary Responsible Organization</th>
<th>Organization POC</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operational Coordination (cont.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7. cont. There is a lack of knowledge regarding the types of assistance that could be provided by the Federal government under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (Stafford Act) to support interim housing activities.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td>Coastal Region Administrator</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Cal OES updates RCPGP Regional Plans based on AAR findings and in conjunction with CONPLAN revisions.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Preparedness Branch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. There is a need for clarification of roles and responsibilities of the Donations Coordination Team.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Preparedness Branch</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Cal OES accepts current RCPGP plans as draft.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td>Coastal Region Administrator</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Bay Area counties and core cities move forward with plan adoption.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>BAUASI, Operational Areas and Core Cites</td>
<td>Coastal Region Administrator</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Cal OES updates RCPGP Regional Plans based on AAR findings and in conjunction with CONPLAN revisions.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Preparedness Branch</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Capability</td>
<td>Issue/Area for Improvement</td>
<td>Corrective Action</td>
<td>Capability Element</td>
<td>Primary Responsible Organization</td>
<td>Organization POC</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>Completion Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>1. The level of knowledge and understanding of the Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Plans, RECP and supporting plans was remarkably uneven among the participants.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Planning &amp; Preparedness Branch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>BAUASI, Operational Areas and Core Cites</td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Planning &amp; Preparedness Branch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Planning &amp; Preparedness Branch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2. Improvement Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Capability</th>
<th>Issue/Area for Improvement</th>
<th>Corrective Action</th>
<th>Capability Element</th>
<th>Primary Responsible Organization</th>
<th>Organization POC</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Planning (cont.)| 2. The failure of Cal OES to approve and adopt these plans causes plan approval and adoption problems for the Operational Areas and Core Cities. | 1. Cal OES accepts current RCPGP plans as draft.                                    | Planning           | Cal OES                          | • Coastal Region Administrator  
• Planning & Preparedness Branch                                                  | January 2014   | June 2014                      |
|                 |                                                                                             | 2. Bay Area counties and core cities move forward with plan adoption.               | Planning           | BAUASI, Operational Areas and Core Cites | • Coastal Region Administrator  
• Planning & Preparedness Branch                                                  | January 2014   | December 2014                  |
|                 |                                                                                             | 3. Cal OES updates RCPGP Regional Plans based on AAR findings and in conjunction with CONPLAN revisions. | Planning           | Cal OES                          | • Coastal Region Administrator  
• Planning & Preparedness Branch                                                  | January 2014   | June 2015                      |
|                 |                                                                                             | 4. Cal OES provides final acceptance of the RCPGP Regional Plans.                   | Planning           | Cal OES                          | • Coastal Region Administrator  
• Planning & Preparedness Branch                                                  | June 2015      | December 2015                  |
|                 | 3. The definitions and planning considerations for people with disabilities and others with access and functional needs are not up-to-date in the plans, or with existing Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs). | 1. Cal OES accepts current RCPGP plans as draft.                                    | Planning           | Cal OES                          | • Coastal Region Administrator  
• Planning & Preparedness Branch                                                  | January 2014   | June 2014                      |
|                 |                                                                                             | 2. Bay Area counties and core cities move forward with plan adoption.               | Planning           | BAUASI, Operational Areas and Core Cites | • Coastal Region Administrator  
• Planning & Preparedness Branch                                                  | January 2014   | December 2014                  |
### Table 2. Improvement Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Capability</th>
<th>Issue/Area for Improvement</th>
<th>Corrective Action</th>
<th>Capability Element</th>
<th>Primary Responsible Organization</th>
<th>Organization POC</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Planning (cont.) | 3. cont. The definitions and planning considerations for people with disabilities and others with access and functional needs are not up-to-date in the plans, or with existing Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs). | 3. Cal OES updates RCPGP Regional Plans based on AAR findings and in conjunction with CONPLAN revisions. | Planning | Cal OES | • Coastal Region Administrator  
• Planning & Preparedness Branch | January 2014 | June 2015 |
| | 4. The roles, responsibilities, and operating protocols for the Debris Task Force are not well-defined in the plan, nor are the process by which the Debris Task Force demobilizes and its functions transfer to the Debris Management Working Group that reports to the Regional Recovery Task Force. | 1. Cal OES accepts current RCPGP plans as draft. | Planning | Cal OES | • Coastal Region Administrator  
• Planning & Preparedness Branch | January 2014 | June 2014 |
| | 2. Bay Area counties and core cities move forward with plan adoption. | Planning | BAUASI, Operational Areas and Core Cites | • Coastal Region Administrator  
• Planning & Preparedness Branch | January 2014 | December 2014 |
| | 3. Cal OES updates RCPGP Regional Plans based on AAR findings and in conjunction with CONPLAN revisions. | Planning | Cal OES | • Coastal Region Administrator  
• Planning & Preparedness Branch | January 2014 | June 2015 |
| | 4. Cal OES provides final acceptance of the RCPGP Regional Plans. | Planning | Cal OES | • Coastal Region Administrator  
• Planning & Preparedness Branch | June 2015 | December 2015 |
## Table 2. Improvement Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Capability</th>
<th>Issue/Area for Improvement</th>
<th>Corrective Action</th>
<th>Capability Element</th>
<th>Primary Responsible Organization</th>
<th>Organization POC</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning (cont.)</td>
<td>5. The Catastrophic Earthquake Debris Removal Plan does not provide guidance on how to identify priority routes for debris clearance.</td>
<td>1. Cal OES accepts current RCPGP plans as draft.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator • Planning &amp; Preparedness Branch</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Bay Area counties and core cities move forward with plan adoption.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>BAUASI, Operational Areas and Core Cites</td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator • Planning &amp; Preparedness Branch</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Cal OES updates RCPGP Regional Plans based on AAR findings and in conjunction with CONPLAN revisions.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator • Planning &amp; Preparedness Branch</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Cal OES provides final acceptance of the RCPGP Regional Plans.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator • Planning &amp; Preparedness Branch</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. The Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Debris Removal Plan should include some general criteria to assist in site selection.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator • Planning &amp; Preparedness Branch</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Cal OES accepts current RCPGP plans as draft.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>BAUASI, Operational Areas and Core Cites</td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator • Planning &amp; Preparedness Branch</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2. Improvement Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Capability</th>
<th>Issue/Area for Improvement</th>
<th>Corrective Action</th>
<th>Capability Element</th>
<th>Primary Responsible Organization</th>
<th>Organization POC</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Planning (cont.)| 6. cont. The Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Debris Removal Plan should include some general criteria to assist in site selection. | 3. Cal OES updates RCPGP Regional Plans based on AAR findings and in conjunction with CONPLAN revisions. | Planning | Cal OES | • Coastal Region Administrator  
• Planning & Preparedness Branch | January 2014 | June 2015 |
|                 | 4. Cal OES provides final acceptance of the RCPGP Regional Plans. | Planning | Cal OES | • Coastal Region Administrator  
• Planning & Preparedness Branch | June 2015 | December 2015 |
|                 | 7. Recovery aspects of donations management is not addressed in the current Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Donations Management Plan. | 1. Cal OES accepts current RCPGP plans as draft. | Planning | Cal OES | • Coastal Region Administrator  
• Planning & Preparedness Branch | January 2014 | June 2014 |
|                 | 2. Bay Area counties and core cities move forward with plan adoption. | Planning | BAUASI, Operational Areas and Core Cites | • Coastal Region Administrator  
• Planning & Preparedness Branch | January 2014 | December 2014 |
|                 | 3. Cal OES updates RCPGP Regional Plans based on AAR findings and in conjunction with CONPLAN revisions. | Planning | Cal OES | • Coastal Region Administrator  
• Planning & Preparedness Branch | January 2014 | June 2015 |
|                 | 4. Cal OES provides final acceptance of the RCPGP Regional Plans. | Planning | Cal OES | • Coastal Region Administrator  
• Planning & Preparedness Branch | June 2015 | December 2015 |
### Table 2. Improvement Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Capability</th>
<th>Issue/Area for Improvement</th>
<th>Corrective Action</th>
<th>Capability Element</th>
<th>Primary Responsible Organization</th>
<th>Organization POC</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public and Private Services and Resources</strong></td>
<td>1. There is some confusion over NGOs’ roles and responsibilities in support of volunteer management activities at the Operational Area level.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator&lt;br&gt;• Planning &amp; Preparedness Branch</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Bay Area counties and core cities move forward with plan adoption.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>BAUASI, Operational Areas and Core Cities</td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator&lt;br&gt;• Planning &amp; Preparedness Branch</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Cal OES updates RCPGP Regional Plans based on AAR findings and in conjunction with CONPLAN revisions.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator&lt;br&gt;• Planning &amp; Preparedness Branch</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Cal OES provides final acceptance of the RCPGP Regional Plans.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator&lt;br&gt;• Planning &amp; Preparedness Branch</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The role and volunteer assets of private business needs to be further examined.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator&lt;br&gt;• Planning &amp; Preparedness Branch</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Capability</td>
<td>Issue/Area for Improvement</td>
<td>Corrective Action</td>
<td>Capability Element</td>
<td>Primary Responsible Organization</td>
<td>Organization POC</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>Completion Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public and Private Services and Resources (cont.)</td>
<td>2. cont. <em>The role and volunteer assets of private business needs to be further examined.</em></td>
<td>2. Bay Area counties and core cities move forward with plan adoption.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>BAUASI, Operational Areas and Core Cities</td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator  • Planning &amp; Preparedness Branch</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Cal OES updates RCPGP Regional Plans based on AAR findings and in conjunction with CONPLAN revisions.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator  • Planning &amp; Preparedness Branch</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Cal OES provides final acceptance of the RCPGP Regional Plans.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator  • Planning &amp; Preparedness Branch</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. The Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Interim Housing Plan does not address potential housing resources that regional businesses may be able to provide during a catastrophic event.</td>
<td>1. Cal OES accepts current RCPGP plans as draft.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator  • Planning &amp; Preparedness Branch</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Bay Area counties and core cities move forward with plan adoption.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>BAUASI, Operational Areas and Core Cities</td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator  • Planning &amp; Preparedness Branch</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2. Improvement Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Capability</th>
<th>Issue/Area for Improvement</th>
<th>Corrective Action</th>
<th>Capability Element</th>
<th>Primary Responsible Organization</th>
<th>Organization POC</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. cont.</td>
<td>3. Cal OES updates RCPGP Regional Plans based on AAR findings and in conjunction with CONPLAN revisions.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Cal OES provides final acceptance of the RCPGP Regional Plans.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Cal OES accepts current RCPGP plans as draft.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Bay Area counties and core cities move forward with plan adoption.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>BAUASI, Operational Areas and Core Cites</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Cal OES updates RCPGP Regional Plans based on AAR findings and in conjunction with CONPLAN revisions.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Cal OES provides final acceptance of the RCPGP Regional Plans.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Coastal Region Administrator</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public and Private Services and Resources (cont.)

3. The Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Interim Housing Plan does not address potential housing resources that regional businesses may be able to provide during a catastrophic event.

4. There is inadequate staffing to successfully support donations management capabilities at the Operational Area level.
## Table 2. Improvement Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Capability</th>
<th>Issue/Area for Improvement</th>
<th>Corrective Action</th>
<th>Capability Element</th>
<th>Primary Responsible Organization</th>
<th>Organization POC</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Situational Assessment | 1. The Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Mass Care and Sheltering Plan updates should include the use of social media to assist with pushing out shelter information, as well as to support family welfare and reunification efforts. | 1. Cal OES accepts current RCPGP plans as draft. | Planning | Cal OES | • Coastal Region Administrator  
• Planning & Preparedness Branch | January 2014 | June 2014 |
| | | | | | | | |
| | 2. Bay Area counties and core cities move forward with plan adoption. | Planning | BAUASI, Operational Areas and Core Cites | • Coastal Region Administrator  
• Planning & Preparedness Branch | January 2014 | December 2014 |
| | | | | | | | |
| | 3. Cal OES updates RCPGP Regional Plans based on AAR findings and in conjunction with CONPLAN revisions. | Planning | Cal OES | • Coastal Region Administrator  
• Planning & Preparedness Branch | January 2014 | June 2015 |
| | | | | | | | |
| | 4. Cal OES provides final acceptance of the RCPGP Regional Plans. | Planning | Cal OES | • Coastal Region Administrator  
• Planning & Preparedness Branch | June 2015 | December 2015 |
APPENDIX B: EXERCISE PARTICIPANTS

Table 3. Participating Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidio of San Francisco, Fire Marshal (National Park Service)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Department of Transportation (US DOT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California Department of Social Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Department of Toxic Substances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Governor’s Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Highway Patrol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Resiliency Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalRecycle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-1-1 Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area Center for Regional Disaster Resilience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Transportation Commission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Food Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Sheriff’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda Health Consortium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City and County of San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City and County of San Francisco General Services Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City and County of San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Concord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Hospital and Research Center at Oakland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Rio Vista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San José</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3. Participating Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participating Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of San Jose Fire Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa Office of Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Contra Costa Transit Authority (ECCTA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Vista Fire Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Benito County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Benito County Office of Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Paratransit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Port</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San José Fire Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Leandro Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo County Office of Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Ramon Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara County Fire Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano County Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South San Francisco Fire Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs)

- American Red Cross
- The Salvation Army

### Private

- Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E)
- Zanker Road Resource Management

### Consultants

- Remmel Consulting
- URS Corporation
- Willdan
APPENDIX C: PARTICIPANT FEEDBACK

Following each TTX, participants were asked to complete a participant evaluation form. This evaluation was formulated to assess participants’ experiences and attitudes about various aspects of the exercises. A section of the participant feedback form comprised seven statements with which participants were asked to rate their agreement on a scale of 1 to 5, in which 1 indicated “Strongly Disagree,” 3 indicated “Neutral,” and 5 indicated “Strongly Agree.” The following pages show responses by each TTX.

Debris Removal TTX – Participant Feedback Summary

The exercise scenario was realistic and plausible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 17  
Average = 4.6

Exercise participants included the right people in terms of level and mix of disciplines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 17  
Average = 4.4
Debris Removal TTX (cont’d)

Participants were actively involved in the exercise.

- 94% Strongly Agree
- 0% Agree
- 0% Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 6% Disagree
- 0% Strongly Disagree

N = 17
Average = 4.9

Exercise participation was appropriate for someone in my field with my level of experience/training.

