



[Introduction](#) | [Residents](#) | [Special District](#) | [SFO](#) | [Public Schools](#) | [Radio Networks](#) | [SamTrans](#)

# **When the Big One Comes Will We Respond with a Bang or a Whimper?**

## **Disaster Preparedness**

### **General Background and Introduction**

A catastrophic earthquake will hit the Bay Area by April. The earthquake is certain, only the year is unknown. Experts forecast a 70% probability that a magnitude 6.7 or greater earthquake will shake the Bay Area by the year 2030. Is the County prepared to respond?

Recent events resulting from Katrina and other worldwide disasters have made everyone more concerned about the state of our preparedness. It is likely, though, that this concern will dissipate with time. The risks will not.

A community's disaster response plan might be well documented, but that does not guarantee it will be well executed. It is not expected that all county departments, cities, or special districts will be as well trained as the Menlo Park Fire District, which sponsors the California Task Force 3 Urban Search and Rescue Team. All county departments, cities, and special districts must, however, plan so that when a disaster strikes, they can respond effectively. That means being prepared, having communications in place, building relationships with like entities, and making sure that leaders are trained to act quickly and efficiently.

### **Leadership Matters**

The effectiveness of any emergency response is derived ultimately from those in charge. It is the leaders who must require and oversee planning for emergency response, who must allocate sufficient resources and adequately prepare personnel, and who must give high priority to training. It is the leaders who must assure the coordination of all the departments and agencies that are responsible for emergency planning, response, mitigation, and recovery. Not insignificantly, the leaders must know their own roles in an emergency.

The County's response to a disaster will be directly proportional to its level of preparedness. The level of preparedness will be directly proportional to the leadership provided in the County. Unless the leaders of the County are prepared to suffer the same anger and scorn recently directed at the leaders of New Orleans, the state of Louisiana, and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) following Hurricane Katrina, they must provide the necessary leadership now.

## **But Individual Preparedness Counts Too**

In a recent cable television program Stephen Colbert, in a parody of anchor news commentary on FEMA, suggested invigorating the organization by renaming it the Storm Accident and Viral Emergency Unconditional Relief Support and Emendation of Loss Federation (SAVE UR SELF). "Save yourself" is not as foolish a motto as Colbert's humor suggests. The San Mateo County Health Department has distributed throughout the County an informative *Pocket Guide to Emergency Preparedness*, emphasizing that "your best protection is preparation." This small, comprehensive guide offers specific tips for preparing a household emergency plan and lists emergency supplies that residents can easily assemble and keep in their homes. The Red Cross has recently recommended that such emergency kits include at least a one-week supply of food, water, and prescription medicines. The Health Officer of San Mateo County has suggested a two-week supply.

Colbert's fictitious acronym also suggests the name of crucial real organizations, such as CERT (Community Emergency Response Team), CERPP (Citizens Emergency Response and Preparedness Program), and NERT (Neighborhood Emergency Response Team). These are vital programs, in which citizens can learn to save themselves and their neighbors by planning their individual disaster and emergency responses. Too often the significance of these community groups is overlooked. The San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury (Grand Jury) believes that the Board of Supervisors and city councils must take a leadership role in promoting the spread of these organizations throughout the County.

## **Disaster-Prone San Mateo County**

In a recent newspaper article the director of the San Mateo County Sheriff's Area Office of Emergency Services and Homeland Security characterized California as "an act-of-God theme park." Indeed, San Mateo County, as the epicenter of the 1906 San Francisco earthquake, can lay claim to being one of the scariest rides in this park. In addition to the inevitable earthquakes generated by its proximity to the San Andreas and other major faults, the County is at risk from various other natural and manmade catastrophes:

- flooding and landslides during frequent major winter storms
- flooding by breaching of old and weak levees
- a Tsunami on sections of the San Mateo Coast

- wildfire in drought years in the acres of mountain grasslands and trees subject to prevailing strong southerly winds
- a possible pandemic brought in through San Francisco International Airport (SFO), where over 10,000 passengers arrive daily from Asia
- a major airline crash in the heavily populated areas surrounding SFO
- the possibility of a terrorist attack.

## **Function and Role of the Office of Emergency Services**

In San Mateo County, the Sheriff's Office of Emergency Services (OES) is the primary agency responsible for minimizing the effects of disasters and major emergencies on the citizens of the County. The OES is responsible for the Emergency Operations Plan (EOP), which describes the County's planned response to extraordinary emergencies associated with natural disasters, man-made technological incidents, and national security alerts. The EOP includes procedures for organizing and operating the County's Emergency Operations Center (EOC), where members of the response team manage the County's actions in a disaster. The OES staff also provides planning and training services to the 20 cities in the County.

The OES is funded through a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) between the 20 incorporated cities and the County of San Mateo. The cities contribute money to the JPA based upon a formula that takes into account the population and average assessed property value of each city. The County then matches the cities' contribution. The remainder of the OES budget comes from state and federal Emergency Management Assistance program funds.

The Joint Powers Agreement is governed by an Emergency Services Council. This council comprises one representative from each city plus a member of the County Board of Supervisors. The Council approves budgets and provides strategic direction for the Joint Powers Agreement.

## **The Grand Jury Disaster Readiness Investigations**

Following the Katrina disaster, the Grand Jury decided to investigate how well the County was prepared for a disaster in several specific areas. These independent studies resulted in six reports, which considered the following issues

1. The training of city residents in disaster preparedness
2. The readiness of Special Districts
3. The readiness of the San Francisco International Airport (SFO)
4. The care of students at the County's public schools in a disaster
5. The adequacy of law enforcement radio networks
6. The readiness of SamTrans, Public Works, and Environmental Services

The reports follow this introduction.

While these reports all have their own conclusions and recommendations, the Grand Jury's overall conclusion is that the County can be only as prepared as it has the political will to be.

The Grand Jury realizes that it has merely touched upon this enormous issue, but it can say the following with confidence:

- It is better at all levels to prepare before an emergency rather than to react during one.
- It is better to communicate and build professional relationships before an emergency rather than trying to do so during an emergency.
- Leadership matters, both before and during an emergency.
- Resources are scarce, but the mission is vital.



[Issue](#) | [Background](#) | [Findings](#) | [Conclusions](#) | [Recommendations](#) | [Responses](#) | [Attachments](#)

## **Summary of Disaster Preparedness Training for the Residents of Cities in San Mateo County**

### **A disaster in the making**

#### **Issue**

Are the cities of San Mateo County adequately preparing their residents to deal with major disasters?

