Annual Emergency Managers Meeting Minutes  
Hosted by UC Davis  
November 8-9, 2007

Attendees: Berkeley, Davis, Davis Med Ctr, Irvine, Irvine Med Ctr, Los Angeles, UCLA Med Ctr, Merced, Riverside, San Diego, San Francisco, San Francisco Med Ctr, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz, LBNL, LLNL, ANR, UCOP (Emergency Services, Risk Services, Clinical Services, and Strategic Communications).

Thursday, Nov. 8th

1. **Welcoming Remarks & Introductions**  
   Stan Nosek, Vice Chancellor – Administration, stressed the importance of collaboration

2. **Draft Annual EM Report Discussion** – Charbonneau et al
   - Systemwide summary table of campus survey responses/metrics distributed for discussion/vetting of NFPA 1600 program element metrics scoring (0-1-2-3)
   - Program budget should not be limited to EM dept’s line item budget, but should be viewed in campus-wide context (multiple campus depts.); EM program is a campus-wide institutional program, not only the responsibility of single administering dept.
   - Emergency Ops Plan should be adopted/endorsed by the Campus, not just dept.
   - Performance Objectives can be listed in Strategic Plans or annual performance evaluations
   - Delegation of program authority determined differently by campuses; Med Ctrs should have ties to campus; issues regarding legal/financial authorities
   - Advisory Committees – should include ‘key’ campus functional areas; need to engage key campus stakeholders; formed under authority of senior administration?
   - HVA conducted by UCOP (2005) – general level of ‘all-hazard’ specificity/detail but campuses then conducted in-depth analysis of ‘top 10’ risks; campuses need ‘monitor’ hazards/threats – must periodically re-evaluate HVA campus-specific threats as determined by program; risks often event-driven (e.g. Va Tech); recommend conservative scoring of HVA due to timeliness and level of analytical detail
   - Hazard Mitigation – FEMA PDM grant processes; formal campus hazard mitigation plans?; many campus mitigation measures conducted by outside contractors; recommend conservative scoring of Mitigation program element due to limited activity
   - Resource Management & Logistics – process/procedures for determining what/where/when/how resources will be obtained/managed – not necessarily extensive inventory lists; Op Area coordination of volunteers/donations?; management of solicited and unsolicited donations/goods/volunteers; some campuses have organized CERT-type teams of campus volunteers - time-consuming, turnover/attrition of trained people; ARC-Campus MOAs?; EOC Logistics Section HR function deal with volunteers?
   - Program Plans – very few Campus Mitigation, Recovery, or Continuity Plans
   - Comm’s & Warning – need campus-wide multiple means notification; best to integrate multiple platforms into single redundant coordinated system; staffing 24/7 ability to activate systems problematic (single dispatcher); federal proposed legislation may require 100% campus-wide notification within 15 minutes! (feasible?); scenario will
dictate notification process/procedures; indoor building PA system or scrolling electronic message boards useful; emergency response agency radio inter-operability (local police/fire)

- SOPs – succession of campus executive leadership should be pre-designated as part of Executive Policy Group
- EOCs – can be virtual (note FBI LEO has standing ‘virtual command center’ capability at no cost to campus): [http://www.leo.gov/](http://www.leo.gov/)
- Training – use discretion on who needs training; “key campus emergency responders/response teams; EOC personnel; and senior execs commensurate with responsibilities/roles”; tests not required; keep internal training records
- Exercises/Corrective Action – campus Risk Mgr is potential EM resource/partner; “reasonableness” of corrective action; liability issues?
- Finance/Admin – process/procedures to document all costs/damages, etc.
- Campuses asked to submit revised metrics scores and narrative executive summaries to UCOP by end of November for annual status report.

3. **Recommendations of UC Campus Security Task Force – Charbonneau**

- Student Mental Health – Emergency Comm’s – Preparedness & Response – Prevention & Hazard Mitigation thematic recommendations summaries provided to group; based on recommendations of three workgroups: Student Mental Health; Crisis Communication & Emergency Preparedness; and Campus Safety
- Emergency Comm’s campus-wide “gap analysis”; develop interdisciplinary Crisis Comm’s Plan and support team; public safety responder radio inter-operability
- Assess UCPD staffing and equipment for initial response; develop public safety critical incident response training plan; work towards full compliance with NPFA Standard; develop specific plans and procedures
- Conduct security survey risk assessment of campus buildings; include security in new facility design review; work towards implementation of HVA recommended mitigation measures