- 76% Strongly Agree
- 12% Agree
- 6% Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 6% Disagree
- 0% Strongly Disagree

N = 17
Average = 4.5
Debris Removal TTX (cont’d)

The exercise increased my understanding about and familiarity with the capabilities and resources of other participating organizations.

![Pie chart with percentages: 53% strongly agree, 35% agree, 6% disagree, and 0% strongly disagree. N = 17, Average = 4.4](image)

The exercise provided the opportunity to address significant decisions in support of critical mission areas.

![Pie chart with percentages: 47% strongly agree, 24% agree, 23% disagree, and 0% strongly disagree. N = 17, Average = 4.1](image)
Debris Removal TTX (cont’d)

After this exercise, I am better prepared to deal with the capabilities and hazards addressed.

- 5 Strongly Agree: 47%
- 4: 29%
- 3: 18%
- 2: 6%
- 1 Strongly Disagree: 0%

N = 17
Average = 4.2
Mass Care and Sheltering TTX – Participant Feedback Summary

**The exercise scenario was realistic and plausible.**

- 0% strongly disagree
- 0% disagree
- 24% agree
- 27% strongly agree
- N = 33
- Average = 4.0

**Exercise participants included the right people in terms of level and mix of disciplines.**

- 0% strongly disagree
- 3% disagree
- 17% agree
- 30% strongly agree
- 50% neutral
- N = 30
- Average = 4.1
Mass Care and Sheltering TTX (cont’d)

Participants were actively involved in the exercise.

- 40% Strongly Agree
- 33% Agree
- 21% Neutral
- 3% Disagree
- 3% Strongly Disagree

N = 33
Average = 4.0

Exercise participation was appropriate for someone in my field with my level of experience/training.

- 40% Strongly Agree
- 39% Agree
- 18% Neutral
- 3% Disagree
- 0% Strongly Disagree

N = 33
Average = 4.2
Mass Care and Sheltering TTX (cont’d)

The exercise increased my understanding about and 
familiarity with the capabilities and resources of other 
participating organizations.

- 5 Strongly Agree
- 4
- 3
- 2
- 1 Strongly Disagree

N = 33
Average = 4.0

The exercise provided the opportunity to address 
significant decisions in support of critical mission areas.

- 5 Strongly Agree
- 4
- 3
- 2
- 1 Strongly Disagree

N = 33
Average = 3.8
Mass Care and Sheltering TTX (cont’d)

After this exercise, I am better prepared to deal with the capabilities and hazards addressed.

- 42% Strongly Agree
- 16% Agree
- 0% Neutral
- 0% Disagree
- 42% Strongly Disagree

N = 31
Average = 3.7
Volunteer Management TTX – Participant Feedback Summary

The exercise scenario was realistic and plausible.

- 5 Strongly Agree: 37%
- 4: 42%
- 3: 10%
- 2: 11%
- 1 Strongly Disagree: 0%

N = 19
Average = 4.1

Exercise participants included the right people in terms of level and mix of disciplines.

- 5 Strongly Agree: 40%
- 4: 40%
- 3: 10%
- 2: 10%
- 1 Strongly Disagree: 0%

N = 20
Average = 4.1
Volunteer Management TTX (cont’d)

Participants were actively involved in the exercise.

- 55% strongly agreed
- 37% agreed
- 5% neutral
- 5% disagree
- 0% strongly disagreed

N = 19  
Average = 4.4

Exercise participation was appropriate for someone in my field with my level of experience/training.

- 25% strongly agreed
- 60% agreed
- 10% neutral
- 5% disagree
- 0% strongly disagreed

N = 20  
Average = 4.0
Volunteer Management TTX (cont’d)

The exercise increased my understanding about and familiarity with the capabilities and resources of other participating organizations.

- 55% Strongly Agree
- 35% Agree
- 10% Neutral
- 0% Disagree
- 0% Strongly Disagree

N = 20
Average = 4.4

The exercise provided the opportunity to address significant decisions in support of critical mission areas.

- 40% Strongly Agree
- 25% Agree
- 25% Neutral
- 10% Disagree
- 0% Strongly Disagree

N = 20
Average = 4.0
Volunteer Management TTX (cont’d)

After this exercise, I am better prepared to deal with the capabilities and hazards addressed.

- **50%** 5 Strongly Agree
- **25%** 4
- **15%** 3
- **10%** 2
- **0%** 1 Strongly Disagree

*N = 20
Average = 4.2*
Interim Housing TTX– Participant Feedback Summary

The exercise scenario was realistic and plausible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Strongly Agree</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 15  
Average = 3.8

Exercise participants included the right people in terms of level and mix of disciplines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Strongly Agree</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 16  
Average = 3.8
Interim Housing TTX (cont’d)

Participants were actively involved in the exercise.

- 5 Strongly Agree: 25%
- 4: 13%
- 3: 6%
- 2: 6%
- 1 Strongly Disagree: 13%

N = 16
Average = 3.7

Exercise participation was appropriate for someone in my field with my level of experience/training.

- 5 Strongly Agree: 56%
- 4: 0%
- 3: 6%
- 2: 13%
- 1 Strongly Disagree: 6%

N = 16
Average = 4.0
Interim Housing TTX (cont’d)

The exercise increased my understanding about and familiarity with the capabilities and resources of other participating organizations.

- 47% Strongly Agree
- 12% Agree
- 6% Slightly Agree
- 23% Slightly Disagree
- 12% Disagree
- 6% Strongly Disagree

N = 17  
Average = 3.4

The exercise provided the opportunity to address significant decisions in support of critical mission areas.

- 41% Strongly Agree
- 12% Agree
- 6% Slightly Agree
- 23% Slightly Disagree
- 18% Disagree
- 6% Strongly Disagree

N = 17  
Average = 3.1
Interim Housing TTX (cont’d)

After this exercise, I am better prepared to deal with the capabilities and hazards addressed.

- 5 Strongly Agree: 6%
- 4: 31%
- 3: 14%
- 2: 0%
- 1 Strongly Disagree: 50%

N = 16  
Average = 3.1
Donations Management TTX– Participant Feedback Summary

The exercise scenario was realistic and plausible.

- 65% Strongly Agree
- 35% Agree

N = 17
Average = 4.6

Exercise participants included the right people in terms of level and mix of disciplines.

- 59% Strongly Agree
- 29% Agree
- 6% Neutral
- 6% Disagree

N = 17
Average = 4.4
Donations Management TTX (cont’d)

Participants were actively involved in the exercise.

- 94% Strongly Agree
- 6% Agree
- 0% Neutral
- 0% Disagree
- 0% Strongly Disagree

Average = 4.9

Exercise participation was appropriate for someone in my field with my level of experience/training.

- 76% Strongly Agree
- 12% Agree
- 6% Neutral
- 6% Disagree
- 0% Strongly Disagree

Average = 4.5
Donations Management TTX (cont’d)

The exercise increased my understanding about and familiarity with the capabilities and resources of other participating organizations.

- 53% Strongly Agree
- 35% Agree
- 6% Neutral
- 6% Disagree
- 0% Strongly Disagree

N = 17
Average = 4.4

The exercise provided the opportunity to address significant decisions in support of critical mission areas.

- 47% Strongly Agree
- 24% Agree
- 23% Neutral
- 6% Disagree
- 0% Strongly Disagree

N = 17
Average = 4.1
Donations Management TTX (cont’d)

After this exercise, I am better prepared to deal with the capabilities and hazards addressed.

- 5 Strongly Agree: 47%
- 4: 29%
- 3: 18%
- 2: 6%
- 1 Strongly Disagree: 0%

N = 17
Average = 4.2
Mass Transportation/Evacuation TTX– Participant Feedback Summary

The exercise scenario was realistic and plausible.

- 58% of participants strongly agree.
- 25% agree.
- 13% neither agree nor disagree.
- 4% disagree.
- 4% strongly disagree.

N = 24
Average = 4.3

Exercise participants included the right people in terms of level and mix of disciplines.

- 42% of participants strongly agree.
- 42% agree.
- 8% neither agree nor disagree.
- 4% disagree.
- 4% strongly disagree.

N = 24
Average = 4.1
Mass Transportation/Evacuation TTX (cont’d)

Participants were actively involved in the exercise.

- **5 Strongly Agree**: 54%
- **4 Agree**: 38%
- **3**: 4%
- **2**: 4%
- **1 Strongly Disagree**: 0%

*N = 24  
Average = 4.4*

Exercise participation was appropriate for someone in my field with my level of experience/training.

- **5 Strongly Agree**: 38%
- **4 Agree**: 46%
- **3**: 8%
- **2**: 4%
- **1 Strongly Disagree**: 4%

*N = 24  
Average = 4.2*
Mass Transportation/Evacuation TTX (cont’d)

The exercise increased my understanding about and familiarity with the capabilities and resources of other participating organizations.

- 8% Strongly Agree
- 4% Agree
- 4% Neutral
- 46% Disagree
- 38% Strongly Disagree

N = 24  
Average = 4.0

The exercise provided the opportunity to address significant decisions in support of critical mission areas.

- 0% Strongly Agree
- 12% Agree
- 17% Neutral
- 13% Disagree
- 58% Strongly Disagree

N = 24  
Average = 3.7
Mass Transportation/Evacuation TTX (cont’d)

After this exercise, I am better prepared to deal with the capabilities and hazards addressed.

- 5 Strongly Agree: 17%
- 4: 13%
- 3: 8%
- 2: 4%
- 1 Strongly Disagree: 8%

N = 24
Average = 3.8
## APPENDIX D: ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAR</td>
<td>After-Action Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC</td>
<td>American Red Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOC</td>
<td>Business Operations Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal OES</td>
<td>California Governor's Office of Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>California Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARES</td>
<td>California Animal Response in Emergency System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDPH</td>
<td>California Department of Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERT</td>
<td>Community Emergency Response Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONOP</td>
<td>California Catastrophic Incident Base Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONPLAN</td>
<td>San Francisco Bay Area Earthquake Readiness Response: Concept of Operations Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCT</td>
<td>Donations Coordination Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF-6</td>
<td>California Emergency Function 6 Mass Care and Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF-17</td>
<td>California Emergency Function 17 Volunteer and Donations Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMAC</td>
<td>Emergency Management Assistance Compact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMMA</td>
<td>Emergency Managers Mutual Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOC</td>
<td>Emergency Operations Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOM</td>
<td>Emergency Operations Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOP</td>
<td>Local Government Emergency Operations Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOP</td>
<td>Emergency Operations Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVC</td>
<td>Emergency Volunteer Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAST</td>
<td>Functional Assessment Service Teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA</td>
<td>Federal Emergency Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSEEP</td>
<td>Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Improvement Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JFO</td>
<td>Joint Field Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIC</td>
<td>Joint Information Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Magnitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUs</td>
<td>Memoranda of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTC</td>
<td>Metropolitan Transportation Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>non-governmental organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OES</td>
<td>Office of Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACES</td>
<td>Radio Amateur Civil Emergency Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCG</td>
<td>Regional Coordination Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCPGP</td>
<td>Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Grant Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECP</td>
<td>Regional Emergency Coordination Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REOC</td>
<td>Regional Emergency Operations Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEMS</td>
<td>Standardized Emergency Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SME</td>
<td>subject matter experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>State Operations Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOP</td>
<td>State Operations Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTX</td>
<td>Tabletop Exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UASI</td>
<td>Urban Areas Security Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCG</td>
<td>Unified Coordination Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOAD</td>
<td>Voluntary Organizations Active in Disaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMD</td>
<td>Weapons of Mass Destruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX E: CAL OES LETTER

EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
GOVERNOR

*Cal OES
GOVERNOR’S OFFICE
OF EMERGENCY SERVICES

MARK S. GHIRLADUCCI
DIRECTOR

November 1st, 2013

Janell Myhre, Bay Area UASI Regional Program Manager
Bay Area Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI)
711 Van Ness Avenue #420
San Francisco, CA 94102

Subject: Cal OES Review of the 8 Bay Area Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Plans

Dear Ms. Myhre:

The California Governor’s Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES) has reviewed the 8 “draft” Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Grant Program (RCPGP) Bay Area Urban Areas Security Initiative (BAUASI) Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Plans. The draft plans consist of:

- Debris Removal Plan*
- Mass Transportation Evacuation Plan
- Mass Care and Shelter Plan
- Interim Housing Plan
- Volunteer Management Plan
- Donations Management Plan
- Mass Fatality Plan
- Logistics Plan

*not compliant with FEMA debris plan requirements

Together with the current San Francisco Bay Area Earthquake Readiness Response: Concept of Operations Plan (CONPLAN), Bay Area county Emergency Operations Plans, and our Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS), the RCPGP draft plans will ensure a more effective response to a catastrophic earthquake striking the region.

Cal OES is initiating the revision of the CONPLAN will be working with Operational Areas to ensure that all plans are aligned, in accordance with SEMS. Our goal for the RCPGP draft plans is to partner with the BAUASI and incorporate the draft plans as annexes into the updated CONPLAN and, where appropriate, into the Regional Emergency Coordination Plan (RECP).
The Bay Area UASI Management team has demonstrated tireless leadership, dedication, communication, and coordination with all levels of government to develop these plans. Reaching consensus and ensuring consistency of the roles and responsibilities of government through these draft plans helps ensure local, State, and Federal responders have a framework to build upon as we train to exercise our CONPLAN. The resulting deliverables have many uses beyond the BAUASI and we encourage our Operational Areas and other emergency management partners to use or leverage the information in the 8 draft plans to create their own plans.

Cal OES looks forward to continuing our partnership with the BAUASI and the RCPGP as we strive to make our communities resilient to disasters.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Joel Traversaro, Coastal Region Administrator
Governor's Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES)

cc: Charles Simpson, Deputy Director for Response and Recovery, Cal OES
Christina Curry, Deputy Director for Planning, Preparedness, and Prevention, Cal OES
Brendan Murphy, Deputy Director for Finance and Administration, Cal OES
Steve Sellers, Assistant Director for Response, Cal OES
Jennifer Chappelle, Deputy Coastal Region Administrator, Cal OES
Craig Dziedzic, General Manager Bay Area UASI
Catherine Spaulding, Assistant General Manager Bay Area UASI
APPENDIX F: PLAN RELATIONSHIP DIAGRAMS

Diagram of plan relationships showing Federal, State, Regional, and Local Governments.
To: Bay Area UASI Approval Authority  
From: Mary Landers, Regional Grants Manager  
Date: April 10, 2014  
Re: Item #8: Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Grant Program (RCPGP) Sustainment Plan

Staff Recommendations:

Information only

Action or Discussion Items:

Discussion

Discussion:

The Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Grant Program (RCPGP) ends with the FY 11 allocation. The grant requirements state that, in addition to the conduct of a full scale exercise (accomplished with the Yellow Command scenario in Urban Shield), a plan to sustain future activities in the region must be developed.