#### **Summary**

As Americans learned with Katrina, residents must rely on themselves during the first hours and days of a major disaster. Individual actions can determine whether or not one has food, shelter, medicine, or even life itself. Community Emergency Response Teams (CERT) are a critical means of training individuals for an immediate response in a disaster. Implementation of CERT training by cities and towns in San Mateo County is mixed, at best.

The San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury (Grand Jury) recommends that every city in San Mateo County establish an active and ongoing CERT training program, with the initial goal of training 5% of its households.



# **Disaster Preparedness Training for the Residents of Cities in San Mateo County**

## **A disaster in the making**

### **Issue**

Are the cities of San Mateo County adequately preparing their residents to deal with major disasters?

### **Background**

As Americans learned from Katrina, people must rely on themselves during the first hours and days of a major disaster. It takes considerable time for a city, state, or national disaster relief organization to respond to cataclysmic events. Individual actions can determine whether or not one has food, shelter, medicine, or even life itself. Often ignored is the advanced training and preparation that is essential to bridge the gap until help arrives.

### **Investigation**

The San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury (Grand Jury) contacted 21 cities and towns and interviewed police and fire personnel to ascertain whether they had disaster preparedness programs designed for training individuals.

### **Findings**

Community Emergency Response Teams (CERT) are highly organized and monitored programs developed to provide specific and coherent disaster preparedness training of individual residents.

Various cities use different names and acronyms for their community emergency response programs, but all the programs are based on the original Community Emergency Response Team program that originated in Los Angeles and was adopted as a standard by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Menlo Park has retained the

name CERT for its program, while Woodside calls its program CERPP for Citizens Emergency Response and Preparedness Program. Other cities use such acronyms as NEST for Neighborhood Emergency Services Team (La Honda), NERT for Neighborhood Emergency Response Team (San Francisco), and PANDA for Palo Alto Neighborhood Disaster Activity.

CERT programs are conducted by fire department personnel and benefit from close cooperation with police departments and coordination support from San Mateo County's Office of Emergency Services (OES). This training is free to citizen participants and consists of several modules usually taught in weekly evening classes. The number and topics of the modules vary from one city to another. For example, Menlo Park's six subjects include:

- Emergency Preparedness, Earthquake Preparedness
- Fire Safety, Hazmat
- Basic First Aid, Triage
- Light Search and Rescue
- Incident Command System
- A Hands-On Exercise

A survey of the cities and municipalities in San Mateo County (County) found the following:

<b>City</b>	<b>CERT Program</b>	<b>Number of Individuals Trained</b>
Atherton	Yes	30
Belmont	Yes	38
Brisbane	Yes	65
Broadmoor	No	0
Burlingame	Inactive	0
Colma	No	0
Daly City	Yes	40
East Palo Alto	Yes	50
Foster City	Yes	214
Half Moon Bay	No	0
Hillsborough	Yes	50
Menlo Park	Yes	300
Millbrae	Inactive	0
Pacifica	No	0
Redwood City	Yes (New In2006)	0
San Bruno	Inactive	0
San Carlos	Yes	36
San Mateo	Yes (New In 2006)	0
South San Francisco	Yes (New In2006)	0
Woodside Fire District (Woodside, Portola Valley, and nearby County)	Yes	300+
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1123</b>

The total trained is approximately 0.1% (or 1 in 1,000) of the population of San Mateo County. Expressed another way, only 0.4% of all households in the County have trained residents, ranging from more than 5% in the Woodside Fire District to 0% in many cities.

CERT programs often turn to Neighborhood Watch programs (Watch programs) to recruit residents to train in emergency preparedness. Watch programs are coordinated by police departments and are primarily used for crime prevention. These programs have existed for several years and are widespread throughout the County. They take several forms and vary in physical boundaries, membership, organization, goals, and scope. Some Watch Programs have begun limited disaster preparedness training, covering such topics as:

- Where to meet in an emergency
- Where non-ambulatory residents live
- Communications basics

## **Conclusions**

Community Emergency Response Teams (CERT) programs provide excellent training for local residents and instructs them how to prepare for and respond to local disasters. Very little of this training, however, is actually carried out. Only 1,123 individuals in the County have been trained and, of these, 800 reside in only three communities. Indeed, 10 out of the 21 cities and municipalities in the County have not trained a single individual.

The more common Neighborhood Watch programs could provide a greater cadre of people interested in CERT training.

## **Recommendations**

1. The San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury recommends that the city council of every city and town in San Mateo County establish and promote an active and ongoing CERT training program with the initial goal of training 5% of its households.
2. Because leadership matters the San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury recommends that:
  - 2.1. All members of the Board of Supervisors become CERT trained as a demonstration of their commitment to this critical individual effort.
  - 2.2. All members of the city council of every city and town in San Mateo County become CERT trained as a demonstration of their commitment to this critical individual effort.





[Issue](#) | [Background](#) | [Findings](#) | [Conclusions](#) | [Recommendations](#) | [Responses](#) | [Attachments](#)

## Summary of Disaster Preparedness of Special Districts

### Issue

To what extent are Special Districts in San Mateo County prepared to respond to a disaster?

### Summary

Special districts are governmental agencies that deliver specific services within defined geographic boundaries. The most common special districts fall into the following categories: Police or Fire Protection; Water; Sanitation/Sewer; Healthcare/Hospitals; and Resource Conservation. The functions implemented by special districts for a geographic region are similar to those performed by departments in larger municipalities.

The San Mateo Civil Grand Jury (Grand Jury) conducted interviews with staff and board members of 20 Special Districts to determine the level of emergency preparedness of each. In addition, the Grand Jury interviewed personnel from the San Francisco Airport, the California Water Service Company, and the County Office of Emergency Services (OES). (See appendix for a complete list of districts interviewed). Interviews included specific questions about the status of disaster plans, self-evaluations by the districts of their disaster preparedness, and open-ended questions about existing mechanisms for coordination within each jurisdiction and throughout the County.

Since the services performed by some special districts are especially critical in a disaster, the Grand Jury decided to focus this report to address water, fire protection and sanitary districts. In the event of a disaster, these special districts would be central response points to the “extraordinary fire, flood, storm, epidemic, riot, earthquake, or other similar public calamities” described by the Emergency Services Organization in its Joint Powers Authority (JPA) agreement.

Interviews conducted with special districts revealed recurring issues and concerns related to three topics: 1) their degree of emergency-preparedness; 2) the coordination of

emergency services with the municipalities they serve and with other districts; and 3) County-wide radio communication.