4. **OP Risk Services (ORS) Programs – Confetti/Dimond & Leonard**

- “Restarting UC” business continuity planning program based on UC Berkeley campus-specific dept-level software program; ORS will pay for software upgrades and maintenance at no cost to campuses; software program modifications needed for medical center-specific application; who should campus program functional owners be – Provost vs. VCA?; ORS will pay each campus/med ctr up to $100K annually for salary/benefits on 50/50 cost share basis; what is relationship between campus EM and BCP functions – should they be combined/re-organized?; common systemwide program or planning framework?
- “Be Smart About Safety” program funding for loss prevention/control focused on lowering workers comp costs; also similar model program dealing with general liability program currently under actuarial review; separate application process for each program BSAS FAQ and funding application online at: [http://www.ucop.edu/riskmgmt/bsas/welcome.html](http://www.ucop.edu/riskmgmt/bsas/welcome.html)
• ICAMP (Integrated Capital Asset Mgmnt Program) – reduce claims resulting from deferred maintenance and improve overall life safety and improve UC reputation and position in insurance market; web-based intelligent data warehousing product hosted by third party; initial assessment of campus assets to be completed by third party
• FM Global – new insurance (property excess) mutual carrier will be conducting site visits to each campus to perform life safety engineering evaluations of all bldgs >$10M in the next year;

5. **News from the East Coast – Bujak & Nunez**
   - Where does EM fall in universities? – varies (no consistency)
   - March 2006 - EM Task Force created
   - Recommendations: need adequate funding and 100% FTE EM at each campus
   - Region 9 does not have a representative for the IAEM
   - Email listserv (DRU) 250+ schools for collaborative efforts hosted by U of Oregon set specifically for .edu address only – to subscribe to this listserv send email note to: majorndomo@lists.uoregon.edu with message “subscribe dru” in body of email note.
   - Exercise development for business continuity can be seen on the IAEM website
   - University critical plans - top 15 programs needed for an institution to operate

6. **UC Davis Police “Active Shooter” training presentation**
   - Strategies for Survival
     1. Get out! ESCAPE.
     2. Take cover (behind something that will stop a bullet) – look for chances to escape
     3. Hide and look for a chance to escape
     4. Play dead and look for a chance to escape
     5. Attack the shooter (last resort!) – element of surprise – firearms take-away moves – watch and listen for suspect to stop shooting/reload
   - Active “Critical Incident” Safe Place
     1. Have at least two exits for escape
     2. Use furniture to block doors
     3. Call 911 on phone
     4. Keep cell phones on ‘vibrate’ so you don’t reveal your hiding place
     5. Windows offer avenue of escape on ground floor
     6. Look for chances to escape!
     7. Notify Police of your location and medical needs
     8. Be mentally prepared – Pre-plan – Know your surroundings.
   - Things to Remember
     1. Follow police directions (keep hands up when exiting)
     2. Do not touch suspected explosives
     3. Don’t hang up on 911 dispatcher until directed to do so (if safe)
     4. Provide first aid if able
     5. Stay calm and remember your personal plan
     6. Always look for a chance to ESCAPE.

7. **Campus Roundtable Issues Discussion**
Friday, Nov. 9th

1. Warning & Notification/Crisis Communication Plans – Art Botterell, CoCo SO

(3) Types of Emergency Public Information:

a. Strategic ("Issue" crisis)
   Info Source: Public Affairs
   Audience: General public and stakeholders
   Goals: Enhance and protect organization/advance programs (strategic)

   “Reassuring” – TV figurehead spokespersons – preparing the ground for info
   (e.g. – Chancellor reassuring function “terrible tragedy has occurred”)

b. Operational
   Info Source: EOC/JIC/PIO
   Audience: Affected community/stakeholders
   Goals: Mitigate impacts/facilitate recovery

   “Informing” – cybernetic metaphor – facts and figures (administrative)

c. Exigent (time-critical warning - "Event" crisis)
   Source: Dispatcher/Incident Commander/Emergency Ops personnel
   Audience: Community/persons immediately at risk
   Goals: Protect life and property/stimulate action/elicit cooperation

   “Alerting” – immediate/urgent - attention management (operational)

Alerting & Warning: life-threatening event requiring immediate action

Time of Day – VIP factor (night/weekend staffing levels; campus population – primarily student housing (residence halls))

Dispatcher can quickly become overloaded as result of issuing an alert (both by process and subsequent campus response) – need back-up staff support (Public Affairs, etc.);
Dispatchers are 24/7 ‘lowest common denominator’ (first to know about incident)

Scope/scale of ‘life safety’ threat: campus-wide or limited/isolated incident?
Who is the audience? – entire campus community; segment of campus population; or particular zone/area of campus?
Crisis Communication Plans

- Security Task Force: each campus will develop a Crisis Communication Plan and interdisciplinary team that clearly defines roles and responsibilities as well as delegations and lines of authority for various campus officials to support timely campus-wide warning and notification during an emergency situation or critical incident.
- NFPA 1600 Standard: establish and maintain disaster/emergency public information capability including media contact facility; system for gathering, monitoring, and disseminating emergency info; method to coordinate and clear info for release; pre-scripted info bulletins; special needs populations; and protective action guidelines/recommendations (evacuation or shelter-in-place); establish procedures to disseminate and respond to requests for information.