Members of the Bay Area Regional Catastrophic Planning Team (BA RCPT) participate in quarterly national calls with the other 9 RCPGP sites to share information and planning efforts. One of the sites, the Puget Sound region, was the first to draft and share their Sustainment Plan. The BA RCPT reviewed this plan and voted to use this plan as a template for the preparation of the region’s plan.

Attached are two Appendices: Appendix A is the final version of the plan and Appendix B is a PowerPoint indicating the highlights of the Plan. Highlights include: strategies and recommendations for sustaining capabilities, action items like the development of a regional BA RCPT charter and a quarterly meeting schedule, and closer collaboration with Cal OES to ensure that the plans are kept up to date.

The BA RCPT has already reviewed and approved the final draft of the Sustainment Plan.
FINAL
REGIONAL CATASTROPHIC
PREPAREDNESS GRANT PROGRAM
(RCPGP) SUSTAINMENT PLAN

Prepared for

The San Francisco Bay Area Urban Areas Security Initiative
711 Van Ness Ave.
San Francisco, CA 94102

January 31, 2014

URS

1333 Broadway, Suite 800
Oakland, CA 94612
510.893.3600     Fax: 510.874.3268
This Sustainment Plan has been prepared for the Bay Area Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) on behalf of the counties and cities within the 12-county Bay Area region. The Plan discusses the current regional capabilities and provides strategies for capability sustainment, including a five-year Action Plan and a discussion on training and exercises. The plan has been prepared in accordance with the standards of the National Incident Management System, the California Standardized Emergency Management System, and other Federal and State requirements and standards for emergency response plans applicable as of the date of the Plan’s preparation.

This Plan provides guidance only; it is intended for use in further development of response capabilities, implementation of training and exercises, and defining the approach to incident response. The actual response to an incident, whether at the regional, county, or city level, is dependent on:

- The specific conditions of the incident, including the incident type, geographic extent, severity, timing, and duration
- The availability of resources for response at the time of the incident
- Decisions of Incident Commanders and political leadership
- Action taken by neighboring jurisdictions, the State, and Federal Government

These and other factors may result in unforeseen circumstances, prevent the implementation of Plan components, or require actions that are significantly different from those described in the Plan.

The Plan is not applicable outside the 12-county region that comprises the planning area.
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1. Introduction

The Federal Government provides funding under the Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Grant Program (RCPGP) to selected metropolitan areas throughout the United States to assist those areas in planning for catastrophic events. The San Francisco Bay Area is one of the selected metropolitan areas. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) administers the program. The Bay Area Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI) Program is implementing the RCPGP for 12 counties and two cities in the Bay Area.

The United States Geological Survey estimates that there is a 63 percent chance of a large earthquake occurring in the Bay Area sometime in the next 30 years. Because of this and other risks, the Bay Area presents a unique set of planning challenges in regards to major catastrophic events. Unlike conventional incidents or disasters, a catastrophic disaster can cause major damage across multiple jurisdictions and requires resources and coordination on a scale beyond the capability of a single jurisdiction. Effective response and recovery to a catastrophic incident requires coordination across all levels of government, sectors, and jurisdictions. For example, after a major earthquake, local governments will face many challenges. With an emphasis on regional planning, the RCPGP initiative provides funding to tackle these challenges and enhance the region's capacities to prepare for, mitigate against, respond to, and recover from all types of catastrophic events, while providing an important all-hazards planning complement to the terrorism preparedness focus of the UASI grant.

Through a variety of RCPGP projects, Regional Catastrophic plans have been developed in eight functional areas: Debris Removal, Donations Management, Interim Housing, Logistics, Mass Care and Sheltering, Mass Fatality, Mass Transportation/Evacuation, and Volunteer Management, utilizing the common scenario of a catastrophic earthquake in the Bay Area. Each planning effort produced a regional plan, which identifies the major roles and responsibilities of regional emergency response entities, as well as the critical relationships and lines of communication between local and regional responders and providers. In addition to the regional plans, plans were completed for the 12 RCPGP counties (12 Operational Areas – illustrated in Figure 1) and two core cities in the Bay Area UASI. These plans have been designed from a standard template to provide consistency and integration with the regional plans, while being customized to the needs of the individual Operational Areas and local jurisdictions. Although developed for a catastrophic earthquake scenario, these plans provide an all-hazards framework, designed to be scalable to the size and scope of any disaster.

---

1 Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Monterey, Napa, San Benito, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Solano, and Sonoma counties and the cities of Oakland and San Jose
SUSTAINMENT PLAN OVERVIEW

The purpose, vision, mission and guiding principles of this Sustainment Plan are provided below. This Sustainment Plan discusses the current capabilities of the region and provides a brief summary of the eight Regional Catastrophic plans developed under the RCPGP. Strategies for sustainment are also provided, including an Action Plan for the next five years and a discussion on training and exercises. Finally, this Sustainment Plan provides recommendations for RCPT partners for sustaining capabilities and preparedness obtained through the RCPGP.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this Sustainment Plan is to confirm:

- How the Regional Coordination Planning Team (RCPT) proposes to sustain the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Catastrophic Plans and Annexes over the next five years (through 2018).
- The means by which the RCPT members will agree to continue to coordinate, monitor, and evaluate their sustainment efforts.
- The agencies with responsibility for maintaining the plans and products developed under the RCPGP.
- Sources and strategic priorities for future funding, planning and action.

VISION

Through implementation of this Sustainment Plan, the RCPT envisions San Francisco Bay Area Region’s stakeholders working collaboratively to prepare for, respond to, and recover from a catastrophic incident.

- We will sustain, maintain, and continue to build on the catastrophic plans and tools developed to support regional coordination before, during, and after a catastrophic incident.
- Catastrophic planning will be part of every emergency management program, based on the concepts in the San Francisco Bay Area Catastrophic Earthquake Readiness Response Concept of Operations Plan (CONPLAN), the California Catastrophic Incident Base Plan: Concept of Operations (CONOP), and the Regional Emergency Coordination Plan (RECP).
- These efforts will be coordinated through a regional committee composed of stakeholders who represent the whole community from across the San Francisco Bay Area Region.

A map of the 12-County planning region is included in Figure 1.
MISSION

The mission of this Sustainment Plan and the RCPGP efforts is to increase the San Francisco Bay Area Region’s level of preparedness and its capability to effectively respond to and recover from catastrophic incidents through stakeholder collaboration.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The RCPT adopts the following guiding principles to accomplish the Mission, Vision, and Purpose of this Sustainment Plan:

The RCPT will:

- Recognize that catastrophic events are beyond our individual jurisdictions’ capabilities to address;
- Work to build local, regional, state, and Federal relationships in support of catastrophic planning by engaging stakeholders among government and non-government organizations;
- Be transparent in our work;
- Trust our partners;
- Be open to talking about the risks and issues we face and seek creative, collaborative solutions;
- Support continuous productive communication and partnership with the California Governor’s Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES) and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA);
- Acknowledge that local agencies have a choice whether to participate in our efforts, and continue to promote the value of their participation;
- Support local determination of regional planning priorities;
- Continue to bring dedicated, knowledgeable agency representatives to the table;
- Promote an awareness of individual agency capabilities and focus on addressing gaps in those capabilities; and
- Utilize benchmarks and accountability.
Figure 1. Map of 12-County Planning Region
2. Current Regional Capabilities

In 2008, the San Francisco Bay Area Region received one of ten national grants under the RCPGP. Congress established the program to enhance catastrophic incident preparedness in selected high-risk, high-consequence urban areas, including the San Francisco Bay Area Region. The RCPGP is FEMA’s first grant program to focus solely on the development of plans and procedures.

The RCPGP’s focus on both “regional” and “catastrophic” incidents required a shift in thinking and operations, and new levels of collaboration. Originally conceived as a two-year planning grant, the complexity and long-term nature of regional catastrophic planning became apparent to all RCPGP sites, which led to an extension of the program through three additional award cycles (through July 2014).

Within the San Francisco Bay Area Region, the RCPT, composed of representatives from the Operational Areas and core cities, oversees the RCPGP grant. Members of the RCPT address challenging decisions thoughtfully, respecting the diversity of opinion and experience in the group. As a result of this process, members of the RCPT have an improved understanding of their own capabilities and those within the region.

Through the efforts of the RCPT, the San Francisco Bay Area Region has gained or expanded capabilities in eight functional areas: debris management, donations management, interim housing, logistics, mass care and shelter, mass fatality management, mass transportation and evacuation, and volunteer management. As part of each effort, project leads have identified gaps and recommendations to address during future planning processes.

This Sustainment Plan addresses the following plans and functional planning efforts, which were funded through the RCPGP:

**REGIONAL CATASTROPHIC EARTHQUAKE DEBRIS REMOVAL PLAN**

The Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Debris Removal Plan provides a guide for debris removal operations occurring within the region after a catastrophic earthquake. The plan provides operational details for developing situational awareness and establishing debris clearance priorities; clearing debris; staging, processing, and disposing of debris; removing debris; assessing buildings and infrastructure; and demolishing unsafe buildings and infrastructure. The plan is an incident-specific annex to the RECP; a diagram that presents the relationship between the Debris Removal Plan and other applicable plans can be found in Appendix B Plan Association Diagrams.
REGIONAL CATASTROPHIC EARTHQUAKE DONATIONS MANAGEMENT PLAN

The Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Donations Management Plan is a scenario-driven, function-specific operations plan for the 12-county Bay Area planning region that describes the actions of and coordination among government agencies and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) for managing donations in the aftermath of a catastrophic earthquake on the San Andreas Fault. The plan is a guide for the coordination of in-kind and monetary donations for the benefit of those affected by the disaster. The plan is an incident-specific annex to the RECP; a diagram that presents the relationship between the Donations Management Plan and other applicable plans can be found in Appendix B Plan Association Diagrams.

REGIONAL CATASTROPHIC EARTHQUAKE INTERIM HOUSING PLAN

The Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Interim Housing Plan provides a guide for operations associated with providing interim housing for displaced residents in the San Francisco Bay Area Region. The plan provides primarily operational details for interim housing but also includes information about support through Federal and state disaster assistance programs. The plan is an annex to the RECP and is consistent with concepts described in the Recovery Subsidiary Plan and the Base Plan. A diagram that presents the relationship between the Interim Housing Plan and other applicable plans can be found in Appendix B Plan Association Diagrams.

REGIONAL CATASTROPHIC EARTHQUAKE LOGISTICS RESPONSE PLAN

The Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Logistics Response Plan provides guidance for coordinating logistics support necessary to respond effectively to a catastrophic earthquake. The plan specifically addresses the distribution of life-sustaining commodities. It provides logistics-related details for prioritizing, requesting, procuring, and allocating commodities as well as operational details for establishing and operating Logistics Staging Areas and commodity points of distribution. Additionally, it describes transporting, receiving, warehousing, distributing, and tracking commodities in the region, applying the California Standardized Emergency Management System, the National Incident Management System, and the Incident Command System for logistics response operations. The plan also describes the coordination of logistics activities among local, regional, state, and Federal entities, as well as the private sector, and NGOs. The plan is an incident-specific annex to the RECP and is consistent with it and the RECP Logistics Subsidiary Plan. A diagram that presents the relationship between the Logistics Response Plan and other applicable plans can be found in Appendix B Plan Association Diagrams.

REGIONAL CATASTROPHIC EARTHQUAKE MASS CARE AND SHELTERING PLAN

The Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Mass Care and Sheltering Plan provides a concept of operations for the San Francisco Bay Area Region for the care and sheltering of individuals, including people with disabilities or access and functional needs, who have been displaced by a catastrophic earthquake. The plan primarily provides operational details for sheltering but also
includes some details for other aspects of mass care, including feeding, basic medical care, bulk distribution of emergency relief supplies, and tracking affected populations. The plan identifies agencies at all levels with roles and responsibilities in mass care and sheltering, identifies time-based objectives for response, and includes a response timeline, which identifies mass care and shelter activities that are likely to occur in response to a catastrophic earthquake. The plan is an incident-specific annex to the RECP and is consistent with it and the RECP Mass Care and Shelter Subsidiary Plan. In the development of the plan, concepts were integrated from the CONPLAN and RECP, and from Federal and state guidance. A diagram that presents the relationship between the Mass Care and Sheltering Plan and other applicable plans can be found in Appendix B Plan Association Diagrams.

REGIONAL CATASTROPHIC INCIDENT MASS FATALITY PLAN

The Regional Catastrophic Incident Mass Fatality Plan provides guidance for regional coordination of resources to support mass fatality operations occurring within the region, such as recovery, transport, storage, and processing of human remains and personal effects. The plan provides operational details for notification, scene evaluation and organization, recovery of remains, fatality collection points, transportation and temporary storage, morgue operations, Family Assistance Center operations, final disposition, and demobilization. Unlike the other plans developed for the San Francisco Bay Area under the RCPGP, the Mass Fatality Plan addresses two additional catastrophic scenarios: an influenza pandemic and a chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, and explosives incident. The plan is an incident-specific annex to the RECP and is consistent with it and the RECP Law Enforcement Subsidiary Plan. In the development of the plan, concepts were integrated from the CONPLAN, the California Mass Fatality Management Guide, and the RECP, and from Federal and state guidance. A diagram that presents the relationship between the Mass Fatality Plan and other applicable plans can be found in Appendix B Plan Association Diagrams.

REGIONAL CATASTROPHIC EARTHQUAKE MASS TRANSPORTATION/EVACUATION PLAN

The purpose of the Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Mass Transportation/Evacuation Plan is to provide a guide for using mass transportation resources in regional operations that are needed to support the movement of populations affected by the earthquake both initially out of the region and then eventually back into the region, and using the same resources to move emergency service workers into the affected area. The plan uses two earthquake scenarios as the basis for the assumptions, objectives, and operational activities described in the plan. The plan is an incident-specific annex to the RECP and is consistent with it and the RECP Transportation Subsidiary Plan. Additionally, guides like the Emergency Water Transportation System Management Plan, prepared for the Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA) and partially funded by the RCPGP, complement and enhance the existing work for a mass transportation response. A diagram that presents the relationship between the Regional
Catastrophic Earthquake Mass Transportation/Evacuation Plan and other applicable plans can be found in Appendix B Plan Association Diagrams.