Grand Jury recommendations include: 1) ensuring that special districts become members of service associations that provide disaster response support assistance; 2) encouraging closer coordination between special districts and the municipalities they serve; 3) conducting a study to determine the potential advantages of organizing local Emergency Operations Centers by region rather than by municipality; and 4) educating special districts about County-wide digital radio systems.



## Disaster Preparedness of Special Districts

### Issue

To what extent are Special Districts in San Mateo County prepared to respond to a disaster?

### Background

State law defines a special district as “any agency of the state [created] for the local performance of government or proprietary functions within limited boundaries.” Special districts, therefore, are a form of government that delivers specific services within defined geographic regions. Inadequate tax bases and competing demands for existing taxes make it difficult for cities and counties to provide all the services their citizens require. When residents or landowners want new services or higher levels of existing services, they can form a district to pay for and administer them. The functions implemented by special districts for a geographic region are similar to those performed by departments in larger municipalities.

Special districts are as diverse as the communities they serve. In San Mateo County, special districts provide services in the following areas:

- Water
- Fire Protection
- Sanitation/Sewer
- Healthcare/Hospitals
- Harbor/Ports
- Mosquito Abatement/Vector Control
- Police Protection
- Recreation & Parks/Open Space
- Resource Conservation

Most special districts in California are independent districts that have their own boards of directors elected by the voters of the district. Although special districts are primarily accountable to the voters in their service area, they also receive critical oversight of district operations by state and county governments.

## Investigation

The Grand Jury conducted interviews with staff and board members of 20 special districts to determine the level of emergency preparedness of each. In addition, the Grand Jury interviewed personnel from the San Francisco Airport, the California Water Service Company, and the County Office of Emergency Services (OES). Interviews included specific questions about the status of disaster plans, self-evaluations by the districts of their disaster preparedness, and open-ended questions about existing mechanisms for coordination within their jurisdiction and throughout the County.

Since the services provided in a disaster by some special districts are more critical than those provided by other special districts, the Grand Jury decided to focus this report to address water, fire protection and sanitary districts. In the event of a disaster, these special districts would be central response points to the “extraordinary fire, flood, storm, epidemic, riot, earthquake, or other similar public calamities” described by the Emergency Services Organization in its JPA agreement.

## Findings

The following findings reflect recurring themes, issues, and problem areas raised by special districts in the course of their interviews.

### Emergency Preparedness

Not all districts have emergency preparedness plans. Those plans that exist vary significantly in scope, depth, and comprehensiveness.

Few of the districts interviewed evaluated themselves as being well prepared for a major disaster. Responses to the question “How well prepared is your district for a disaster?” included the following statements:

*“Disaster planning is limited.”*

*“Not well.”*

*“It really depends on the type of emergency.”*

*“Well prepared for our size.”*

*“Fairly well prepared.”*

This wide range of responses points to a decided lack of confidence and consistency on the part of special districts in their ability to respond appropriately in the event of a disaster.

Of all the special districts interviewed, the Menlo Park Fire District (MPFD) might serve as a model for others to emulate. MPFD and the city of Menlo Park are in the forefront of disaster preparedness. The fire district sponsors the California Task Force 3 Urban Search and Rescue Team and operates very successful Community Emergency Response Teams (CERT).

## **Coordination**

Wide-ranging responses to questions about coordination revealed major issues regarding the integration of special districts into local, regional, or County-wide emergency response systems. One water district described the problem in these words: *“We need better coordination among the special district, the fire department, PGE, the police department, and the city. We should all meet together and come up with a coordinated plan. Right now we feel isolated.”*

The OES is the day-to-day focal point of County emergency preparedness. It assists cities in preparation of emergency plans; represents the County’s interests in regional, state, and national forums; and applies for grants. It operates the County Emergency Operations Center (EOC) in the event of a disaster. Municipalities have their own local emergency operations centers and coordinate with the County. However, municipalities often lack the resources and expertise needed to handle large-scale disasters.

The County OES/JPA is an agreement between municipalities and the County that does not include special districts as voting members. In the JPA, special districts are defined as participating partners, but with the exception of fire and police districts, their participation has been limited.

Few special districts have well delineated disaster preparedness agreements with the relevant departments of the municipalities they serve. In many instances, special districts are isolated from the jurisdictions they serve as well as from other like-districts. Special districts reported having uneven working relationships with the municipalities in their service areas.

Water/Wastewater Agency Response Network (WARN) is an association whose mission is to support and promote emergency preparedness and mutual assistance for its members. While all water and sewer districts are eligible for membership in WARN, the following districts are not currently listed as members: Midcoast Sewer Authority; West Bay Sanitary District; Coastside County Water District; and Skyline Water District.

Due to the nature of their work and their training, fire districts are generally better prepared than other districts to respond to disasters. The Menlo Park Fire District described an upcoming plan to have the cities in its jurisdiction *“partner to build a single emergency center to collaborate in disaster preparedness. It could provide a seamless operation that brings together the police departments, the public works departments, and the fire department. It could bridge city borders and have autonomy beyond city limits. With such a single site, operated by the fire district working in partnership with each of the cities, all could share a mutual benefit based upon each agency’s size and ability to effectively provide for and support its own emergency operations center.”*

## **Communication**

Several special districts mentioned concerns about communication in the course of their interviews. The most commonly stated problems included: 1) the lack of a common communication frequency in the County and the finances to acquire it; 2) a lack of uniformity in the radio equipment used countywide; and 3) the fact that special districts cannot access the County mutual aid radio network used by other first responders but must rely on conventional and cellular telephones.

Staff from the Office of Emergency Services strongly recommends that “*special districts review their emergency communications systems and build redundant radio links to the County.*”

## **Conclusions**

Interviews conducted with special districts revealed recurring issues and concerns related to three topics: 1) their degree of emergency-preparedness; 2) the coordination of emergency services with the municipalities they serve and with other districts; and 3) County-wide radio communication issues.

Not all special districts have disaster preparedness plans or feel confident in their ability to respond adequately in an emergency.

Not all special districts belong to associations (such as the Water/Wastewater Agency Response Network [WARN] for water and sanitary districts) whose mission is to support and promote emergency preparedness, disaster response and mutual assistance among their members

Many special districts lack close coordination with the municipalities within their jurisdiction as well as with other emergency service providers such as fire departments and police departments.

The current OES/JPA structure for disaster response calls only for coordination between each municipality and the County, making special districts tangential to that interaction. Because this structure effectively excludes special districts and because special districts often serve more than one municipality, this could result in a lack of coordination, inefficiency, and duplication of effort in an emergency situation.