Breakout Group Notes

- Decision Criteria: what is hazard? what is threat to life/property? urgency? who is audience (students/staff/faculty)? system capabilities/limitations?
- Flexible; fluid; reach special populations (deaf/blind); redundant; one message clear, concise, short/sweet, pre-scripted/pre-approved
- Approval hierarch – time/threat
- Branding in people’s mind – community education
- Chart of campus functional groups: time vs. threat (authorizations)

Campus Officials: Time vs. Threat (chart)

- Executive Policy Group (days/weeks ~ low threat)
- Vice Chancellors (hours/days ~ medium threat)
- Police/Fire Chief (hours ~ high threat)
- Emergency Manager (minutes/hours ~ severe threat)
- PD/FD Watch/Shift Commander (minutes ~ extreme threat)
- Dispatcher (seconds/minutes ~ urgent threat)

- Clearly defined authority backed by campus policy and procedures – SOPs provide framework for crises (trained persons might not be available); need tools that can be adapted to crises
- Defined events and systems; pre-scripted messages; trained personnel
- Follow-up media relations – public affairs/UCOP
- Campus-wide education and awareness

- Capabilities and limitations differ from campus to campus – ability to craft messages quickly and disseminate campus-wide
- Anticipate different scenarios
- Defined policy “who pushes the button” – official authority needs to be identified (police/fire chief; emergency mgr; first responders; eh&s director)
- What is said and when (can it be standardized?)
- Need notify key campus people (communications/public affairs) to assume roles
- Training and exercises on roles/responsibilities various campus officials
- Standardized message templates (basic formats to aid in issuing actual message)
Define “closing the campus” and “lock-down” – assess capabilities based on campus infrastructure (ability lock buildings and gates)

Anticipate/consider all recipient populations (parents; students; faculty/staff) and how many opt in/out of notification systems

Notification systems: broadcast email; phone calls; texting/instant messaging; siren (need education on what to do); website and webpage banners; stationary PA systems; mobile PA systems (police cars); classroom/library electronic message boards/screens; CCTV

Delegation of authority; campus officials roles and responsibilities

Protocol/procedures – decision flowchart; definitions; pre-scripted messages format depends on media platform; SOPs – Dispatch, EOC, Watch/Shift Commander (PD/FD)

Systems procedures – technology use; solutions; multi-modal integration

Public Affairs support (follow-up info; staffing resources)

Campus education/awareness program – emergency procedures; entire campus community including parents and UCOP; city/county coordination/notification

Alerting & Warning Systems

Requires ongoing campus educational/awareness program (difficult - transient)

Messages must be prepared (pre-scripted then completed with particulars)

Decision-making process must consider TIME (Urgency) and THREAT Level

No accepted “standard of care” for alerting and warning – no coherent policy resulting in excuse for inaction (failure to issue warning)

Uncertainty – err on side of caution (failure to activate system worst outcome!)

Situational Awareness – indicators of immediate threat to life safety?? Need to “anticipate surprise”

UC (Campus) must be ‘The Authoritative Source’ of info – otherwise lose control of situation to the media, rumors, informal communications, etc.

Fear of issuing warnings – recurring theme (unclear process and authority [who do we trust to do it and who dares to do it?]!]; political factors and repercussions – this is why we need formal campus Crisis Communication Plans!

How to deal with special populations? (deaf/blind)

Effective Warning Guidance (NSTC, 2000)

Warnings are effective only if they are accurate and result in appropriate action. Effective warning messages should:

• Be brief (preferably less than one minute)
• Present discrete ideas in a ‘bulletized’ fashion
• Use non-technical language
• Use appropriate text/graphics geared for the campus community
• Provide official basis for the hazardous event message (UCPD reports…)
• Provide most important information first, including any standardized headlines
• Describe the areas affected and time (if events are moving)
• Provide level of uncertainty (if applicable)
• Provide a brief action-oriented statement for appropriate campus-wide response (accurate and specific instructions or directives)
• Describe where more detailed information can be found (website, etc)