**REGIONAL VOLUNTEER MANAGEMENT PLAN**

The Regional Volunteer Management Plan describes the process for collaboration and coordination during regional events for the effective use of spontaneous and affiliated volunteer resources. The plan provides an overview of the roles and responsibilities for volunteer coordination and describes how activities are coordinated. Although the plan was developed using a catastrophic earthquake scenario, it provides an all-hazards framework and is written to be scalable to the size and scope of any disaster. The plan is an incident-specific annex to the RECP; a diagram that presents the relationship between the Volunteer Management Plan and other applicable plans can be found in Appendix B, Plan Association Diagrams.
3. Sustainment Strategies

Catastrophic incidents are not merely larger versions of local emergencies; a catastrophe will challenge local and regional jurisdictions beyond anything they have previously experienced. To that end, catastrophic planning efforts must involve a shift in thinking, extended resource commitments, extraordinary collaboration, and continual refinement. Knowing the key elements of regional planning success opens the door to even greater accomplishments.

The RCPGP planning communities have built a foundation of trust, forging regional and national relationships. The current question before policymakers is whether it is in the country’s best interest to sustain and build on this investment. If so, regional planning needs to become a priority at all levels of government. New and existing Federal and state grants should support these efforts, and local governments need to commit resources.

While the RCPT expects there to be little or no additional funding for catastrophic planning work during the current planning period (2014-2018), they do expect that Cal OES will expand its engagement on these issues with local governments (“Scenario C” in Table 1 below). Ideally, the RCPT would like to see both expanded Cal OES engagement and for additional funding to be made available in support of regional catastrophic plan sustainment, training, and exercise activities (“Scenario D”).

POTENTIAL FUTURE SCENARIOS FOR REGIONAL CATASTROPHIC PLANNING

The following scenarios identify the various potential funding and State involvement situations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>State Role</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Current State role continues</td>
<td>No additional funding available for local/regional efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Current State role continues</td>
<td>Additional funding is available for local/regional efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>State role expands</td>
<td>No additional funding available for local/regional efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>State role expands</td>
<td>Additional funding is available for local/regional efforts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on this assessment of the near-term future, the RCPT developed the following Action Plan for 2014-2018 (Table 2). The Bay Area UASI will track items documented in the Action Plan below. Updates will be provided periodically during RCPT meetings.
Table 2. Action Plan, 2014-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th>RCPT Governance and Coordination with State, RCPGP Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Sustain a forum and process for collaborative catastrophic preparedness and response planning and learning in the region (governance).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue quarterly meetings of the RCPT, under an amended RCPT Charter. Adoption of the amended Charter should occur after the RCPGP grant obligations have ended in June or July 2014. Thereafter, quarterly RCPT meetings will focus on:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sharing information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reporting on plan sustainment activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reporting on other action plan items identified in this Sustainment Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identifying future projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Continued engagement with stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Continuing regional discussion about catastrophic level incidents and how the region can be better prepared to plan for, respond to, and recover from such events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify plan “champions” to monitor individual plans and work with Cal OES to ensure plans remain up to date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Enhance collaboration, communication, and engagement with Cal OES.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion areas to include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Securing state ownership of the plans and supporting materials developed under the RCPGP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• State maintained website to host the plans and supporting materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Continue to coordinate with the other national RCPGP planning communities through conference calls and meetings. The RCPT will coordinate and provide a brief annual report to be shared with the other RCPGP sites.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.</th>
<th>Sustainment of the Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Cal OES will partner with the Bay Area UASI to incorporate the plans as annexes into the revised CONPLAN or RECP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Track opportunities to promote sustainment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Track local government, regional, and state exercises and forums that can be used to train/exercise the regional plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintain a list of action items for periodic review and prioritization by the RCPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Include evaluation of the regional and local plans in future Golden Guardian exercises when applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Promote local government agency action to adopt local plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Engage in succession planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Encourage local governments to use developed training tools to train staff about the regional and local plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Additional Resources and Other Funding Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1</th>
<th>Track Federal and state funding opportunities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Conduct outreach to the private sector and NGOs for resources and continued participation in planning and exercise efforts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TRAINING AND EXERCISE

The San Francisco Bay Area UASI has developed a multi-year, Regional Training and Exercise Program (RTEP). The goals of the program include improving the regional capacity to prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from terrorist incidents or other catastrophic events by providing strategic planning, training, and exercises. The RCPT intends to enhance and sustain achieved capabilities through leveraging currently planned training and exercises.

The Bay Area’s jurisdictions possess differing levels of preparedness regarding prevention, protection, mitigation, response, and recovery capabilities. Because of these differences, the RTEP uses a building-block approach in the design of the overall exercise program. This building-block approach ensures successful progression in exercise design, complexity, and execution, and allows for the appropriate training and preparation to take place in the jurisdiction or area conducting the exercise. Jurisdictions within the region follow specific planning steps when planning for and conducting an exercise:

1. Assess current operations plans for completeness and relevance.
2. Assess the current level of training and operational plan familiarity for all relevant agencies within the jurisdiction.
3. Conduct necessary training for all relevant agencies.
4. Train personnel on newly received equipment.
5. Conduct exercises using equipment, training, and operations plans.
6. Develop an After Action Report that captures the lessons learned.

To sustain and enhance current capabilities gained through the RCPGP, the RTEP will offer courses and construct exercise objectives that are relevant to the concepts defined in the regional plans. The courses and exercises offered through the RTEP are based on the needs and requirements of agencies within the region. Course offerings and exercise objectives are prioritized through monthly vetting meetings. The specific concepts that are taught and exercised will be determined through the prioritization and vetting process. Additionally, members of the RCPT will submit course proposals for inclusion and acceptance in the RTEP when a need is identified.

As part of the RTEP, the region participates in two major exercises: Golden Guardian and Urban Shield. Golden Guardian is a statewide exercise hosted annually by the state of California (Golden Guardian often focuses on a specific region of the State, the region participates when...
appropriate). Urban Shield is a regional exercise hosted by different jurisdictions in the Bay Area. The RCPT will promote these exercises as an opportunity for the State and local governments to evaluate the RCPGP plans.
4. Recommendations

The RCPT makes the following recommendations to FEMA, the state of California and local governments in the Bay Area for sustaining capabilities and the level of preparedness obtained through the RCPGP:

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FEMA

The San Francisco Bay Area Region RCPT offers the following recommendation for FEMA:

1. Ensure nationwide distribution/sharing of plans developed under the RCPGP through a targeted outreach system in coordination with other RCPGP regions.
2. Continue supporting RCPGP sites through, at minimum, an annual workshop for the ten RCPGP sites.
3. Transfer remaining RCPGP technical assistance support funds to RCPGP site leads to be used at the discretion of RCPGP sites.
4. Develop a planning community or forum to foster coordination and communication between RCPGP regions.
5. Continue building local capability by supporting regional catastrophic planning.
6. Encourage bottom-up sustainment planning supported by grants to local governments.
7. Schedule and hold an annual meeting with RCPT leadership to continue catastrophic planning efforts.
8. Include catastrophic planning as a core funding objective.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

1. Formally accept responsibility for maintaining the plans developed under the RCPGP.
2. Include evaluating the effectiveness of the RCPGP plans as part of state of California-run exercises, such as Golden Guardian.
3. Continue to participate with the RCPT to contribute to the strategic direction of Bay Area planning efforts.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO BAY AREA LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

1. Formally adopt and approve the Operational Area and local government plans developed under the RCPGP.
2. Train appropriate staff on the plans, annexes and supporting tools.
3. Maintain plans through a formal exercise and evaluation program.
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Appendix A: Acronyms

Cal OES  California Governor’s Office of Emergency Services
CONOP  California Catastrophic Incident Base Plan: Concept of Operations
CONPLAN  San Francisco Bay Area Earthquake Readiness and Response Concept of
          Operations Plan
FEMA  Federal Emergency Management Agency
NGO  nongovernmental organization
RCPGP  Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Grant Program
RCPT  Regional Catastrophic Planning Team
RECP  Regional Emergency Coordination Plan
RTEP  Regional Training and Exercise Plan
UASI  Urban Areas Security Initiative
WETA  Water Emergency Transportation Authority
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Appendix B: Plan Association Diagrams

The following Plan Association Diagrams display the relationships between the Federal State, Regional, Operational Area and local level plans for emergency plans and various functional areas. The following Plan Association Diagrams have been developed and are included below:

- Emergency Plan Relationships
- Debris Removal/Management Plan Relationships
- Donations Management Plan Relationships
- Interim Housing Plan Relationships
- Logistics Plan Relationships
- Mass Care and Sheltering Plan Relationships
- Mass Fatality Plan Relationships
- Mass Transportation/Evacuation Plan Relationships
- Volunteer Management Plan Relationships
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Emergency Plan Relationships
Federal ➤ State ➤ Region ➤ Operational Areas ➤ Local Governments

FEMA
National Response Framework (NRF), 2013
Emergency Support Functions (ESFs), 2008

California Catastrophic Incident Base Plan (CONOP) 2008

California
State of California Emergency Plan (SEP)
Emergency Functions (EFs)

Regional Emergency Coordination Plan (RECP), 2007
Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Plans (RCPGP), 2011
RECP Subsidiary Plans

San Francisco Bay Area Earthquake Readiness Response: Concept of Operations Plan (CONPLAN)*

* Only applies to Coastal Region, specifically the San Francisco Bay Area counties of: Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Solano, and Sonoma. Monterey and San Benito Counties were added to Regional planning efforts in 2009.

Emergency Operations Plans (EOPs)
Alameda ➤ Oakland
Contra Costa
Marin
Monterey
Napa
San Benito
San Francisco
San Mateo
Santa Clara
Santa Cruz
Solano
Sonoma

DRAFT
Debris Removal/Management Plan Relationships

Federal ➤ State ➤ Region ➤ Operational Areas ➤ Local Governments

* Only applies to Coastal Region, specifically the San Francisco Bay Area counties of: Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Solano, and Sonoma. Monterey and San Benito Counties were added to Regional planning efforts in 2009.
Donations Management Plan Relationships
Federal ➤ State ➤ Region ➤ Operational Areas ➤ Local Governments

FEDERAL
Volunteer and Donations Management Support Annex (Annex to NRF)

CALIFORNIA
CA - EF 17, Volunteer and Donations Management

Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Donations Management Plan

Operational Area Catastrophic Earthquake Donations Management Plans (Annexes to EOPs)
- Alameda
- Contra Costa
- Marin
- Monterey
- Napa
- San Benito
- San Francisco
- San Mateo
- Santa Clara
- Santa Cruz
- Solano
- Sonoma

Core City Catastrophic Earthquake Donations Management Plans (Annexes to EOPs)
- Oakland
- San Jose

Coastal Region
* Other than Marin County it is unknown or assumed that the other San Francisco Bay Area Operational Area and Core Cities lack plans that specifically address Interim Housing.
Logistics Plan Relationships
Federal ► State ► Region ► Operational Areas ► Local Governments

Operational Area Catastrophic Earthquake Logistics Response Plans (Annexes 1)
- Alameda
- Contra Costa
- Marin
- Monterey
- Napa
- San Benito
- San Francisco
- San Mateo
- Santa Clara
- Santa Cruz
- Solano
- Sonoma

Core City Catastrophic Earthquake Logistics Response Plans (Annexes to EOPs)
- Oakland
- San Jose

Operational Area plans are annexes to the Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Logistics Response Plan

* Only applies to Coastal Region, specifically the San Francisco Bay Area counties of: Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Solano, and Sonoma. Monterey and San Benito Counties were added to Regional planning efforts in 2009
Mass Care and Sheltering Plan Relationships
Federal ➤ State ➤ Region ➤ Operational Areas ➤ Local Governments

* Only applies to Coastal Region, specifically the San Francisco Bay Area counties of: Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Solano, and Sonoma. Monterey and San Benito Counties were added to Regional planning efforts in 2009
Mass Fatality Management Plan Relationships
Federal ▶ State ▶ Region ▶ Operational Areas ▶ Local Governments

*Only applies to Coastal Region, specifically the San Francisco Bay Area counties of: Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Solano, and Sonoma. Monterey and San Benito Counties were added to Regional planning efforts in 2009.
Mass Transportation/Evacuation Plan Relationships

Federal ➤ State ➤ Region ➤ Operational Areas ➤ Local Governments

CONPLAN¹
Annex C - Tab 14, Transportation and Logistics

CALIFORNIA
CA - EF 1, Transportation
CA - EF 16, Evacuation

FEDERAL
ESF #1 - Transportation Mass Evacuation Incident Annex (Annex to NRF)

Operational Area Catastrophic Earthquake Mass Transportation/Evacuation Plans (Annexes to EOPs)
- Alameda
- Contra Costa
- Marin
- Monterey
- Napa
- San Benito
- San Francisco
- San Mateo
- Santa Clara
- Santa Cruz
- Solano
- Sonoma

Core City Catastrophic Earthquake Mass Transportation/Evacuation Plans (Annexes to EOPs)
- Oakland
- San Jose

* Only applies to Coastal Region, specifically the San Francisco Bay Area counties of: Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Solano, and Sonoma. Monterey and San Benito Counties were added to Regional planning efforts in 2009.