## Recommendations

The Grand Jury makes the following recommendations:

1. The Board of Directors of Midcoast Sewer Authority, West Bay Sanitary District, Coastside County Water District, and Skyline Water District should ensure that their districts become members of WARN or of another service association that can provide disaster response assistance.
2. The Board of Directors of each Water, Fire Protection and Sanitary District should:
  - 2.1 Ensure that the district coordinates closely with the municipalities it serves by: a) assigning an in-house emergency coordinator to work with the emergency coordinator of each city, town or county jurisdiction in its service area, and b) actively participating in the EOC activities of each city, town, or county jurisdiction in its service area.
  - 2.2 Ensure that their emergency communications systems are reviewed and that redundant radio links to the County are built.
3. The Sheriff should direct the County Office of Emergency Services to commission a study to determine the potential advantages of organizing local Emergency Operations Centers by region rather than by municipality.

# Appendix

## Special Districts Interviewed For This Report

Bayshore Sanitary District  
Broadmore Police Protection District  
Coastside County Water District  
Colma Fire Protection District  
Granada Sanitary District  
Half Moon Bay Fire Protection District  
Highlands Recreation District  
Ladera Recreation District  
Menlo Park Fire Protection District  
Mid-Peninsula Water District  
Mid-peninsula Regional Open Space District  
Montara Water and Sanitary District  
North Coast County Water District  
Point Montara Fire Protection District  
San Mateo County Harbor District  
Sewer Authority Midcoast  
Skyline County Water District  
West Bay Sanitary District  
Westborough Water District  
Woodside Fire Protection District





[Issue](#) | [Background](#) | [Findings](#) | [Conclusions](#) | [Recommendations](#) | [Responses](#) | [Attachments](#)

## Summary of Disaster Preparedness at San Francisco International Airport

### Issue

How can the San Francisco International Airport (SFO) and San Mateo County (County) improve their joint emergency preparedness?

### Summary

The location of the San Francisco Airport (SFO) within San Mateo County (SMC) dictates that the two entities coordinate their response to emergencies. The airport represents many risks to the county but it also possesses many resources that can assist the County in a crisis. A number of mutual aid agreements currently exist between the two, however, SFO is not represented on the most senior disaster planning board in the County, the Emergency Services Council.

The San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury recommends that the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors and the Emergency Services Council invite the San Francisco International Airport to join the Joint Powers Agreement as an Associate member and invite their representative to attend meetings of the Emergency Services Council.



# Disaster Preparedness at San Francisco International Airport

## Issue

How can the San Francisco International Airport (SFO) and San Mateo County (County) improve their joint emergency preparedness?

## Background

San Francisco International Airport is owned and operated by the City of San Francisco. The airport is located entirely within unincorporated San Mateo County 13 miles south of San Francisco, adjacent to the cities of Millbrae and San Bruno. In 2005 over thirty-two million passengers passed through the airport. In terms of passengers it was the thirteenth largest airport in the U.S. and the twenty-second largest airport in the world.

The San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) provides basic police services to SFO and enforces the Airport Transportation Security Administration (TSA) security plan. It also supports the individual security plans of the airlines. The SFPD's Airport Bureau also plays a crucial role in the Airport's emergency response capabilities

The San Francisco Fire Department is responsible for providing fire protection, emergency medical services, training, and fire prevention for the Airport.

## Findings

- San Mateo County and the San Francisco Airport are currently mutual aid partners in a number of arenas:
  - SFO relies on county hospitals for surge capacity in the event of an incident at the airport.
  - SFO has a joint agreement with the San Mateo Department of Public Health regarding the protection against and treatment of communicable diseases.
  - SFO conducts an annual air crash exercise involving County resources.

- The fire departments of both SFO and those within the County are available to help one another in case of need. For example, SFO assistance was used in responding to a fuel truck fire on highway 101.
- SFO has a positive and informal relationship with the Office of Emergency Services (OES).
- The County Sheriff is responsible for investigation of all criminal activity at SFO and maintains an office at the airport.
- The Federal Aviation Agency requires that SFO be prepared to meet nine types of emergencies. The airport exceeds this and prepares for 13 different types of emergencies, including a major earthquake.
- SFO operates a state-of-the-art emergency operations center located at the airport.
- SFO and the County are currently discussing the hazards associated with opening a fuel depot in South San Francisco.
- According to County officials the airport represents a major risk to the County, but it also has considerable resources that could be used to assist in an emergency.
- Overall emergency planning in the County is the primary responsibility of the Sheriff's Office of Emergency Services (OES) which is funded through a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) between the 20 incorporated cities and the County. The governing body of the JPA is the Emergency Services Council.
- SFO is not a member of the JPA.

## **Conclusions**

The location of the airport within the County dictates that the two entities coordinate their response to certain emergencies. The airport represents many risks to the county but it also possesses many resources that can benefit the County in a crisis. The need for comprehensive mutual aid agreements and disaster preparedness plans will increase if an airport fuel depot is located in South San Francisco.

The foregoing Findings point to the need to include SFO in the emergency planning of San Mateo County.

## **Recommendation**

The San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury recommends that the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors and the Emergency Services Council invite the San Francisco International Airport to join the Joint Powers Agreement as an Associate member and invite their representative to attend meetings of the Emergency Services Council.



[Issue](#) | [Background](#) | [Findings](#) | [Conclusions](#) | [Recommendations](#) | [Responses](#) | [Attachments](#)

## **Summary of Disaster Preparedness in San Mateo County Public School Districts**

### **Issue**

How can the public school districts in San Mateo County be better prepared to care for students should a disaster occur while students are in attendance at school?

### **Summary**

The San Mateo County Grand Jury (Grand Jury) surveyed all 23 elementary and high school districts, and all responded. The nine-question survey was designed to obtain answers to fundamental questions dealing with basic preparations, communication techniques, and general awareness. The Grand Jury found that all school districts have in place emergency plans for the care of students should a disaster or other emergency take place during school hours. There is considerable variation among districts.



# **Disaster Preparedness in San Mateo County Public School Districts**

## **Issue**

How can the public school districts in San Mateo County be better prepared to care for students should a disaster occur while students are attending school?

## **Background**

The 2005-2006 San Mateo County Grand Jury (Grand Jury) embarked on a county-wide inquiry to determine the adequacy of preparations for a disaster in the County. One area of inquiry focused on the preparedness of the public school districts and their provisions for the care of students should a disaster occur while children are attending school. The public schools of the county include 17 K-8 districts, three K-12 districts, and three high school districts and serve 88,015 students. Caring for those students until they can be safely reunited with their parents is a huge responsibility and requires thoughtful and thorough preparation. Such preparation includes plans to ensure the safe evacuation of the site; to provide stocks of first aid, food, and temporary or alternate shelter; and to communicate with emergency personnel and parents.

