Ad Hoc Committee on  
Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI)  
Monday, November 5, 2018  
9:00 a.m.

Location: Castro Valley Library  
3600 Norbridge Avenue  
Castro Valley, CA 94546

Summary Minutes

I. Call to Order/Roll Call

Erin Armstrong, Chair, UASI Ad Hoc Committee, called the meeting to order. The roll was called, and members present included Matthew Snelson, Cinthya Muñoz-Ramos, Erin Armstrong, Ana-Marie Jones and John Lindsay-Poland. All members were present.

II. Approval of Minutes

Erin Armstrong made a motion to approve the minutes of October 19, 2018, seconded by John Lindsay-Poland.

Motion passed: 5/0

III. Revised Meeting Schedule

September 21, 2018, 9:00 – 11:30 am, 1221 Oak Street, Room 255, Oakland, CA  
October 4, 2018, 9:00 – 11:30 am, 1221 Oak Street, Room 225, Oakland, CA  
October 19, 2018, 9:00 – 11:30 am, Fremont Main Library – 2400 Stevenson Blvd., Fremont, November 5, 2018, 9:00 – 11:30 am, Castro Valley Library – 3600 Norbridge Ave., Castro Valley, CA  
November 19, 2018, 9:00 – 11:30 am, Berkeley City Hall, 2180 Milvia St., Berkeley, CA  
November 30, 2018, 9:00 – 11:30 am, 1221 Oak Street, 5th Fl, Oakland, CA -BOS Chambers  
December 14, 2018, 9:00 – 11:30 am, 1221 Oak Street, 5th Fl, Oakland, CA -BOS Chambers

Cinthya Muñoz-Ramos will confirm the location of the UASI meeting in Berkeley on November 19, 2018.

Erin Armstrong stated that the Committee may need to increase meeting frequency and or extend the UASI meetings beyond December 14, 2018.

IV. Revised Learning Goals

Erin Armstrong reported that today’s meeting is the last meeting in the discovery phase and the Committee will move into the design phase and to be aware of the learning goals.

Ana-Marie Jones stated that under the design phase item 1: “Create a vision for disaster prevention, response and recovery in Alameda County and the Bay Area region” the words “preparedness” and “resiliency” should be added.
John Lindsay-Poland reported that he is looking for people from academic institutions to begin surveying agencies on their preparedness activities. He also stated that there may be new information coming in concurrently while the Committee moves on to the design phase.

John Lindsay-Poland also asked the status of the Committee’s request for the fiscal year 2018 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

Dennis Houghtelling, Assistant Sheriff, reported that the MOU is with County Counsel for review and he will provide the document as soon as it is available.

V. A ‘Whole Community Approach’ Framework

Ana-Marie Jones presented a PowerPoint presentation the “Whole Community Approach” framework.

Ms. Jones contracts with FEMA and have worked with FEMA over the years related to preparedness, response, recovery and planning. The document “A Whole Community Approach to Emergency Management: Principles, Themes and Pathways for Action” is the most current FEMA information on changing how the nation does preparedness, response and recovery.

Questions/Discussion

Ana Marie Jones responded to questions regarding:

- Fear-based approaches – they do not work because they do not produce a long-term behavioral change
- Changes in administration de-funded Collaborating Agencies Responding to Disasters (CARD) and it was hard to receive buy-in from other entities once the support from the Sheriff’s Office ended
- Supervisor Haggerty, District 1, was a big supporter of CARD, however there were no conversations about challenging the Sheriff’s Office budget to fund CARD
- Funding sources for CARD included: EMT funding, planning grants, foundations, Haas, United Way, community-based foundations, Alameda County Public Health
- Outside of UASI grant it is not known how much funding is available for community preparedness
- What FEMA can do is very different from what can happen at the community levels
- CARD was the longest serving such agency, in existence from 1989 through 2016, with a budget of $500,000 in the strong years
- The structure of CARD included a Board of Directors, a staff of five (5) employees and several hundred agencies to take CARD classes, including support from the Public Health Department and the Social Services Agency

VI. Compliance Report

Attachment

Commander Shawn Sexton, Bay Area UASI, Project Manager and Regional Training and Exercise Compliance Team Project Coordinator, Alameda County Sheriff’s Office and Deputy Chief Abe Roman, City of Berkeley Fire Department presented a PowerPoint presentation on the first year of the Urban Shield Compliance Team report.
The Compliance Team concept was conceived to review/evaluate the 2018 Urban Shield Full-Scale Exercise (FSE), training events and Vendor Show to monitor and ensure compliance with the 12 Guiding Principles drafted by the Alameda County BOS in 2017.

The strategy was to organize the Compliance Team with a multi-disciplinary approach, placing a heavy emphasis on recruiting evaluators with an extensive training background and expertise from agencies outside of the Alameda County Sheriff’s Office.

The Compliance Team was given the authority to visit any of the scenario locations and to view any of the scenarios, training presentations and the Vendor Show. If a non-compliance issue was identified, the Compliance Team had the authority to make an immediate change in the field to ensure compliance.