DRAFT
Volunteer Management Plan Relationships
Federal ➔ State ➔ Region ➔ Operational Areas ➔ Local Governments

FEDERAL
Volunteer and Donations Management Support Annex (Annex to NRF)

CALIFORNIA
CA - EF 17, Volunteer and Donations Management

Regional Volunteer Management Plan

Operational Area Volunteer Management Plans (Annexes to EOPs)
- Alameda
- Contra Costa
- Marin
- Monterey
- Napa
- San Benito
- San Francisco
- San Mateo
- Santa Clara
- Santa Cruz
- Solano
- Sonoma

Coastal Region
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BAY AREA UASI

SUSTAINMENT PLAN

REGIONAL CATASTROPHIC PREPAREDNESS GRANT PROGRAM

Approval Authority Meeting
April 10, 2014
Plan Overview

- Required in the FY 11 RCPGP grant guidelines
- Patterned after the Puget Sound Plan
- Covers the eight plans prepared by the region
- Strategies for sustainment are included
- Provides recommendations for sustaining capabilities
Action Plan 2014-2018

- Develop an RCPT Charter & hold quarterly meetings
- Identify Plan “champions” to keep plans current
- Enhance collaboration with Cal OES
- Continue working with national RCPGP partners
- Incorporate Plans into CONPLAN or RECP through Cal OES
- Promote local agency adoption of plans
- Conduct outreach to private sector and NGOs
Training and Exercise

- RCPT will work with the UASI Regional T/E Program
- Leverage planned training and exercises
- Offer training courses and exercises relevant to regional plans
- RCPT to propose courses when identified
- Exercises to be used as a means to evaluate RCPGP plans
## Plan Recommendations

### For FEMA
- Share Plans nationally
- Support RCPGP sites on some level

### For Cal OES
- Formally accept plans
- Continue working with RCPT

### For Local Governments
- Formally adopt plans
- Maintain plans through training & exercises
QUESTIONS?

BAY AREA UASI
To: Bay Area UASI Approval Authority  
From: Bruce Martin, CBRNE Program Manager  
Date: April 10, 2014  
Re: Item #9: Bay Area Radiological/Nuclear Detection Program Development Initiative

Staff Recommendations:

Receive Report

Action or Discussion Items:

Discussion Only

Discussion:

We have begun to facilitate a regional effort to plan and develop a program to detect radiological/nuclear materials that are out of regulatory control. This presentation is informational and feedback from the Approval Authority on any aspect of this effort is welcome. Last month, the General Manager informed you of the Securing the Cities grant application process; this effort directly affects the Securing the Cities grant application.

Preventing radiological and nuclear terrorism requires the ability to detect and interdict nuclear materials before they can be misused. The Bay Area has obtained assistance from the Department of Homeland Security’s Domestic Nuclear Detection Office (DNDO) to support the development of a plan. Agencies around the Bay Area have some RND resources that would benefit from better coordination and more consistency in their use; other agencies actively pursuing RND equipment acquisition and deployment. Leading a concerted and coordinated effort now to develop a cohesive regional RND program will reduce duplication of training and equipment funding, improve regional interoperability, and better enable successful long-term regional program implementation and advancement.

There are several State and Urban Area Security Initiative strategic security goals and objectives directing a coordinated radiological/nuclear detection capability. An effective Bay Area RND Program directly supports the prevention/protection mission area core capabilities within the UASI, as well as DNDO’s Global Nuclear Detection Architecture. The Bay Area program will
create a regional concept of operations, training and exercise schedule, equipment purchase recommendations, and sustainment activities.

More than 50 Federal, State, and local law enforcement, fire, hazmat, and public and environmental safety agencies and organizations are participating in the Bay Area RND program workshops, data collection, and document development effort. UASI staff and regional participants provide organizational leadership and process input to craft Bay Area-specific priorities, strategies, and documents. DNDO will support the development effort by providing example documents, meeting and workshop facilitation, and radiological/nuclear detection subject matter expertise.

This is a rapid development effort, engaging and integrating all key stakeholder agencies over a six month period, with a kick-off meeting held March 20, 2014, a Concept of Operations development workshop in June 2014, and an Implementation and Sustainment Workshop expected in August 2014. Multi-agency round table meetings and webinars will be conducted between these meetings to develop the products mentioned above.

In addition to document development, a regional review of existing capabilities will be conducted to help ensure effective coordination of capabilities and identify areas for future improvements.

Currently, we are contemplating that the UASI CBRNE Working Group (WG) be the lead element in the ongoing effort. Assigning leadership of the RND program to the UASI CBRNE WG, with long-term implementation jointly supported by the CBRNE and Training & Exercise committees, would be mutually beneficial to all missions: UASI local lessons learned and realities would be leveraged to better secure the foundation of the regional preventive RND program, with the RND mission space inherently advancing the goals of both UASI committees.
Radiological/Nuclear Detection Regional Program Development

UASI Approval Authority Meeting
10 April 2014

Bruce Martin, CBRNE Project Manager for UASI
We are Initiating a regional Rad/Nuc Detection Program Development Effort

Preventing radiological and nuclear terrorism requires the ability to detect and interdict nuclear materials before they can be misused.
Preventive Radiological & Nuclear Detection:

**PRND = Detect to Prevent**

Multi-Discipline Program with a LE Focus
Other RND programs advancing in the State

- Bay Area Maritime Program maturing
- Securing the Cities in LA/Long Beach
Goal 4 *Strengthen CBRNE Detection, Response, and Decontamination Capabilities*

**Objective 4.3 Enhance Screening Search and Detection Capabilities**

⇒ Per 2012 Core Capability Assessment, *Screening, Search and Detection “Needs Attention”*
Goal 5 Strengthen Catastrophic CBRNE and All Hazards Incident Planning, Detection and Response Capabilities

Objective 5.3 Implement the California Preventative Radiological and Nuclear Detection Program
Scoping Completed for RND Program Assistance in summer 2013

- **>20 organizations initially engaged**
  
Pockets of assets and energy, enough interest to support regional engagement.

- **Initial multi-agency planning meeting conducted 12/11/13**

- Agency outreach will continue through the entire development effort.
Overarching Program Development Goal:

Establish regional framework for the coordination of rad/nuc detection activities that has broad participation…

…while minimizing the impact of program development and implementation on Bay Area agencies
Development Activities to Date

• Stood up Executive Task Force to steer the program development process
• Developed preliminary Program Mission, Objectives and End States
• Initiated capabilities information gathering
• Started agency-specific program development/advancement support (for agencies with RND equipment)
• Constructing a General Task Force to develop regional program documents and sustainment tools
Executive Task Force
Task Force Chair: Chief Bruce Martin, Bay Area UASI CBRNE Program Manager

Purpose: Steer the overall land-based/Bay Area Interior RND program development effort.

- **Alameda County Fire Department**, Division Chief Rob Schnepp (Special Operations)
- **Alameda County Sheriff’s Office**, Commander Rocky Medeiros
- **BART Police Department**, Lieutenant Kevin Franklin, Manager of Security Programs
- **California Highway Patrol**, Lieutenant Jim Libby, Dublin Area
- **Federal Bureau of Investigation**, San Francisco, Special Agent Sean Donahue, WMDC
- **Northern California Regional Intelligence Center**, Deputy Director Daniel Mahoney
- **Radiological Assistance Program**, Joel Swanson, Contractor Response Coordinator
- **San Francisco Police Department**, Deputy Chief Charlie Orkes, Special Operations
- **San Francisco Fire Department**, Assistant Deputy Chief Kyle Merkins
- **San Jose Police Department**, Deputy Chief David Hober, Bureau of Field Operations
- **Santa Clara County Fire Department**, Battalion Chief James Young
- **Santa Clara County Sheriff**, Sergeant Brian Washburn, Bomb Technician/Commander
- **USCG/Maritime representation**, LCDR Deon Scott, Asst Chief Enforcement Division
- **95th Civil Support Team**, Lt Col Michael Sather
Constructing Working Groups & Program Development Structure

determined by regional interests, priorities, and desired products

(draft)

Executive Task Force

General Task Force

- ConOps
- Equipment & Capabilities
- Training & Exercise

Task Teams: (~3-4 meetings)

- Commercial Vehicles
- Special Events
- Intel & Info Sharing
- Aviation
- Mass Transit Systems
- Maritime*

Pathway/Topical input (~1-3 meetings)

- Maritime Program ConOps and SOP coordinated separately by AMSC/Neptune Coalition, but this interior development effort will be informed by their lessons learned.
END STATES

• A sustainable RND Program that ensures that officers in the field have the equipment, training, and technical support structure to help them quickly and successfully resolve radiation detection issues.

• A robust and efficient program that minimizes impacts on commerce and the public while avoiding undue operational impacts on the agencies that perform RND operations.

• Coordinated progression of potential radiological and nuclear threats to Federal support.

• Collaborative RND data/intelligence sharing and incident communications, coordinated through local public safety agencies and regional fusion centers.

• Uniformity of protocols and radiation detection equipment to foster interoperability and efficient training.

• Leveraging of multi-agency support for special events to provide a baseline mechanism for RND collaboration.

• A framework that supports the integration of additional agencies and regional partners.

• Sustained regional resources for surge and alarm adjudication that can be shared across the region.
Preliminary Regional Engagement & Development Timeline

- Task Force/WG Meetings (April – July)
  - ~Monthly Roundtable meetings & status telecons/webinars
  - Additional State/Local program and technical briefings to inform product development
- Equipment Demo/Rodeo
  - Vendor (or)
  - Community Show and Tell
- ConOps Workshop
- Sustainment Workshop

Bay Area

RND Program Development Activities

March 20th 2014
Program Development Kick Off Meeting
- Briefing on Bay Area Rad/Nuc Detection capabilities
- What is the Radiological and Nuclear Terrorism threat to the region?
- Review regional role in the Global Nuclear Detection Architecture
- Bay Area Rad/Nuc Detection program mission, goals and objectives
- Identify agency interest areas and opportunities for capability improvements
- Detection equipment demo/display

June 5th 2014
ConOps Alarm Adjudication Workshop
- Bay Area (draft) ConOps document roll-out and vetting
- Regional ConOps, alarm resolution, and reachback capabilities
- Standard Operation Procedures & Job Aids
- (Optional) Rad/Nuc detection equipment rodeo

August 2014
Implementation & Sustainment Workshop
- Vet equipment requirements and acquisition priorities
- Long-term program governance, functions, and ownership
- Training and exercise program
- Regional strategy roll-out
Preliminary Regional Interests and Priorities that may be addressed by Working Groups

• Regional strategy and **ConOps**

• **Special Event planning** ConOps & tools

• Comprehensive regional equipment & capabilities survey

• **Sustainment:** Equipment calibration, **Training & Exercise/Drill coordination**

• Prosecutor's Office: Reasonable suspicion, use of PRD’s to support stop/search

• **Regional pathway analysis and strategy development**
Technical support for **SOP and policy development**

**Equipment tech spec info to inform purchases**

**Training** – locally delivered options, initial and refresher

**Job aids**

**Grant writing information**
Regional Program Development – Next Steps

– Construct and Begin Working Groups
  • **ConOps** – regional implementation of CA State PRND ConOps
  • **Special Events** – planning tool/template
  • **Training and Exercise**
  • **Equipment Choices**
  • **Maritime** - *developed separately under AMSC/Neptune Coalition direction*
  • **Others per Kick Off Meeting participant feedback**

– Draft:
  • Strategy
  • ConOps document & SOP template
  • Regional Equipment & Capabilities list
DHS Domestic Nuclear Detection Office (DNDO) Assistance will facilitate:

- Development of a regional Concept of Operations (ConOps) and guidelines for comprehensive RND alarm adjudication that is consistent with the State of California ConOps.
- Incorporation of radiological/nuclear detection into training and exercise programs.
- Determination of the resources and capabilities of all entities to assist with rad/nuc detection and reporting activities.
- Establishment of a radiological/nuclear intelligence sharing protocol among all partners.
- Development of a Bay Area detection architecture that ensures a smooth transition of potential threats between agencies and the Federal Radiological/Nuclear Search Operations.
- Identification of long term program management and oversight.
- Creation of uniform protocols and radiation detection equipment to foster efficient procurements, interoperability and training consistency.
To: Bay Area UASI Approval Authority
From: Robin Donoghue, Meyers Nave
Date: April 10, 2014
Re: Item 10: Brown Act Update

Staff Recommendation:

Information only

Action or Discussion Item:

Discussion only

Summary

Item 10 - Appendix A provides an update on the Ralph M. Brown Act.
OPEN MEETING LAWS IN CALIFORNIA: RALPH M. BROWN ACT UPDATE

April 2014

www.meyersnave.com
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I. INTRODUCTION, PURPOSE, AND SCOPE OF BROWN ACT

The Ralph M. Brown Act (the “Act”), codified as Government Code sections 54950 through 54963, is California’s open public meeting law. It was first enacted in 1953 as good government reform to limit perceived and real backroom deal making and to make local government decision making more transparent to the public. The Brown Act is intended to facilitate public participation in all phases of local government decision-making and to curb misuse of the democratic process by secret legislation of public bodies. (Chaffee v. San Francisco Library Commission (2004) 115 Cal.App.4th 461.) The basic requirement of the Act is set forth at Government Code section 54953(a):

“All meetings of the legislative body of a local agency shall be open and public, and all persons shall be permitted to attend any meeting of the legislative body of a local agency, except as otherwise provided in this chapter.”

By adopting this legislation, the Legislature established a clear presumption in favor of public access to public meetings.

Even though the Act establishes broad public access rights to the meetings of “legislative” bodies, it also recognizes that under certain limited circumstances there is a legitimate governmental interest in closing some meetings to the public. Examples of such statutorily-authorized closed session topics include personnel issues, pending litigation, anticipated litigation, labor negotiations, real property acquisitions, and public security.

The Brown Act now covers virtually every type of local government body, elected or appointed, decision-making or advisory, permanent or temporary. Similarly, meetings subject to the Brown Act are not limited to formal gatherings but include communications by which a majority develops a “collective concurrence as to action to be taken.” Even discussions among a majority of the legislative body are considered “meetings” if the discussion involves any item within the body’s subject matter jurisdiction.

II. BODIES COVERED BY THE BROWN ACT

The Brown Act applies to “legislative bodies” of all local agencies in the State of California. “Legislative body” is defined in the Brown Act to include the governing body of a local agency (e.g., the board of directors) and any commission, committee, board or other body of a local agency, whether permanent or temporary, decision making or advisory, created by charter, ordinance, resolution or formal action of the legislative body. “Standing committees” (even those consisting of less than a quorum of the body) are subject to the requirements of the Brown Act. Standing committees have either: (1) a continuing subject matter jurisdiction; or (2) a meeting fixed by charter, ordinance, resolution or other formal action of the legislative body. For example, if a governing body creates a long-term committee on a particular subject (e.g., finance, public safety, budget, etc.), such a committee would be considered a standing committee subject to the Brown Act. (Gov. Code § 54952(b).)
Also included as legislative bodies are any non-profit corporations created by the legislative body to exercise delegated authority or any non-profit that receives funding from the legislative body and to whose board the legislative body appoints one of its members (Gov. Code § 54952(c).)

Government Code section 54952 includes as a legislative body a limited liability company that is created by the legislative body to exercise delegated authority or that receives funding from the local agency and to whose board the legislative body appoints one of its members.

The Brown Act does not apply to ad hoc advisory committees composed solely of less than a quorum of the legislative body. Such committees shall not have “continuing subject matter jurisdiction” and do not have a meeting schedule fixed by formal action of a legislative body. Ad hoc committees generally serve only a limited or a single purpose, are not perpetual, and are dissolved once their assigned task is completed.