## **Investigation**

All 23 elementary and high school districts responded to a survey that consisted of nine questions, several of which had two parts. The survey was designed to obtain answers to basic questions. The investigation did not include review of detailed plans or other documentation. (The questionnaire and summary of responses can be found in the appendices to this report.)

## Findings

- All districts have a plan for caring for children in the event of an emergency. Several districts are in the process of revising and standardizing the plan for all schools they administer.
- Among the potential disasters for which schools prepare are fire, earthquake, intruder-on-campus, bomb threat, hazardous materials incident, civil defense threat, windstorm, or flood.
- Most districts review their emergency plans annually and conduct periodic drills or simulations with students, ranging from monthly fire drills to annual or semi-annual earthquake or intruder drills. Reviews are conducted at various times of the year.
- The full-time employees of all districts are trained and understand their assigned responsibilities to care for children in the event of an emergency. Training is conducted annually.
- With respect to holding students for an extended period of time, there is wide variation among districts. The time periods range from a few hours to three days (72 hours). Several school districts have committed to holding students "until parents arrive to pick up children."
- Most schools expect to communicate with parents through cellular phones or land-line telephones. A variety of phone trees, automated calling systems, and radio station broadcasts were mentioned as alternate communication methods.
- Several schools can communicate with police or fire departments directly by radio and do not depend on telephones.
- Nearly all districts inform their students of what to expect in case of an emergency or disaster.
- High schools release older students (grades 9 - 12) on their own; elementary schools release students only to parents or other designated individuals.
- Among special preparations are the following:
  - Walkie-talkies to connect to emergency lines
  - Each classroom equipped with an emergency backpack containing basic first aid supplies and emergency contact and release information for each child in the class
  - Students bringing their own disaster kits with boxed drinks, granola bars, and other snacks to be stored at the school
  - Availability of a book of student photographs for emergency personnel to use

## **Conclusions**

The Grand Jury found that all school districts have emergency plans for the care of students should a disaster or other emergency occur during school hours. There is variation among the plans, and several areas that warrant attention are outlined in the following recommendations. The Grand Jury concluded that it was important that parents be aware of emergency plans.

## **Recommendations**

The Grand Jury recommends that all school districts in San Mateo County review the following recommendations and comply as soon as possible.

1. At the beginning of each school year each district or school should review its emergency plans and update training of personnel.
2. Each school site housing children should have emergency communication equipment that will operate independently of the land-line or cellular phone systems to guarantee reliable communication with police and fire departments.
3. Each district should inform parents, in writing, that telephone communications might not be possible in an emergency and should spell out how their school will provide for children in the event of a major disaster.

# APPENDIX A

## School Emergency Preparedness Survey Questionnaire

The San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury, in response to elevated concerns regarding Disaster Preparedness, is approaching government agencies across the entire county to assess the level of preparedness. The following questionnaire is designed specifically for public school districts, and is designed to be easy to answer and return with little, if any, need for attached documents.

1. Is there an emergency plan in place at each facility housing children in your district should a disaster occur during hours when children are present? \_\_\_\_\_

With what types of disasters is your school district presently prepared to deal?  
Please list.

2. Are all sites/facilities equally prepared? \_\_\_\_\_ If not, is there a plan to ensure that?
3. When was the plan at each facility last reviewed or updated? \_\_\_\_\_  
How frequently is there a drill or practice? \_\_\_\_\_

4. Are there assigned responsibilities for full time regular employees to care for children in the event there is a disaster during school hours when children are in attendance?

5. Have the employees been trained and understand their responsibilities? \_\_\_\_  
When?

6. How long is each facility prepared to hold students?  
\_\_\_\_\_

7. What are the provisions for communication with parents or guardians and subsequent release of students if an emergency occurs during school hours?  
(describe briefly)

8. Do students understand the expectations of the plan, specifically those relating to being released from school?

What differences are there for high school, middle school, or elementary schools?

Are there any preparations unique to your district which you would like to have shared with other schools and districts?



## APPENDIX B

### Summary of Survey Responses

#### Sheet 1

	Bayshore S.D.	Belmont-Redwood Shores Elem. S.D.	Burlingame S.D.	Cabrillo Unified S.D.	Hillsborough City School District	Jefferson S.D.	Jefferson Union H.S. District	Las Lomas S.D.
1. Emergency Plan for Children	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2. All Sites	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
3a. Last Plan Review	Apr-05	Annually	Sep-05	Oct-05	Sep-05	Spring 2005	Several years ago	Spring 2004/Fall 2005
3b. Drill	Monthly	Annually	Monthly	Monthly	Monthly	Fire-monthly, EQ-4x, Armed Int-2x/yr	Fire/EQ/lockdown annually, larger scale not	Monthly
4. Full Time Emp. Assigned to Care for Children in Emerg.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
5a. Employees Trained	Yes	Yes	Some	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes except Long term disasters	Yes
5b. When Training Conducted	Faculty meetings	11/29/05-3/26/06	?	Annually	Annually	Annually	Annually	Annually - First Aid every 2 yrs
6. Duration of Emergency Care	1 Day	72 Hours	Until pickup	24 hours	24 hrs	72 hours	1 day	24 hours
7. Communication Provisions w/Parents	Telephone	Telephone	Cell phones, walkie-talkies, NIT	Phone tree	Cell phones, text messaging, phone trees	Communicate with those on emergency list	Telephone	KGO 810 radio
8a. Are Students Informed	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	6-8 grade yes, K-5 uncertain	Yes	Yes	Yes
8b. Differences	Similar	No	No	HS released w/o parent, others with parent	No	No	No	Only elem. has special name tags and color coded areas
9. Unique Preparations	NA		Aircraft crash/Smog/Wildland fire/Tidal wave/Wind storm	HS is Red Cross Evac. Facility for all schools	No	Walkie-Talkies within & to emergency line & administration	Simultaneous telephone to all w/ emergency #	Follow SEMS & all of ICS