The Compliance Team evaluated:
- Grey Command - Community Preparedness Fair
- Green Command - Community Emergency Response Team (CERT)
- Red Command (Fire) Sites, as well as all the tactical site locations
- In addition, the Compliance Team evaluated the Regional Preparedness Training Seminars and Vendor Show.

Questions/Discussion

Commander Sexton and Deputy Chief Roman responded to questions regarding the Compliance Team presentation. Including:

- There were no scenarios expressed to the Compliance Team where guidelines were not followed because of vendors’ use of certain equipment, surveillance technology, for example.
- Compliance team observed that during this second year of the guiding principles in place, there were no noticeable gaps or burdensome principles, however some guiding principles may not fit a certain scenario
- The compliance team also evaluated Black Command and evaluators focused on if the scenarios were being executed correctly; continually testing equipment and vendors
- Lessons learned: communication through the process, increased communication, everyone involved to understand the mission and the twelve guiding principles; make sure information is communicated all the way down; a better reporting process
- “Tactical is the core of Urban Shield” Originally, that may have been the case — however, today, there is no specific core, but it is a collaborative multi-disciplinary approach
- Cannot address any type of disaster without involving the community
- Commander Sexton worked with Assistant Sheriff Dennis Houghtelling to convene ten (10) persons for the compliance team, of which three (3) were law enforcement members
- There are many definitions of surveillance, for example: security camera (for protection one’s home and or property) and surveillance cameras (set up camera to surveil a neighbors’ property)
- The Commander was not aware of defining terms related to human rights, racist stereotyping, crowd control, and surveillance and based on expertise of Compliance Team Members used “situational awareness” technology.
• Community fair people were greeted by young marines; was that useful? Chief Roman stated that it came as a surprise and that is something that can be reviewed.
• Structure of compliance how far in advance – communication via emails and phone calls and conducted a briefing the day of the exercise; after there was a debrief (hotwash).
• The Ad Hoc Committee will receive comments from the Urban Shield Compliance Team debriefing.
• Compliance Team members felt the community fair was a success.
• 12 guidelines were shared with Compliance Team members and site captains.

Speakers

Tano Trachtenberg, legislative aide, City of Berkeley Mayor’s Office, stated 1) that the Berkeley City Council sent the Alameda County Board of Supervisors a list of recommendations regarding UASI/Urban Shield and asked had they been received; 2) definitions of surveillance is important; 3) concern of vendors in designing scenarios; 4) how many tactical scenarios were visited – armed protester scenario in 2017, another scenario played out as not described; all scenarios should be evaluated;

Tracy Rosenberg, Oakland Privacy Council, stated that she sent recommendations to the Board of Supervisors regarding Urban Shield. Ms. Rosenberg supports de-escalation and violence avoidance training.

Don Fog, Oakland Privacy Council, stated that the general population should be highly involved with emergency preparedness.

VII. Debriefing and Feedback

Committee members debrief the informational presentations at the 2nd and 3rd meetings and share their ideas about the future of Urban Shield.

Omowale Satterwhite, facilitator informed the Committee about the structure of the Design Goals

- Design goals 1 through 3 are for strategic direction
- Design goals 4 through 5 are for strategic action, execution, implementation, methodology, people, communities and institutions to be included
- Design goals 6 through 7 are about monitoring, reviewing, testing and a tool to inform

In meeting five (5) the Committee should frame some options and in meeting six (6) the Committee should discover points of consensus and focus on strategic action.

Committee Debrief/Feedback

Matt Snelson

- Tactical: Within the tactical exercise and why are the SWAT teams being utilized? No team is a full-time SWAT team; Fremont is the 4th largest city in the San Francisco Bay Area; SWAT seeks training outside and brings training back to the department; subject matter experts within the departments bring back best practices; that is likely the case in most departments within the County.
• Has been a participating member of Urban Shield, has run a site, and been an observer which has allowed him to see the training implemented in thirty-two (32) scenarios. As the manager of the Fremont SWAT team it allows him to observe how the team performs and identify learning gaps.

• Within the UASI funding there is a requirement that there is a nexus to terrorism and 25% of the funds needs to be used for law enforcement;
• $1.7 million in training and exercise; there is a need to prepare for man-made disasters
• Do we do away with the tactical performance? Lt. Snelson is staunchly against that, as it is addressing a community and regional need;
• The Committee’s first task should be discussing are we refining Urban Shield or are we rejecting the UASI funding within Alameda County; if funding is rejected, Alameda County loses control of what happens with UASI funding in the future;
• Where would the training be in the future;
• This is the right place for UASI, and decide what to do as a community
• Cutting the tactical component and the Sheriff’s Office participation would cease
• How many years it has taken to incrementally move forward, recognize the ripple effect; As a region it allows focus on state level and county level EMS;
• If the UASI funding is rejected the County would be starting from scratch