Committees that are not created by formal action of the legislative body are not covered. For example, if a staff member or a single member of a governing board creates an advisory group and it is not otherwise created by formal action, that committee is not covered by the Brown Act.

III. MEETING DEFINED

The Brown Act defines a meeting as “any congregation of a majority of the members of a legislative body at the same time and location, including teleconference locations as permitted by Section 54953, to hear, discuss, deliberate or take action on any item that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the legislative body.” (Gov. Code § 54952.2(a).) This definition is extraordinarily expansive and essentially prohibits any deliberation among members of a legislative body on issues before that body other than at a scheduled public meeting.

However, there are six types of gatherings that are exempt from the provisions of the Brown Act. These exceptions are: (1) the individual contact exception; (2) the conference exception; (3) the community meeting exception; (4) the other legislative body exception; (5) the social or ceremonial occasion exception; and (6) the standing committee attendance exception.

Unless a gathering of a majority of the members of a legislative body falls within one of these specified exceptions, if a majority of the members are in the same place and discussing any city business matter, such a gathering would be considered a meeting under the Brown Act.

A. EXCEPTIONS

1. Individual Contact Exception: The Act specifically allows individual contacts or conversations between a member of the body and any other person, providing such contract or conversation does not result in a serial meeting (defined below). (Gov. Code § 54952.2(c)(1).)

2. Conference Exception: The Act specifically allows the attendance of a majority of members at a conference or similar gathering, provided that a majority of the members do not discuss among themselves, other than as part of the scheduled program, specific matters within the jurisdiction of the agency. (Gov. Code § 54952.2(c)(2).)
3. **Community Meeting Exception**: A majority of members may attend an open and publicized community meeting organized to address a topic of local concern without running afoul of the Act, as long as the agency did not organize the event and the members do not discuss among themselves, other than as part of the scheduled program, specific matters within the jurisdiction of the agency. (Gov. Code § 54952.2(c)(3).)

4. **Other Legislative Body Exception**: A majority of the members of a local legislative body may attend an open and noticed meeting of another body of the same agency, as well as an open and noticed meeting of another local agency, again with the caveat that they may not discuss among themselves, other than as part of the scheduled meeting, specific business within their jurisdiction. (Gov. Code § 54952.2(c)(4).) Thus, for example, the Brown Act does not prohibit a majority of a city’s planning commissioners from attending an open and noticed meeting of the City Council.

5. **Social or Ceremonial Occasion Exception**: A majority can attend social or ceremonial events as long as they do not discuss among themselves specific business within the subject matter jurisdiction of their agency. (Gov. Code § 54952.2(c)(5).)

6. **Standing Committee Attendance Exception**: A majority of members may attend an open and noticed meeting of a standing committee of the body, provided that members of the body who are not members of the standing committee attend only as observers. (Gov. Code § 54952.2(c)(6).)

**B. SERIAL MEETINGS**

Although the Brown Act does not prohibit individual contacts or conversations between a member of a legislative body and any other person, the Brown Act does prohibit a series of such individual contacts if they result in a so-called “serial meeting.” (Gov. Code § 54952.2(b).)

The Act expressly prohibits serial meetings, defined as “a series of communications of any kind, directly or through intermediaries, to discuss, deliberate, or take action on any item of business that is within the subject matter jurisdiction or the legislative body.” (Gov. Code § 54952.2(b)(1).)

For example, a chain of communications (sometimes referred to as a “daisy chain” serial meeting) occurs in the following circumstance: Member A contacts member B. Member B then contacts member C. Member C then contacts Member D, and so on, until a majority of the members of the legislative body have participated in the discussion.

An example of the so-called “hub and spoke” serial meeting occurs when a staff person telephones members of a board one-by-one to discuss a proposed action, or a chief executive briefs board members prior to a formal meeting and, in the process, reveals information about the members’ respective views. The Brown Act prohibits not only reaching a collective concurrence, but also any discussion by a majority of the legislative body members on any item that is within the legislative body’s jurisdiction. The Brown Act does not, however, prevent an employee or official of the agency from having separate conversations with a majority of the legislative body outside of a meeting in order to answer questions or provide information to the members, as long as that person does not communicate the comments or positions of a member or members to a majority. (Gov. Code § 54952.2(b)(2).)
1. Individual Contacts Between Members of the Public and Board Members. Although Government Code 54952.2(c)(1) allows for individual contacts or conversations between a member of a legislative body and another person, it should be kept in mind that such individual contact should not be expanded in an effort to engage a majority of the legislative body in a discussion of any issue within the legislative body's jurisdiction. In other words, a member of the public should not act as an intermediary to relay among a majority of the members the members' positions or comments on topics within their subject matter jurisdiction.

2. Video Teleconferencing and Conference Telephone Calls. The prohibition against serial meetings specifically exempts video conferencing or teleconferencing meetings as long as they are conducted according to the procedures set forth in the Brown Act at section 54953(b). Such procedures require the following steps: (1) an agenda must be posted at all videoconference or teleconference locations; (2) each location must be identified in the notice and agenda of the meeting and must be accessible to the public, and (3) a quorum of the members of the legislative body must participate from within the boundaries of the agency's jurisdiction.

3. Writings as Meetings. Although generally distribution of written instruments does not constitute a meeting under the Brown Act, at least one court has determined that circulation of a proposal among board members for their review and signature did, in fact, constitute a meeting in violation of the Brown Act when a majority of the members of the legislative body signed the document.

4. E-mails. The Brown Act prohibits the use of "a series of communications of any kind . . . to discuss, deliberate or take action . . . ." (Gov. Code § 54952.2(b)(1).) Consequently, e-mails are subject to the Brown Act. The ease with which one can send an e-mail message may make it a particularly problematic trap for unwary public officials. A board member may send a message to a colleague about a matter that will be before the board. The recipient might forward it to a third board member, resulting in a serial meeting prohibited by the Brown Act. All may be acting without any intention of violating the Brown Act, and yet they may have done so. The e-mail string is also an electronic record of the violation. If a majority of the members of a legislative body either receive or reply to an e-mail, a serial meeting may result since the transmission of the members' ideas could be construed as a "discussion" under the Brown Act. This can easily occur when a member selects "reply to all" on a message sent from staff where that message contains discussion, deliberation, decisions or other content on any issue within the legislative body's jurisdiction.

IV. NOTICE AND AGENDA REQUIREMENTS

A. REGULAR MEETINGS

Each legislative body of a local agency, except for advisory committees or standing committees, must provide either by ordinance, resolution or bylaws the time and place for holding regular meetings.

1. Agenda Requirements. For regular meetings, the legislative body must post an agenda at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. The agenda must contain a brief general description of each item of business to be conducted, and must specify the time and location of the regular meeting. (Gov. Code § 54954.2(a).) The Brown Act provides that such descriptions of agenda items generally need not exceed 20 words, but should inform interested members of the public about what is under consideration, so that the public can determine whether it wishes to participate in the meeting. (Gov. Code § 54954.2(a)(1).)
The agenda must also include a notice informing the public that any writing that is a public record and relates to an open session agenda item that is distributed less than 72 hours prior to the meeting will be available for public inspection at City Hall. (Gov. Code § 54957.5.) If requested, the agenda shall be made available in appropriate formats to serve persons with disabilities, and the agenda must include information regarding how, to whom and when a request for disability accommodation may be made by a person with a disability who requires such accommodation in order to participate in the public meeting.

**UPDATE:** The agenda must be posted in a location freely accessible to members of the public, and on the agency’s web site.

2. **Exceptions to Agenda Requirements.** The Brown Act provides that no action or discussion shall be undertaken on any item not appearing on the posted agenda except: (1) a member of a legislative body or its staff may briefly respond to statements made or questions posed by a person exercising public testimony rights under the public comment portion of the meeting; (2) a member of the legislative body, on his or her own initiative, or in response to questions posed by the public, may ask questions for clarification, make a brief announcement or make a brief report on his or her own activities; and (3) a member of the legislative body may provide a reference to staff or other resources for factual information, request staff to report back to the body at a subsequent meeting concerning any matter, or take action to direct staff to place a matter of business on a future agenda. (Gov. Code § 54954.2(a)(2).)

In addition, the legislative body may take action on items not appearing on the posted agenda if the body publicly identifies the item and one of the following three circumstances exists:

(a) A majority determines that an emergency exists as defined by Government Code section 54956.5 (discussed in more detail below).

(b) Two-thirds vote of the members of the body present or, if less than two-thirds of the members are present, a unanimous vote of those members present, determines that there is a need to take immediate action and that the need for action came to the attention of the local agency subsequent to the agenda being posted.

(c) The item was previously posted for a prior meeting of the body that occurred not more than five calendar days prior to the date action is taken on the item, and at the prior meeting the item was continued to the meeting at which action is being taken. (Gov. Code § 54954.2(b).)

3. **Public Testimony.** The Brown Act provides that every agenda for a regular meeting must provide an opportunity for members of the public to address the legislative body on any item under the subject matter jurisdiction of the body. Encompassed in this provision are two types of public comment periods. One is a general comment period in which members of the public may comment on any item of interest that is within the body’s subject matter jurisdiction and is not on the agenda. The other public comment period is with respect to any item on the agenda. Such comment periods on agenda items must be allowed to occur prior to or during the Council’s consideration of the item. (Gov. Code § 54954.3(a).)

There is one exception to allowing public comment. This exception provides that the agenda need not provide an opportunity for members of the public to address the legislative body on any item that had already been considered by a committee, composed exclusively of members of the legislative body, at a public meeting wherein all interested members of the public were afforded the opportunity to address the committee on the item unless the item has been substantially changed since the committee heard the item as determined by the legislative body.
The legislative body is allowed to adopt reasonable regulations, including regulations limiting the total amount of time allocated for public testimony on particular issues and for each individual speaker. (Gov. Code § 54954.3(b).)

**B. SPECIAL MEETINGS**

A special meeting may be called at any time by the presiding officer of the legislative body or by a majority of the members of the legislative body by delivering written notice to each member of the legislative body and to each local newspaper of general circulation and radio or television stations requesting notice in writing. The notice must be delivered personally or by any other means and shall be received at least 24 hours before the time of the meeting as specified in the notice, which shall also specify the time and place of the special meeting and the business to be conducted. No other business shall be considered at special meetings. In other words, there cannot be any matters added to the agenda. In some instances written notice may be dispensed with as to any members of the legislative body. The call and notice must be posted 24 hours prior to the special meeting in a location freely accessible to members of the public. (Gov. Code § 54956.)

**UPDATE:** The notice must also be posted on the agency’s web site.

**UPDATE:** Agencies may not agendize or discuss matters regarding local agency official salaries, salary schedules or compensation paid in the form of fringe benefits at a special meeting. The definition of “local agency officials” includes chief executive officers, deputy and assistant chief executive officers, department heads and officials who have an employment contract with the agency, and who are not members of a collective bargaining unit. General budget discussions may still be held at special meetings, however. (Gov. Code § 54956.)

**C. EMERGENCY MEETINGS**

As noted above, a legislative body may conduct an emergency meeting when there is an “emergency situation” requiring prompt action due to disruption or threatened disruption of public facilities without having to comply with the 24-hour notice requirement of a special meeting. (Gov. Code § 54956.5(b)(1).) The Brown Act defines “emergency situation” as work stoppage or crippling activity or other activity that severely impairs public health, safety, or both, as determined by a majority of the members of the legislative body; and a “dire emergency” as a crippling disaster, mass destruction, terrorist act, or threatened terrorist activity that poses peril so immediate and significant that requiring the legislative body to provide even one-hour notice before holding an emergency meeting may endanger the public health, safety, or both, as determined by a majority of the members of the legislative body. (Gov. Code § 54956.5(a)(1).)

However, newspapers of general circulation, radio or television stations that have requested special meeting notices shall be notified by the presiding officer or designee one hour prior to the “emergency” meeting by telephone unless telephone services are not functioning. In the case of a “dire emergency,” notice shall be given to the media at or near the time the presiding officer notifies members of the legislative body of the emergency meeting.

The legislative body may not meet in closed session during an emergency meeting, except pursuant to Government Code section 54957, which allows a closed session with law enforcement on specified security
matters if agreed to by a two-thirds vote of the members present at the emergency meeting or, if less than two-thirds of the members are present, by unanimous vote. (Gov. Code § 54956.5(c).)

UPDATE: **D. PUBLIC REPORTING OF ACTIONS TAKEN IN OPEN SESSIONS**

All legislative bodies must publicly report any action taken and the vote or abstention on that action of each member present for the action. “Action taken” is a collective decision made by a majority of the members upon a motion, proposal, resolution, order or ordinance, and may include decisions made by general consensus. The public announcement is in addition to the prior requirements of taking and recording attendance, and recording votes, in the minutes. The minutes should also clearly record whether any voting member leaves the meeting before adjournment or enters the meeting after the call to order.

Each time the legislative body takes action, the action should be by motion followed either (1) by a roll call vote with each vote or abstention individually recorded in the minutes or (2) following each vote, the Chair or Clerk of the legislative body (or other appropriate person) announcing the vote, including who voted which way. The Chair’s or Clerk’s statement should be substantially similar to the following and should be recorded in the minutes:

> “The Board voted on a motion to [describe action taken].

The motion [carried/did not carry] by unanimous vote.

-or-

The following individuals voted in favor [list members]; the following members voted against [list members]; and [the following members abstained/no members abstained]. Based on this count, the motion [carried/did not carry].”

The same statement should be made where a decision, such as a direction to staff, is made by general consensus.

E. **CLOSED SESSIONS**

1. **Agenda Requirements.** Although closed sessions not open to the public may be conducted at regular or special meetings, there must still be notice of the closed sessions even if no action is contemplated.

The Brown Act provides certain “safe harbor” provisions or model formats for describing closed session matters. Substantial compliance with these “safe harbor” provisions satisfies agenda description requirements. (See Gov. Code § 54954.5.)

2. **Oral Announcement Prior to Closed Session.** The Brown Act also requires an oral announcement of the items to be discussed in closed session prior to adjourning to closed session. In some instances, the Brown Act only requires a reference to the item as it appears on the agenda. In other situations, the Brown Act requires additional information and describes the types of announcements which must be made. However, these provisions do not require the disclosure of privileged or confidential communications exempt from disclosure under the Public Records Act.
3. **Report at the Conclusion of Closed Sessions.** The Brown Act requires that a legislative body reconvene in open session after conducting a closed session. If certain types of action are taken in closed session and under certain specified circumstances, the legislative body is to report the action taken and the vote, subject to limited exceptions. (See Gov. Code § 54957.1.)