## APPENDIX B

### Summary of Survey Responses

#### Sheet 2

	Menlo Park City S.D.	Millbrae S.D.	Pacifica S.D.	Portola Valley S.D.	Ravenswood City S.D.	Redwood City S.D.	San Bruno Park S.D.	San Carlos S.D.
1. Emergency Plan for Children	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2. All Sites	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Somewhat	No	Yes
3a. Last Plan Review	Oct-05	Each Fall	May-05	Dec-05	Currently being reviewed	1/year	Oct-05	Yearly
3b. Drill	Quarterly	Fire monthly, EQ & Intruder-2x/yr	Monthly	Monthly w/2 full scenarios per year	Minimum of each semester	Fire 1/mo, Earthquake 1/yr	Monthly	Monthly
4. Full Time Emp. Assigned to Care for Children in Emerg.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
5a. Employees Trained	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Some	Yes with backups	Yes	Yes
5b. When Training Conducted	Annually	Annually	Apr-05	Oct-05	Sep-05	?	New employee	Yearly
6. Duration of Emergency Care	3 Days	1 Day	2-3 days	3 days	1 Day	Until parents arrive	Some a few hours, two sites for 3 days	48 hours
7. Communication Provisions w/Parents	?	?	Telephones	Automated telephone system	Telephone & cell phone	KNBR 680 or KIQI 1010	?	Cell phone
8a. Are Students Informed	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not well	Yes	Yes	Yes
8b. Differences	No	No	No	Elem w/teachers, middle school w/grade level teams	No	No	No?	few, if any
9. Unique Preparations	No	?	No	911 phone call system great	No	No	"Cheat Sheets" for subs, students bring own disaster kits	no

## APPENDIX B

### Summary of Survey Responses

#### Sheet 3

	San Mateo-Foster City Elem. S.D.	San Mateo Union H.S. District	S. San Francisco Unified S.D.	Woodside Elem. S.D.	Brisbane S.D.	La Honda-Pescadero Unified S.D.	Sequoia Union H.S. District
1. Emergency Plan for Children	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Updating	Yes
2. All Sites	No	Yes?	No	Yes	Yes	No, revising	No, revising
3a. Last Plan Review	Annually	Annually	Currently being reviewed	Spring 2005	Fall 2005	Dec-05	Jan '06
3b. Drill	Monthly	Monthly	See schedule	Yes	Monthly	Monthly	Monthly
4. Full Time Emp. Assigned to Care for Children in Emerg.	Yes	Yes	Assigning now	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
5a. Employees Trained	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
5b. When Training Conducted	at staff meetings	Annually & Monthly	2 schools in Nov 2005 Others ?	Monthly	Nov 2005	Not yet	Annually
6. Duration of Emergency Care	72 Hours	72 Hours	12 to 24 hours	48 hours	24 Hours	As long as necessary	1-2 days
7. Communication Provisions w/Parents	?	Contact ed system, telephone	District intra-net	Local radio, telephone tree	Telephone	Student release procedure	Cell phone
8a. Are Students Informed	Yes	Yes	Will be establishing procedures	Yes	Yes	Will train students this year	Yes
8b. Differences	No	No	?	No	No	No	No
9. Unique Preparations	No	No	In process of new template & handbook by 4/06 & will share	n/a	Photo book of students	No	No



[Issue](#) | [Background](#) | [Findings](#) | [Conclusions](#) | [Recommendations](#) | [Responses](#) | [Attachments](#)

## Summary of Preparing for FCC-Mandated Changes in County Law Enforcement Radio Networks

### Issue Statement

How can San Mateo County best prepare for mandated changes to its public safety radio networks?

### Summary

As part of an inquiry into emergency preparedness, the San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury (Grand Jury) examined the radio communication capabilities of the County Sheriff and local police departments. The Jury interviewed radio technical specialists and a cross-section of law enforcement personnel to ascertain the County's communications capability. During the investigation, the Grand Jury learned of an FCC-mandated bandwidth change that will take effect on January 1, 2013.

The Grand Jury found that the existing law enforcement radio communication system functions satisfactorily, **but** that this system must change prior to January 1, 2013. The report recommends actions needed to prepare for these changes.



# Preparing for FCC-Mandated Changes in County Law Enforcement Radio Networks

## Issue Statement

How can San Mateo County best prepare for mandated changes to its public safety radio networks?

## Background

As part of an inquiry into emergency preparedness, the San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury (Grand Jury) examined the radio communication capabilities of the Sheriff and local police departments. The pertinent Federal Communications Commission (FCC) regulations apply to law enforcement, fire, and ambulance service, but this report deals only with law enforcement communications.

San Mateo County's digital<sup>1</sup> radio communication network was built in 2001-2004 at a cost of approximately \$24 million. The network uses state-of-the-art technology, is resilient in case of hardware failures, and can be expanded to accommodate additional users. A consequence of this technology is the complexity and high cost of the receiving/transmitting stations and the mobile radios. The cost of these stations might be one reason that there are far fewer digital receivers in the populated areas than there are analog receivers. The network is operated by the Information Services Department (ISD) and is used by county departments, the Sheriff, and the Redwood City Police Department. The digital radio network is operated as an enterprise and users pay a service fee. San Mateo County also operates and maintains four analog mutual-aid radio channels, accessible to all law enforcement agencies for large-scale or county-wide operations.

Eighteen local police departments<sup>2</sup> in the county rely on the many mature local analog systems that they own. In the last two decades most of these departments have installed multiple analog receivers in their jurisdictions to support the increased use of handheld

---

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix A for a glossary of terms.

<sup>2</sup> See Appendix B for a list of cities.

radios. This is significant because handheld radios transmit at much lower power than do mobile (car) radios and must be nearer to a receiver to work satisfactorily.

The present radio networks will have to change within the next six years to comply with the FCC decision to change the assignment of public safety radio channels. These channels currently are 25 kHz wide (wideband), but since the number of radio users is increasing, the FCC plans to reduce the width of each channel to 12.5 kHz (narrowband) allowing two conversations to take place where only one previously fit. All law enforcement radio users must switch to narrowband equipment by January 1, 2013.

## **Investigation**

The initial purpose of the investigation was to follow up on media reports that the County's digital radio network had experienced problems due to software changes in 2005. As the investigation progressed, the focus changed to the issue of the impending shift to narrowband radio equipment. In the course of the investigation the Grand Jury interviewed a cross-section of law enforcement personnel and radio technical specialists.

## **Findings**

- All law enforcement personnel interviewed stated that the county-wide digital radio network does not currently perform as well as expected. The initial trial of digital radios by the Redwood City Police Department was marred by coverage gaps and the poor performance of handheld radios inside buildings. The Redwood City Police Department has subsequently switched to the digital radio network and is working with ISD to optimize its performance in Redwood City.
- The proponents of the digital network in ISD believe the following.
  - The digital system offers capabilities not available with analog equipment, e.g., message encryption and data transmission.
  - Analog radio equipment will not perform as well as digital equipment with narrowband channels.
  - Their current efforts to improve system performance will correct both the real and perceived shortcomings.
- Most of the local police departments are reluctant to forsake their existing analog radio systems and migrate to the County's digital system because the digital system does not perform as well as their existing systems.
- It is critically important that handheld radios function properly in all locations, including within buildings. Most local police departments have installed enough analog receivers to guarantee satisfactory performance of their current systems.