John Lindsay-Poland

• Correspondence was received from the General Manager of the Bay Area UASI, Craig Dziedzic;
• The Chair shared with committee members a response that Bay Area UASI gave around the calendar for decision making of Bay Area UASI and what the impact has been;
• Last year the performance for UASI grant ended on December 31st and that meant that there were courses that were scheduled in November but were not able to be carried out until May; The Committee had never heard about any delays in any of the Sheriff’s Office or BAUASI presentations;
• The number of courses offered in 2016 and 2017 were equivalent; in 2018 there were approximately two dozen courses offered from February through April 2018 – during the period that UASI staff stated that those courses had been delayed;
• He has several ideas for criteria; that we don't have time for today; they could be organized in the different categories; did not see where design goals 8 and 9 fit in what was described;
• Believe that UASI grant can be refined and reject Urban Shield as currently constituted;
• Should seek a change in the way the grant is carried out; not rejecting the funding but reconstituting the exercise;
• $4.9 million grant and considerable County investment;
• More than 1100 Sheriff’s Office staff have received pay incentives between 2% and 2.5% per year, that is compounded over the years; millions of county dollars invested in the exercise as well, keep that in mind when we bring our recommendations; there is a lot more to be done with community oversight and participation in the design of the exercise as well as the content and the different kinds of hazards that the exercises are preparing for;

Ana-Marie Jones

The turnover in administration has caused the County to lose a level of knowledge, intellectual capital and experience that used to be a place of pride for Alameda County; something that brought in millions of dollars for our county;
• Ms. Jones was a part of Alameda County’s Emergency Management infrastructure; in alignment with CARD what was wanted most was to make it fully inclusive and representative of the communities served;
• Pleased that the Committee spoke about cultures; just today’s meeting showed different cultural perspectives of different pieces; and the impact of certain experiences; trust is the underpinning of everything; until we get a handle on how this is that level of trust won’t be there; in alignment not interested in Alameda County losing any money but more money;

• UASI and community approach; mother community organizer father was law enforcement;
• Hopes the Committee can find a way forward to educating the Board of Supervisors;

Cinthya Munoz Ramos

• It has been difficult to make space and time to ensure that my thoughts as a member of the Committee are my thoughts as opposed to a staff member
• It has been enlightening to be a part of the Committee and the amount of that information we have received that is not publicly accessible; how urban shield operates, how exercises get formed and what meetings happen when and the timelines for the various decisions and approvals about how to move the funding forward;
• A lot of that unknowing has led to confusion and disagreements and chaos that sometimes follows urban shield conversations,
• The Committee is tasked with making recommendations to the Board of Supervisors for this funding to be used and move forward, not as it currently has been; the assumption coming into this Committee is that how it has been is not working for everyone; and it is not working for Alameda County and cannot continue the way it has been; the wealth of information the Committee has received from community partners and the more clarity received will greatly assist in moving recommendations forward.
• Curious about how to expand on the community and cultural aspect of this work; because it seems that Urban Shield operates in a very monocultural way; who it trains and supports has been very isolated;
• There have been improvements over the last three years, which came out of many community conversations and advocates coming forward; excited that this Committee has the ability to move recommendations forward that can respond to community concerns;
• The 12 guiding principles are one of many recommendations that have come forward from the community and curious as to what systems exist; the compliance team went into effect this year and prior to that there had been no compliance team; how is Urban Shield moving the needle on people prepared and trained for a natural disaster; there is a lot of work to be done; does not think a rejection of the funds makes sense but rather we have the expertise to make sure the funding is used effectively.

Erin Armstrong

• UASI and Urban Shield have done some real good, for example with Gray Command and CERT, AC Alert, there is a lot of real good that is happening;
• However there has been a lot of community response in the negative; there is a mismatch, where there is good happening and at the same time the community is up in arms;
• There is an image issue which is too easy of a fix; tactical images are dominant in Urban Shield, what would it look like if Fire were the core or CERT were the core of Urban Shield, the harder fix is leveraging the structure that exists, the practices of Urban Shield to incentive appropriate action; and to project a positive image
Is it possible to have a community grants program focused on building resiliency; can this funding support some programs that have done the work but were de-funded;
Is it possible to adjust the competitive score sheets so that they incentive a minimum loss of life; for example a participant receives negative points for shooting a civilian however there is nothing if you shoot or apprehend a suspect peacefully; there is a lot of good here and the grant needs to be refined; recognize the need for training and exercise; recognize the need for a lot of the elements of Urban Shield; however there are changes that can be made that will have a positive impact;

VIII. Public Comment

Tano Trachtenberg, City of Berkeley Mayor’s Office, stated that it was alarming to hear that if the tactical training were removed that the Sheriff’s Office would not participate in Urban Shield. City of Berkeley Police Officers have stated that tactical is very important to their training and the City of Berkeley Mayor’s Office supports that. He hopes that there is significant middle ground for refinement of the UASI grant;

IX. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned to Monday, November 19, 2018.