Alerting & Warning: social-psychological responses/issues
  o People do NOT act on a single warning – need corroboration – must disseminate redundant warning messages thru different media/platforms
  o False Alarms (“cry wolf” syndrome) – NOT really a problem – people are tolerant (national nuclear attack warning issued in 1971 – no reaction)
  o Irrelevant warnings de-sensitize people (not apply to them – ignore); therefore targetability of warnings to only affected persons/area is VIP
  o Alerts need to focus on PEOPLE – provide call to Action
  o Amount of info to release? Sharing vs. withholding - full disclosure (perception that authorities are hiding something?)
  o Provide incremental range of responses vs. binary (‘stay/go’) response – smooth transitions are much more manageable than abrupt risky transition
  o Panic (“myth that kills”) – breakdown of social fabric occurs when people perceive they must compete for means of escape (predictable circumstances)
  o Panic (unreasoning overpowering terror) vs. anguish (extreme stress/anxiety)
  o Informal communications (word of mouth; social networking) and Media are powerful sources of information – Campus must establish that it is the authoritative source of info

‘Communications’ Organizational Paradigm
  1. Organizations
  2. Human Factors
  3. Procedure
  4. Technology (systems)

Problems flow from top down (from organization to technical solutions). Change moves opposite way (starts with technology and works its way up). Discovery process: how to “map” problem/solution to make processes work?

Botterell’s Laws of Emergency Management
  1. Stress makes you stupid (must design systems for use by impaired persons)
  2. Worst problem is inaction (warning messages not a given)
  3. Trained persons will be unavailable (must develop simple job aids including detailed guides/position descriptions/procedures/reference materials, etc)
  4. Expectation is reality (don’t be afraid to expect success)
  5. Worst-case scenario is simplest situation (lesser events are more ambiguous and therefore more difficult/confusing to deal with)
“An emergency manager is someone who tells you what you don’t want to know and asks you to spend money on things you don’t think will ever happen.” (V.L.)

2. Social Networking as a tool for Crisis Communication (Sara Cohen, UCLA)

- VT shooting incident – first comments 15 min later on http://www.fark.com/ commentary continues on Fark.com throughout Norris Hall incident reporting real-time events by students inside the building
- Social networking sites used by majority of college students
  - http://www.myspace.com/ is accessible to everyone (tends to be younger users)
  - http://www.facebook.com/ must be registered “user” to access (tends to be older users)
- Social networking sites are primary method of communications when cell phones go down (find friends/loved ones, find out what’s going on, info exchange, etc.)
- Sites are user-based, so sponsors have no control over information posted
- http://www.alexa.com/ website traffic site shows % daily reach – shows steady decline in use of UCLA webpage (less than 40% student population) vs. rapid rise in use of myspace.com
- Students are unaware of campus ‘official’ info channels – don’t digest messages in a timely or efficient manner; many students may never receive official messages; about 60% of UCLA students remain uninformed and unapprised of major events as they unfold in campus community; students continue ‘business as usual’ as a crisis unfolds – life safety concern
- Proposal to create an ‘official’ Myspace UCLA Emergency Management profile to act as additional source and means of providing emergency information: Myspace.com/ucla911; can be replicated across the UC system for all campuses; emergency messages can be distributed in minutes – mirror campus emergency website onto Myspace – willing to partner with UC
- Myspace profiles are constantly being monitored to prevent duplicate ‘false’ sites; verification of single source for a ‘group’ monitored by Myspace

3. Campus and Medical Center Breakout Sessions

- Berkeley – PeopleLocator online tool programming being completed with $25K FEMA grant; ready for distribution to other campuses in about 6 mos. (July 2008?); hosted at UCLA for Berkeley campus
- ICS 300/400 training – ICS command staff (not EOC staff); campus can self-certify training; County OES Ofcr. has authority to certify campus trainers (in lieu of taking Train the Trainer course)
- Satellite Phones – Globalstar has become unreliable – recommend dropping service and acquiring Iridium sat phones instead (homeland security funds?)
• UCOP – Campus updated emergency notification protocol and contacts (executive and emergency mgmnt) was distributed to all campuses – please remember to notify UCOP in the event of a significant incident, EOC activation, etc.

• Pandemic Flu Planning - discussion of ‘resource allocation during scarce resources’ document and diversion of resources between UCs in large disasters

• MOUs - discussion of MOUs with other regional hospitals (CHA push) and MOUs with all UC Medical Centers

• Drill Preparation - discussion of utilizing Emergency Management staff from other UCs as controllers, evaluators, sim cells, table top prep, etc.

• Best Practices - discussion to share best practices

• Learning Forum - discussion of UC-wide educational opportunities

• After-Action Templates - discussion of sharing templates

• Hospital Disaster Management Training - LA County class from ASPR funds

• FEMA Classes - reminder of availability

• NFPA 1600/JC ECC Standards Crosswalk - comparison of JC and NFPA standards

• Next year’s meeting will be hosted in SoCal (UCSB or UCR?)

4. Meeting wrap-up and close