- Some local police departments have purchased analog radios that are capable of either wide or narrowband operation, and those agencies have stated that they plan to convert their radios to narrowband channels when necessary, i.e., before 2013.
- Local police departments have conducted some experiments with narrowband channels, and the results show that they can expect to successfully convert their existing analog networks to conform to the FCC mandate.
- There is a significant difference in the cost of the two types of radio: a mobile radio suitable for use on the county digital network costs roughly three times as much (\$3500 vs. \$1200) as an analog radio used by local police departments. A digital receiving/transmitting station costs more than an analog station. The station recently added atop the Hall of Justice cost approximately \$500,000.
- When officers from different local police departments communicate by radio, their conversations must travel over the County digital network. The call originates from a handheld or mobile radio and is transmitted as an analog signal to a base station. There the signal is digitized and transmitted over the County digital network to a base station in the second jurisdiction. The signal is then converted back to analog and transmitted to an officer in the field.
- The typical life of base station radios is 12 to 15 years. Mobile radios typically last seven to ten years and handheld radios five to seven years. Analog radio technology is mature and will be less commonly used in 20 years. Digital radio technology is much newer and is still evolving. It is expected to become less expensive in the future and it may eventually replace analog technology.

## **Conclusions**

- It is essential that the acknowledged performance shortcomings of the County's digital radio network be corrected so that the safety of officers in the field is not compromised.
- Local police departments are correct to insist that any radio technology they employ must provide excellent performance with both mobile and handheld radios.
- The analog radio users that plan to convert their radios to narrowband operation need to know with certainty that narrowband analog equipment will perform satisfactorily and meet future requirements.

- The proponents of the digital radio network and the users of the many analog radio networks disagree on whether analog radios will perform satisfactorily with narrowband channels
- Given the interdependence of the radio users and the climate of changing radio technology, the parties involved need to manage the evolution of the public safety communication system with minimum disruption and maximum efficiency

## **Recommendations**

1. The Grand Jury recommends that the Board of Supervisors ensure the following:
  - 1.1 The Information Services Department vigorously pursues its current efforts to improve the performance of the County's digital radio system.
  - 1.2 The Sheriff and ISD work together with local police departments to ensure that communication systems in the County will comply with the FCC regulations that take effect in 2013 and will match or exceed the performance of existing radio systems.
2. The Grand Jury also recommends that the City Council of every city or town that plans to employ narrowband analog radios in 2013 should ensure that that equipment will perform satisfactorily in all parts of their jurisdiction.
3. The City Council of every city or town should ensure that its city cooperates with other cities and with the Sheriff and ISD to ensure that communication systems in the County will comply with the FCC regulations that take effect in 2013 and will match or exceed the performance of existing radio systems.



# Appendix A

## Glossary of Terms

**Analog** An automobile fuel gauge with a needle is an analog device; it displays full, empty, and all points in between. The value displayed is variable and continuous.

An analog radio emits a continuous electromagnetic carrier wave, and information is transmitted by modulating (changing) either the amplitude (hence AM) or frequency (FM) of the carrier wave.

**Digital** An automobile fuel warning light is a digital device; it has only two states, on or off. If the light is off there is fuel in the tank; if the light is on the tank is almost empty. The warning light cannot indicate that the tank is one-half or one-quarter full.

A digital radio also emits an electromagnetic wave, but instead of the continuous, varying wave used in analog radio, the digital wave is interrupted. Information is transmitted by timing the interruptions or breaks in the carrier wave.

**FCC-Mandated Changes** The FCC requires that Public Safety Radio Pool licensees operating in the 150-174 MHz and 421-512 MHz bands migrate to narrowband (12.5 kHz) technology by January 1, 2013. Additionally, applications for new licenses or expansion of existing licenses using wideband (25 kHz) technology will not be accepted after January 1, 2011. Manufacture or importation of wide-band equipment will be prohibited on January 1, 2011.

**ISD** The Information Services Department provides a variety of information technology and computer application services to County departments. The Communication Services Division of ISD plans, designs, and supports the County digital radio network. (The digital radio network is actually owned by the Joint Powers Authority composed of San Mateo County and all the cities in the county.)

**Public Safety Radio** This term, as used by the FCC, includes law enforcement, fire, ambulance, and other first response services. In San Mateo County, all fire departments use radio frequencies in the 154-155 MHz range, known as high band VHF. The emergency response ambulance service uses the county's digital radio network, as does the Public Works Department. The Sheriff's Department uses the county digital radio network while the local police departments use analog radios, all of which operate in the 470-512 MHz frequency range known as T-band UHF.

# Appendix B

## Police Department Radio Type

<b>Department</b>	<b>Radio Type</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
Town of Atherton	analog	
City of Belmont	analog	
City of Brisbane	analog	
Township of Broadmoor	analog	
City of Burlingame	analog	
Town of Colma	analog	
City of Daly City	analog	
City of East Palo Alto	analog	
City of Foster City	analog	
City of Half Moon Bay	analog	
Town of Hillsborough	analog	
City of Menlo Park	analog	
City of Millbrae	analog	
City of Pacifica	analog	
Town of Portola Valley	digital	Sheriff provides law enforcement services
City of Redwood City	digital	
City of San Bruno	analog	
City of San Carlos	analog	
City of San Mateo	analog	
City of South San Francisco	analog	
Town of Woodside	digital	Sheriff provides law enforcement services



[Issue](#) | [Background](#) | [Findings](#) | [Conclusions](#) | [Recommendations](#) | [Responses](#) | [Attachments](#)

## Summary Report on Disaster Preparedness in SamTrans, Environmental Services, and Public Works

### Issue

Do the San Mateo County Public Works Department, the Environmental Services Agency, and SamTrans have emergency preparedness plans that adequately address the critical elements necessary to protect the County's residents and property in the event of a disaster?

### Summary

This report assesses the emergency preparedness plans of SamTrans and those divisions of the Environmental Services Agency and the Public Works Department for which emergency preparedness plans were deemed appropriate by their department heads, Libraries, Parks and Recreation, Public Works, Facilities and Airports. (The Public Works Department plan is currently in draft form but will be finalized and adopted later this year.)