**E. ADJOURNMENTS AND CONTINUANCES**

The Brown Act provides that a legislative body may adjourn any regular, adjourned regular, special or adjourned special meeting to a time and place specified in the order of adjournment. Less than a quorum may adjourn such meetings and if all members are absent, the clerk or secretary of the legislative body may declare the meeting adjourned and must provide written notice of the adjournment in the same manner as for special meetings. A copy of the order or notice of adjournment must be posted on or near the door of the place where the regular, adjourned regular, special or adjourned special meeting was held within 24 hours after the time of the adjournment. (Gov. Code § 54955.)

A duly noticed hearing may also be continued or recontinued in the same manner as adjourned meetings. However, if a meeting is continued to a time less than 24 hours after the time specified in the original notice, a copy of the notice of continuance must be posted immediately following the meeting in which the continuance was adopted. (Gov. Code § 54955.1.)

**F. LOCATION OF MEETINGS**

Regular or special meetings of the legislative body must be held within the boundaries of the territory over which the local agency exercises jurisdiction. In other words, a city council meeting must be within the city, county board of supervisors must be within the county, and boards of directors for special districts must meet within special districts. (Gov. Code § 54954(b).)

However, there are boundary exemptions set forth in the Brown Act that permit the legislative body to meet outside of its boundaries to do any of the following:

1. Comply with state or federal law or any court order, or attend a judicial or administrative proceeding to which the local agency is a party.

2. Inspect real property located outside the jurisdiction or personal property that would be inconvenient to bring inside the jurisdiction.

3. Participate in meetings or discussions of multi-agency significance so long as the meetings are held at the jurisdiction of one of the agencies and proper notice is provided by all bodies covered by the Act.

4. Meet at the nearest available facility if the legislative body has no meeting facility within the jurisdiction or at the principal office of the legislative body if that office is located outside the jurisdiction.
5. Meet with federal or California officials on a legislative or regulatory issue affecting the local agency when a local meeting would be impractical and over which the state or federal officials have jurisdiction.

6. Meet in or nearby a facility owned by the local agency so long as the topic of the meeting is directly related to the facility itself.

7. Visit the office of the body’s legal counsel for a closed session held on pending litigation when to do so would reduce legal fees or costs.

School districts have certain additional exemptions. Joint powers authorities must meet within the jurisdiction of one of its member agencies unless one of the above exemptions apply.

V. PERMISSIBLE CLOSED SESSIONS

A. PURPOSE

The basic purpose of the Brown Act is to be sure that the public business is conducted in public and that the public is permitted to participate. However, the Legislature has recognized those instances when discussion of certain types of matters in open session would not be in the best interest of the public.

1. Narrow Construction. Closed sessions cannot be conducted unless expressly authorized by specific statutory provisions of the Brown Act. Since closed sessions are the exception to the open meeting requirements of the Brown Act, the provisions allowing closed sessions have been narrowly construed. Even if a matter is sensitive, controversial, cumbersome, embarrassing or could be handled in a much more expeditious manner in closed session, a closed session is not allowed unless expressly authorized by the Brown Act.

2. Semi-Closed Meetings. Sessions of legislative bodies are either “closed” or “open.” There should not be any so-called “semi-closed” meetings. In other words, a legislative body cannot invite selected members of the public to attend closed sessions while excluding others. In general, closed sessions should only include those members of the legislative body and any additional support staff that may be necessary (e.g., legal counsel, supervisor in a disciplinary matter, consultants, real estate or labor negotiators).

3. Secret Ballots. Secret ballots cannot be conducted in closed session unless the vote is specifically related to a closed session matter. In other words, if the item under consideration is not subject to a specific closed session exception, any vote on the item must be conducted in open session. Also, many votes that are permitted to be taken in closed session must be reported in the open session immediately following.

B. AUTHORIZED EXCEPTIONS

1. Personnel Exception (Gov. Code § 54957(b)). The so-called “personnel” exception allows a legislative body to meet in closed session to consider the “appointment, employment, evaluation of performance, discipline, or dismissal of a public employee or to hear complaints or charges
brought against the employee by another person or employee unless the employee requests a public session.”

The term “employee” is defined as including an officer or an independent contractor who functions as an officer or an employee, but does not include any elected official, member of a legislative body or other independent contractors. It is important to keep in mind that this particular closed session does not allow for discussion or action on proposed compensation except for reducing compensation that results from imposition of discipline.

A closed session under the personnel exception that involves specific complaints or charges brought against an employee requires that notice be given to the employee of his or her rights to have complaints or charges aired in open session. The notice must be provided 24 hours before the meeting.

2. Pending Litigation Exception (Gov. Code § 54956.9). The Brown Act provides that a legislative body may meet in closed session to discuss “pending litigation.” “Litigation” is defined to include any adjudicatory proceedings, including eminent domain, before a court, administrative body exercising its adjudicatory authority, hearing officer or arbitrator. For purposes of the Act, litigation is considered “pending” when any of the following circumstances exist: (a) litigation to which the agency is a party has been initiated formally; (b) it has been determined based on certain defined existing facts and circumstances that there exists a significant exposure to litigation (i.e., threatened or anticipated litigation against the agency); or (c) a local agency desires to discuss potential litigation to be initiated by the agency.

With respect to “existing litigation” the most obvious situation is when there has been an actual lawsuit filed in court or where another administrative agency names the local agency as a party.

With respect to threatened or anticipated litigation against the local agency, there are six separate categories of facts and circumstances, one of which must exist in order for a closed session to take place. An agency should consult with its counsel to determine whether these facts and circumstances exist, in order to provide a basis for a closed session. The legislative body may also meet under this exception to determine whether a closed session is authorized based on the information provided by legal counsel or staff.

3. Real Estate Negotiations Exception (Gov. Code § 54956.8). This exception allows a legislative body to meet in closed session to grant authority to its negotiator regarding real property negotiations and the power to finalize any agreement so negotiated. This closed session item concerns the purchase, sale, lease or exchange of property by or for the agency, and it must be preceded by an open session in which the body identifies both the real property and the persons with whom the negotiator may negotiate. If after negotiations for the purchase of property there is an impasse, and the legislative body wishes to consider eminent domain proceedings, such discussions should be held under the pending litigation exception of the Brown Act rather than the real property negotiation exception.

4. Labor Negotiation Exception (Gov. Code § 54957.6). A legislative body may meet in closed session with its labor negotiator regarding employment discussions with employee organizations and unrepresented employees regarding compensation. During such closed sessions, the legislative body may approve an agreement concluding labor negotiations with represented employees. However, closed sessions may not include final actions on proposed compensation for unrepresented employees. Prior to
the closed session, the legislative body shall, in open and public session, identify the designated representatives and parties to the negotiation.

5. **UPDATE:** Public Security Exception (Gov. Code § 54957). Legislative bodies may meet in closed session with the Governor, Attorney General, district attorney, agency counsel, sheriff or chief of police, or their respective deputies, or a security consultant or security operations manager, on matters posing a threat to the security of public buildings, a threat to the security of essential public services, or a threat to the public’s right of access to public services or public facilities.

Government Code section 54957 includes among those who can meet with a legislative body in closed session, agency counsel and security consultants or security operation managers with respect to matters posing a threat to the security of essential public services, including water, drinking water, wastewater treatment, natural gas service and electric service.

6. **License Application Exception (Gov. Code § 54956.7).** The Brown Act provides special provisions for consideration of license applications by persons with criminal records.

7. **Other Authorized Exceptions.**

   a. Joint powers agencies may meet in closed session to discuss a claim for payment of a tort liability loss, public liability loss, or workers’ compensation liability incurred by the joint powers agency or local agency member of such a joint powers agency. (Gov. Code § 54956.95.)

   b. Multi-jurisdictional law enforcement agencies may meet in closed session to discuss the case records of any ongoing criminal investigation of the multi-jurisdictional law enforcement agency. A “multi-jurisdictional law enforcement agency” is a joint powers entity formed to investigate criminal activity or felony possession of a firearm; high technology, computer, or identify theft; human trafficking; or vehicle theft. (Gov. Code § 54957.8.)

   c. A legislative body may meet in closed session to discuss a local agency employee’s application for early withdrawal of funds in a deferred compensation plan when the application is based on financial hardship arising from an unforeseeable emergency due to illness, accident, casualty or other extraordinary event. (Gov. Code § 54957.10)

   d. County hospitals, hospital districts, school districts and community colleges may conduct additional closed sessions under certain statutory provisions, including Health and Safety Code sections 1461, 1462, 32106, 32155 or Government Code sections 37606, 37606.1 and 37624.3 as they apply to hospitals, or any provisions of the Education Code pertaining to school districts and community college districts. (Gov. Code § 54962.)

C. **MINUTE BOOK**

An agency may, but is not required to, keep a minute book with respect to closed sessions. (See Gov. Code § 54957.2.) If it chooses, the legislative body may designate a clerk or other officer or employee to attend the closed session to keep the minute book. Such a minute book is not a public record, therefore is not subject to disclosure, and shall be kept confidential.
D. CONFIDENTIALITY OF CLOSED SESSIONS

Government Code section 54963 provides that a person may not disclose confidential closed session information without the consent of the legislative body holding the closed session. Violations can be addressed by injunction or disciplinary action.

VI. RECORDS DISTRIBUTED TO A LEGISLATIVE BODY

Agendas of public meetings and any other writings, when distributed to all or a majority of the legislative body of a local agency by any person in connection with a matter subject to discussion or consideration at an open meeting of the body, are subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act, Government Code section 6250 et seq., and shall be made available upon request without delay. However, any records so distributed are not subject to disclosure if they fall within the certain specified exemptions (see Government Code sections 6253.5, 6254, 6254.3, 6254.7, 6254.15, 6254.16, 6254.22, and 54957.5(a)).

Any writing that is a public record and relates to an agenda item for an open session of a regular meeting that is distributed less than 72 hours prior to the meeting must be made available for public inspection at a designated public office or location at the same time the writing is distributed to all or a majority of the legislative body. The local agency must list the location where such writings and all of the agency’s agendas are available. The local agency may also post the writing on the agency’s website in a manner and location that makes it clear the writing relates to an agenda of an upcoming meeting. (Gov. Code § 54957.5(b).) Writings that are public records subject to disclosure and that are distributed during a public meeting shall be made available for public inspection at the public meeting if prepared by the local agency or a member of the legislative body, and should be provided after the meeting if prepared by some other person. Any such writings shall be made available in an appropriate alternative format upon request by a person with a disability. (Gov. Code § 54957.5(c).)

VII. PENALTIES AND REMEDIES FOR VIOLATION OF THE ACT

The Brown Act includes provisions that make violations of the Act a crime and authorize civil actions to invalidate actions previously taken or to stop or prevent violations.

A. CRIMINAL PENALTIES (Gov. Code § 54959)

Each member of a legislative body who attends a meeting of that legislative body where “action” is taken in violation of the Act, and where the member “intends to deprive the public of information to which the member knows or has reason to know the public is entitled under this chapter, is guilty of a misdemeanor.” “Action taken” is defined by Government Code section 54952.6 and means a collective decision, commitment or promise by a majority of the members of the body to make a positive or negative decision, or an actual vote. Mere deliberation without some action is not a subject to criminal penalty.
B. CIVIL REMEDIES

1. Injunctive Relief (Gov. Code § 54960). The Brown Act provides that the district attorney or any interested person may commence an action by mandamus or injunctive or declaratory relief for the purpose of stopping or preventing violations or threatened violations of the Brown Act.

2. Invalidation of Action (Gov. Code § 54960.1). The district attorney or any interested person may commence an action or mandamus or injunction for obtaining a court order that actions taken in violation of certain provisions of the Brown Act are null and void. The specified provisions concerning which such a suit may be filed are:

   (a) General open meeting requirement (§ 54953);
   (b) Agenda requirement for regular meetings (§ 54954.2);
   (c) Safe harbor notice provisions for closed sessions (§ 54954.5);
   (d) Procedures for new taxes and assessments (§ 54954.6);
   (e) Requirements for special meetings (§ 54956); and
   (f) Requirements for emergency meetings (§ 54956.5).

However, prior to commencing such an action, the legislative body must be provided a demand to cure or correct the action alleged to have been taken in violation of the Brown Act. The written demand must be made within 30 days of the action if it was in open session, or within 90 days of the action in all other situations. The legislative body shall within 30 days correct or cure the challenged action or advise the demanding party in writing of its decision not to do so. If the legislative body takes no action, the demanding party may initiate litigation but must do so within 15 days of receipt of decision to cure or correct or refusal to do so or within 15 days of the end of the 30-day period to cure or correct.

UPDATE: 3. Limitation on Relief For Past Actions of Legislative Bodies (Gov. Code § 54960.2). For actions filed by the district attorney or any interested person related to past actions of a legislative body, the potential filer must first mail or fax a cease and desist letter to the legislative body within nine months of the alleged violation. The legislative body has 30 days to respond. If the legislative body does not timely provide an unconditional commitment to cease, desist and not repeat the challenged action, then an action may be brought, but only within 60 days of expiration of the response period. “Late” unconditional commitments made be made by the legislative body, but in that event the court shall award attorneys’ fees and costs to the filer. “Unconditional commitments” must be approved by the legislative body in open session, and not on a consent agenda, and will bar the filing of an action. However, violation of an “unconditional commitment” constitutes an independent violation of the Brown act. There are also provisions for rescission of an unconditional commitment.

4. Attorneys’ Fees (Gov. Code § 54960.5). A court may award court costs and reasonable attorneys’ fees to plaintiffs in actions brought under the Brown Act where it finds that there has been a violation of the Act. These costs and fees shall be paid by the local agency and shall not be the personal liability of the public officer or employee. The court may also award court costs and reasonable
attorneys' fees to a defendant legislative body or member where the defendant prevails and the court finds the action was clearly frivolous and totally lacking in merit.
To: Bay Area UASI Approval Authority
From: Tristan Levardo, CFO
Date: April 10, 2014
Re: Item 11: Reallocation of Grant Funds

Staff Recommendation:
Information only

Action or Discussion Item:
Discussion only

Summary
Pursuant to the Approval Authority Bylaws, Section 8.6 Modification of Grant Allocations, the Management Team shall report project budget changes under $250,000 to the Approval Authority on a biannual basis.

Item 11 - Appendix A illustrates the pertinent budget changes for the six months ended December 31, 2013.
Reallocation of Grant Funds (less than $250K)
For the Period July 1, 2013 through December 31, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project, Solution Areas</th>
<th>Project Categories</th>
<th>Initial Allocation</th>
<th>Reallocation</th>
<th>Cumulative Change</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>D-CBRNE Detection and Response, Equipment</td>
<td>Remote robot, SWAT ballistic vests, portable CBRNE equipment, and hook and line kit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>223,679</td>
<td>223,679</td>
<td>Unused allocation from Santa Clara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>F-Citizen Preparedness, Planning and Training</td>
<td>Access and functional needs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43,618</td>
<td>43,618</td>
<td>Unused allocation from Santa Clara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>F-Citizen Preparedness, Planning and Training</td>
<td>Access and functional needs</td>
<td>267,297</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(267,297)</td>
<td>Unfinished project from Santa Clara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>A-Risk Management and Planning, Planning</td>
<td>Regional Risk Management, LTPA</td>
<td>186,479</td>
<td>95,479</td>
<td>(91,000)</td>
<td>Savings in Core City allocations from personnel shifted to CBRNE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>D-CBRNE Detection and Response, Equipment</td>
<td>CBRNE Equipment for Oakland FD</td>
<td>256,996</td>
<td>347,996</td>
<td>91,000</td>
<td>Savings in Core City allocations from personnel shifted to CBRNE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>F-Citizen Preparedness, G- Regional Recovery, H-Training, Planning</td>
<td>Planning Positions</td>
<td>420,000</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>(200,000)</td>
<td>Savings in Core City allocations from personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>C-Communications, Equipment</td>
<td>Alert System</td>
<td>87,000</td>
<td>377,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>Additional funds for the Alert System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>F-Citizen Preparedness, Planning</td>
<td>SF72 Program</td>
<td>3,044,700</td>
<td>1,204,700</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>Additional funds for the SF72 program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>B-Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection, Equipment</td>
<td>AR/RSMS equipment</td>
<td>553,515</td>
<td>403,515</td>
<td>(150,000)</td>
<td>Savings in Core City allocations from RMS equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>C-Communications, Equipment</td>
<td>Portable radios</td>
<td>96,485</td>
<td>246,485</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>Savings in Core City allocations to purchase additional radios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>C-Communications, Equipment</td>
<td>700MHz conventional overlay</td>
<td>287,050</td>
<td>307,050</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>Funding swap from FY12 Alameda’s bayloop project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Total for: 2011/2012 Reallocations</td>
<td>3,719,527</td>
<td>3,206,522</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>C-Communications, Equipment</td>
<td>Bayloop project</td>
<td>265,000</td>
<td>245,000</td>
<td>(20,000)</td>
<td>Funding swap for FY11 Solano’s overlay project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>A-Risk Management and Planning, Planning</td>
<td>Regional Risk Management</td>
<td>202,473</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(202,473)</td>
<td>Savings in Core City allocations from personnel shifted to CBRNE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>D-CBRNE Detection and Response, Equipment</td>
<td>PPEs and fire shelters</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>202,473</td>
<td>202,473</td>
<td>Funding for PPEs and fire shelters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>C-Communications, Planning</td>
<td>Communication Planner</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(200,000)</td>
<td>Unfinished project from San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>C-Communications, Equipment</td>
<td>Portable radios</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>237,500</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>Savings in Core City allocations to purchase additional radios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateos</td>
<td>D-CBRNE Detection and Response, Equipment</td>
<td>Mobile Command Vehicle</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>(75,000)</td>
<td>Savings from CBRNE project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateos</td>
<td>C-Communications, Equipment</td>
<td>SMIRC project</td>
<td>489,000</td>
<td>509,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>Additional funding for SMIRC project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateos</td>
<td>F-Citizen Preparedness, Equipment</td>
<td>Alert System</td>
<td>159,039</td>
<td>214,039</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>Additional funding for Alert system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>F-Citizen Preparedness, G- Regional Recovery, H-Training, Planning</td>
<td>Planning Positions</td>
<td>385,914</td>
<td>240,914</td>
<td>(145,000)</td>
<td>Savings in Core City allocations from planning personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>F-Citizen Preparedness, Planning</td>
<td>SF72 Program</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>345,000</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>Additional funds for the SF72 program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>F-Citizen Preparedness, Equipment</td>
<td>SFPD Alert Program</td>
<td>44,706</td>
<td>12,326</td>
<td>(32,440)</td>
<td>Funding Swap for FY13 SFPD Alert Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Total for: 2012/2013 Reallocations</td>
<td>2,105,722</td>
<td>2,016,722</td>
<td>(93,400)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>F-Citizen Preparedness, Planning</td>
<td>SFPD Alert Program</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32,440</td>
<td>32,440</td>
<td>Funding Swap from FY12 SFPD Alert Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(040914) Approval Authority Meeting Agenda Item 12: Reallocation of Grant Funds
To: Bay Area UASI Approval Authority  
From: Barry Fraser, General Manager  
Date: April 10, 2014  
Re: Item #12: Report from the Bay Area Regional Interoperable Communications System Joint Powers Authority (BayRICS Authority)

Recommendations:
Receive and File Report

Action or Discussion Items:
A report provided by BayRICS General Manager Barry Fraser on the activities of the BayRICS Authority for January/March 2014.

Discussion/Description:
1. BayRICS Administration
BayRICS Board meetings for February and March 2014 were cancelled. The Board’s next meeting will take place on April 10 at 1:30 PM at the Alameda County Sheriff OES, 4985 Broder Blvd., Dublin, CA 94568.

2. BayRICS Planning Committee
At the January 9, 2014 meeting, the BayRICS Board established an ad hoc Planning Committee to develop recommendations for a three-five year strategic plan for BayRICS, in response to the termination of the BOOM Agreement and loss of grant funding for the BayWEB project. The Committee will provide its initial report and recommendations at the April 10 BayRICS Board meeting.

3. BayWEB Radio Site Status
BayRICS staff is conducting an assessment of radio sites Members had contributed to the BayWEB project under site access and use agreements with Motorola. These site agreements have now terminated, and staff is seeking information from Members to determine which sites may still be available for use with future regional projects, including the FirstNet nationwide
broadband network. Staff will provide a full report of the results of this assessment at the April BayRICS Board meeting.

4. Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meetings and Activities

The TAC met in January, February and March 2104. The majority of discussion at these meetings involved two major projects: (1) Regional P25 voice network coordination and (2) Regional uses for the BayLoop microwave network. TAC made recommendations to San Mateo County for the scope of work for contract services to begin P25 coordination activities, including standing up an operations work group to determine the need for regional policies and procedures and to manage the Fleetmap channel guide. TAC also made recommendations for a BayLoop working group that will develop procedures for network optimization, bandwidth management and guidelines for network applications review and approval. Kick off meetings for both project work groups will begin in early April 2014.

5. California First Responder Network (CalFRN) Board Meeting

The CalFRN Board met in Sacramento on Wednesday February 5 from 9:00-Noon. As this was the initial meeting of the Board, most of the meeting involved organizational and administrative matters. Highlights of the meeting included:

- The CalFRN Board will meet the first Wednesday of every other month. Alternating meetings will be by conference call/webcast.
- Karen Wong was elected Chair and Nathan Trauernicht (Chief, UC Davis Fire) will serve as Vice-Chair.
- Chair Wong asked the Board to review draft Bylaws and a Public Safety Survey and provide feedback.
- CalFRN will establish advisory committees, including a Technical Advisory Committee, and working groups to address key work required. Member Barry Fraser stressed the need to quickly set up work groups to address the complex and time-sensitive tasks faced by the Board. Fraser also offered assistance and resources from BayRICS and the BayRICS TAC to help quickly launch the planning process.
- CalFRN needs to place heightened focus on planning for Native American Tribal lands.
- Presentations were made by Ed Parkinson, FirstNet Government Affairs Director, Michael Britt, Arizona State Point of Contact (SPOC), and Brian Hobson, Department of Homeland Security, Office of Emergency Communications (OEC). Mr. Hobson provided information on OEC workshops and an overview of an OEC coverage/capacity prediction tools. The Board discussed holding several of these half-day workshops in multiple locations throughout the State.

The Board’s next meeting will take place on Wednesday, April 2, 9:00 a.m. – Noon.
6. FirstNet Board and Public Safety Advisory Committee (PSAC)

FirstNet Board. The FirstNet Board and committees met on March 10 and 11 at New York City Police Department headquarters. Much of these meetings occurred in closed session to allow discussion of a proposed “Program Roadmap.” The Program Roadmap was approved by FirstNet but has not yet been released to the public. According to FirstNet GM Bill D’Agostino, the roadmap will assist in developing a definitive business plan, along with comprehensive state-based outreach and consultation plans. The approved roadmap focuses on several milestones required for the development of a definitive business plan. Those steps include:

- Staffing and resourcing the organization;
- Completing an open, transparent, and competitive process for comprehensive network proposals;
- Completing an open, transparent, and competitive process for network equipment and service proposals;
- Obtaining proposals for covered leasing agreements that will provide value for excess network capacity;
- Completing testing and validation of critical features and functionality of the network;
- Conducting state outreach and completing state consultation;
- Reviewing aggregated information to determine pricing for approval by the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA).

The FirstNet Board also approved a Human Factor Report delivered by the Public Safety Advisory Committee (PSAC). The PSAC was previously asked by FirstNet to analyze the long-range impacts of the planned network on the way law enforcement, fire, and emergency medical services (EMS) operate.

FirstNet Board meeting schedule for 2014 includes meetings on June 3 in Westminster, CO, in conjunction with a Public Safety Communications Research (PSCR) conference; August 6 in New Orleans, LA, in conjunction with the Association of Public-Safety Communications Officials-International (APCO) Annual Conference; and October 30 at the FirstNet headquarters in Reston, VA.

FirstNet Public Safety Advisory Committee (PSAC). The PSAC met via conference call on March 13. GM Fraser, representing the National Association of Telecommunications Officers and Advisors (NATOA), participated on the call. The PSAC Executive Committee developed a preliminary list of Primary/Secondary/Other user definitions for the FirstNet Nationwide Public Safety Broadband Network (NPSBN). GM Fraser circulated the draft definitions to the TAC and incorporated feedback from several TAC members into the comments he submitted on behalf of NATOA. These comments reflect a diverse range of thinking from a variety of public safety stakeholders, with the common message that decisions about who uses the network and who receives priority should be left to state and local public safety agencies. The PSAC Executive
Committee will incorporate the comments they receive into a second draft of the user definitions, which the TAC will review when they are available.

PSAC’s next meeting will take place the week of June 2-6, at the Public Safety Communications Research (PSCR) Conference in Westminster CO.

7. Other Staff Meetings and Activities:

- GM Fraser met with Las Vegas Police Department officials on February 26 to discuss BayWEB status and lessons learned. This meeting was held in conjunction with a technology demonstration held at the Northern California Regional Intelligence Center (NCRIC) in San Francisco, attended by Fraser and several other Bay Area public safety officials.

- Fraser met with Emergency Management Magazine conference organizers to plan an April 15 Summit Conference in San Francisco. Event will include 2-3 sessions on FirstNet/Broadband Data/Cybersecurity

- Fraser has met with several members/stakeholders to debrief on the termination of BayWEB and status of BTOP grant and next steps

- Fraser attended an East Bay Broadband Consortium meeting on January 29, representing BayRICS and East Bay public safety

- Fraser spoke on February 3 at a workshop in Los Angeles attended by municipal land use and wireless siting attorneys on issues for local planning for FirstNet deployment.

- Fraser met with LA-RICS and staff from the Governor's Office of Business & Economic Development to discuss infrastructure challenges with the BayRICS and LA-RICS projects.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Date Assigned</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Status / Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lessons Learned from FY14 Proposal Cycle and Recommendations for FY15</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Catherine Spaulding</td>
<td>1/21/14</td>
<td>5/8/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Update on regional public safety information sharing systems</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Mike Sena/Dave Frazer</td>
<td>11/19/13</td>
<td>5/8/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Update on Cyber, Recovery, and Citizen Preparedness Regional Projects (FY11 and FY12 Regional Salary Savings Projects)</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Catherine Spaulding, Janell Myhre, Mike Sena, Rob Dudgeon</td>
<td>1/28/14</td>
<td>5/8/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bay Area UASI Social Media Strategy</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Ethan Baker</td>
<td>1/21/14</td>
<td>5/8/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bay Area UASI Management Team Annual Budget and Annual Report</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Craig Dziedzic</td>
<td>1/21/14</td>
<td>6/12/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>NCRIC Annual Update</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Dan Mahoney</td>
<td>1/21/14</td>
<td>6/12/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Asset Risk Update</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Dave Frazer</td>
<td>2/14/14</td>
<td>8/14/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Urban Shield and Yellow Command Exercise planning update</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Dennis Houghtelling/Janell Myhre</td>
<td>1/28/14</td>
<td>8/14/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Medical-Public Health Regional Exercise project update</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Eric Shanks</td>
<td>1/28/14</td>
<td>8/14/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Regional Resident Care Evacuation video project completion</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Ray Riordan</td>
<td>1/28/14</td>
<td>8/14/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2014 DHS Conference Track Session</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Janell Myhre</td>
<td>3/19/14</td>
<td>8/14/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>RCPGP catastrophic plan Just-In-Time training project completion</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Janell Myhre/Ethan Baker</td>
<td>3/6/13</td>
<td>9/11/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Update on Cyber Focus Group</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Dave Frazer, Donovan McKendrick</td>
<td>3/19/14</td>
<td>9/11/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Regional Catastrophic Earthquake Plan Integration</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Janell Myhre</td>
<td>3/19/14</td>
<td>9/11/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Resource Inventory Application project update</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
<td>6/15/13</td>
<td>10/9/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2014 Urban Shield / Yellow Command After Action Report (AAR)</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Dennis Houghtelling</td>
<td>3/19/13</td>
<td>1/8/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Deliverable</td>
<td>Who</td>
<td>Date Assigned</td>
<td>Due Date</td>
<td>Status / Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>UASI Quarterly Reports</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Tristan Levardo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY13 UASI Spending and UASI Travel Expenditures - 5/8/14; FY11 UASI Spending - 6/12/14; FY11 RCPGP Spending – 8/14/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Election of UASI Officers</td>
<td>Discussion &amp;</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/8/15 (Annually)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>