The San Mateo County Civil Grand Jury (Grand Jury) studied the plans submitted by these groups and developed a list of criteria by which the plans could be measured. These criteria are identified and discussed in the main report. Evaluation of the various preparedness plans led the Grand Jury to conclude the following:

- The plans submitted varied widely in content and quality.
- The SamTrans and Libraries plans and the draft Public Works plan were the most comprehensive and complete.
- The plans submitted by Parks and Recreation and the Airports need to be improved or rewritten.
- It is vital that all department heads ensure that there are highest quality emergency preparedness plans for all divisions under their supervision for which a plan is deemed appropriate.

This investigation resulted in several recommendations, including:

- That the Board of Supervisors ensure that all deficient Emergency Preparedness Plans are improved, and that all plans include personnel training programs, provide for periodic field exercises, and that all comply with the California Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS).
- That the SamTrans Board of Directors ensure that the SamTrans Emergency Preparedness Plan includes an adequate personnel training program and provides for periodic field exercises of the plan.



## **Disaster Preparedness in SamTrans, Environmental Services, and Public Works**

### **Issue**

Do the San Mateo County Public Works Department, the Environmental Services Agency, and the San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans) have emergency preparedness plans that adequately address the critical elements necessary to protect the County's residents and property in the event of a disaster?

### **Background**

This report focuses on the emergency preparedness plans of the Environmental Services Agency, the Public Works Department, and SamTrans. There are eight divisions in the Environmental Services Department and four in Public Works. This report considers the plans from SamTrans and from those divisions for which plans were deemed appropriate by their department heads, i.e., Libraries, Parks and Recreation, Public Works, Facilities and Airports. At the time of the writing of this report, the Public Works Department plan was being rewritten. It is expected that this new plan will be adopted later this year.

### **Investigation**

The Grand Jury spent several weeks evaluating the plans listed above. These plans varied greatly in format, length, and content. The Jury also reviewed the San Mateo County SEMS/EOP plan. The Jury then compiled the following list of elements required in a comprehensive plan. This list of critical elements was reviewed by the professional emergency planners in the Office of Emergency Services (OES), who agreed that the list was reasonable and complete. These critical elements are:

- **Purpose and Scope** Describes what the plan is designed to accomplish and who is responsible.
- **SEMS Compliance** Complies with SEMS requirements as

outlined in the State Emergency Planning Guide for Local Government.

- **Staff Roles and Responsibilities** Describes the roles and responsibilities of each staff member.
- **Emergency Contacts and Phone Numbers** Describes the emergency staff chain of command and whom to call under what circumstances.
- **Guidelines for Decision Makers** Provides clear steps to follow in making decisions during an emergency.
- **Specific Emergency Procedures** Contains instructions covering a list of potential emergencies.
- **Evacuation and Shelter Plans** Contains instructions for evacuation and shelter during an emergency.
- **Personnel Training Plan** Defines plans for training personnel with specific topics and types of training.
- **Exercise and Update Plan** Describes the frequency of training exercises and how the results of those exercises are used to improve the plan.
- **Plans for Coordinating with other Agencies and Departments** Describes procedures for coordinating with other agencies during an emergency.
- **Post-Emergency Plans** Defines plans to deal with post-emergency issues and the return to normal operations.

The Grand Jury used the list of critical elements together with the rating system described below to independently evaluate each of the emergency preparedness plans submitted.

A score of 0 indicates that an element is not included in the plan.

A score of 1 indicates that the treatment of an element is incomplete or unclear.

A score of 2 is given if the treatment of an element is complete and clear.

At the time of the writing of this report, the Public Works Department Plan was being re-written. The Grand Jury evaluated a draft of this new Public Works Plan for this report. The revised Public Works Plan, which will be adopted later this year, is expected to include a revised Facilities Plan and a new Airport Plan.

## Findings

The chart below shows the results of the Grand Jury's evaluation of the various preparedness plans.

With a maximum possible score of 22, the three highest scores were attributed to the plans submitted by SamTrans (21), Libraries (17), and the Public Works Draft Plan (16). The scores earned by Parks and Recreation (3), Facilities (5), and Airports (6) leave room for substantial improvement

Plan Element	SamTrans	Environ Services		Public Works		
		Library	Parks&Rec	Draft Plan	Facilities	Airport
					(Note A)	(Note B)
Purpose & Scope	2	2	0	2	0	0
SEMS/ICS Compliant	2	0	0	2	0	0
Staff Roles & Responsibilities	2	2	1	2	1	1
Emergency Contacts & Phone Numbers	2	1	0	2	2	2
Guidelines for Decision Making	2	2	0	1	0	0
Specific Emergency Procedures	2	2	0	1	0	2
Evacuation Procedures	2	2	0	2	2	0
Personnel Training Plan	2	2	1	1	0	0
Exercise & Update Plan	1	2	0	0	0	0
Plans for Coordinating with other Agencies	2	0	1	2	0	1
Post-Emergency Plans	2	2	0	1	0	0
Total	21	17	3	16	5	6

Notes:

- A. Will be superseded by draft Public Works Plan currently being prepared.
- B. Will be updated and re-issued as addendum to Public Works Plan.

## Conclusions

- The plans submitted by SamTrans and Libraries and the draft of the new Public Works plan all address the majority of the critical elements needed to protect the County’s residents and property in case of a disaster.
- The Parks and Recreation and the Airport plans need to be improved or rewritten.
- The Library, Parks and Recreation, and Airport plans are not SEMS compliant.
- The Parks and Recreation plan, the Public Works draft, and the Airport plan need improvement in the areas of training and field exercises.
- It is vital that all department heads ensure that the highest quality emergency preparedness plans exist or are written for all agencies or groups under their supervision for which a plan is deemed appropriate.

## Recommendations

1. The Grand Jury recommends that the Board of Supervisors ensure the following:
  - 1.1 The Parks and Recreation plan is rewritten or improved so that the plan is SEMS compliant, includes personnel training programs, and provides for periodic field exercises to test and improve the Plan.
  - 1.2 The Airport Plan is rewritten or improved, and that the Public Works and Airport Plans are SEMS compliant, include personnel training programs, and provide for periodic field exercises to test and improve the Plans.
  - 1.3 The Libraries Plan is SEMS compliant.
  - 1.4 The new Public Works and Airport Plans are completed and disseminated.
2. The Grand Jury recommends that the Board of Directors of the San Mateo County Transit District ensure that the personnel training section of the SamTrans Emergency Preparedness Plan is upgraded and that periodic field exercises are conducted to test and improve its plan.