BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

KEITH CARSON
SUPERVISOR, FIFTH DISTRICT

February 22, 2018

Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of Alameda
1221 Oak Street, Suite 536
Oakland, California 94612-4305

SUBJECT: APPROVE THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ALAMEDA COUNTY URBAN SHIELD TASK FORCE (USTF) AS LISTED IN THE URBAN SHIELD TASK FORCE SUMMARY REPORT.

Dear Board Members:

RECOMMENDATION(s):

A) Accept the attached Urban Shield Task Force (USTF) Report on the Urban Shield training, which is a comprehensive, full-scale regional preparedness exercise coordinated by the Alameda County Sheriff's Office; and
B) Approve the attached recommendations passed by the USTF.

DISCUSSION/SUMMARY:

Initiated by Supervisor Keith Carson (District 5), the Board of Supervisors convened the Urban Shield Task Force (USTF) in response to growing support and opposition for the continuation of Urban Shield in Alameda County. The Board of Supervisors selected task force members representing the following agencies, services and stakeholders: 5 appointees -1 from each office of the Alameda County Board of Supervisors; 1 member appointed by Alameda County Sheriff Office; 1 association member appointed by Alameda County Chiefs of Police and Sheriff's Association; 1 staff member from the Red Cross; Alameda County Health Officer, appointed by the Alameda County Health Care Services Agency; 1 member from the Alameda and Contra Costa County Medical Association; 2 members from Stop Urban Shield Coalition; 1 local Civil Rights Attorney appointed by the Alameda County Bar Association; 1 staff member or Superintendent appointed by the Alameda County Board of Education; 1 staff member appointed from BART/AC Transit system; County Fire Chief, selected by Alameda County Fire Chiefs Association; and Director of Alameda County Emergency Medical Services.

Charged with assessing the Urban Shield training and making recommendations to the Board of Supervisors, the 18 member task force met over the course of 7 meetings to review material, discuss and make recommendations in response to the following questions:

1. Does the Urban Shield Project meet federal guidelines set out in the Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) grant?

2. Is Urban Shield strictly an emergency preparedness program?

3. In the event of an emergency/ attack or natural disaster, will public safety agencies, public health and other emergency response departments, be adequately trained and equipped to respond to such disasters without the training offered by Urban Shield?

4. Do the terms, conditions and guidelines of this program meet the demand for the Bay Area Region to be prepared to respond to natural disaster (fire, earthquake, etc.) or a terrorist act?

5. What is the impact of Urban Shield on the community's relationship with law enforcement and other emergency preparedness responders such as the public health department; health care agencies; public education agencies; public transportation agencies; fire departments; and emergency medical services?

The attached report summarizes the activities of the Urban Shield Task Force (USTF), including the process used, outcomes, and key recommendations, which are associated with each question above and cover the areas of accountability and transparency, emergency preparedness activities, training and funding, and community impact.

The USTF appreciates the opportunity to represent Alameda County's 5 Districts, to assist the Board of Supervisors in gaining a more comprehensive understanding of Urban Shield and our first responders' capabilities, and to shed light on the needs and impacts in communities served by the Urban Shield. It is our hope that the report and recommendations will assist the Board of Supervisors in its deliberations about Urban Shield and in efforts to improve preparedness for large scale emergencies while safeguarding the rights of every resident in Alameda County.

SELECTION CRITERIA/PROCESS:

The responses to the questions and recommendations were discussed in accordance with Robert's Rules of Order and approved for submission to the Board by majority vote of the USTF members attending in-person at each USTF meeting.

FINANCING: Not applicable.

Sincerely,

Keith Carson
Supervisor, Fifth District

URBAN SHIELD TASK FORCE REPORT

FEBRUARY 21, 2018

ALAMEDA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

Chaired by: Muntu Davis

Facilitated by: Frank J. Omowale Satterwhite and Kathleen Harris

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BACKGROUND

Initiated by Supervisor Keith Carson (District 5), the Board of Supervisors convened the Urban Shield Task Force (USTF) in response to growing support and opposition for the continuation of Urban Shield in Alameda County. Charged with assessing Urban Shield and making recommendations to the Board of Supervisors, the 18 - member task force met on March 10, 2017, and held 6 subsequent meetings.

This report summarizes the activities of the Urban Shield Task Force (USTF), including the process, outcomes, and key recommendations. Additional information on the USTF can be found at http://acgov.org.

Rhonda Bailey and Tisa Potter, Clerk of the Board (CBS), Alameda County; Jeweld Legacy Group, consultant to Supervisor Keith Carson; Briana Brown, BOS District 5; and other staff from the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors provided administrative support.

SELECTION PROCESS

The BOS selected USTF members representing the following agencies, services and stakeholders:

5 appointees - 1 from each office of the Alameda County Board of Supervisors
1 member appointed by Alameda County Sheriff Office
1 association member appointed by Alameda County Chiefs of Police and Sheriff's Association
1 staff member from the Red Cross
Alameda County Health Officer, appointed by the Alameda County Health Care Services Agency
1 member from the Alameda and Contra Costa County Medical Association
2 members from Stop Urban Shield Coalition
1 local Civil Rights Attorney appointed by the Alameda County Bar Association
1 staff member or Superintendent appointed by the Alameda County Board of Education
1 staff member appointed from BART/AC Transit system
County Fire Chief, selected by Alameda County Fire Chief's Association
Director of Alameda County Emergency Medical Services

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Chair: Dr. Muntu Davis, Alameda County Health Officer, Alameda County Health Care Services Agency
Susan Abdallah, Nurse, District 2 Appointee
Dan Bellino, Chief of Staff, Alameda County Superintendent of Schools
James Betts, Surgeon-in-Chief, Assistant Director, Trauma Services, Children's Hospital Oakland
Marla Blagg, BART Police Department
Mike Grant, Owner, Guns Unlimited Training Center, District 1 Appointee
Glenn Katon, Katon Law
Brett Keteles, Assistant Sheriff, Alameda County Sheriff's Office
Lara Kiswani, Arab Resources
Ann Kronenberg, Director, SF Department of Emergency Management; Chair, Bay Area Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI)

Travis Kusman, Director, Emergency Medical Services, Alameda County Health Care Services Agency
Bob Maginnis, AC Chiefs of Police and Sheriff's Association
Cheryl Miraglia, Castro Valley resident, District 4 Appointee
Tash Nguyen, Ella Baker Center, Stop Urban Shield Coalition
John Lindsay-Poland, American Friends Service Committee, Stop Urban Shield District 5 Appointee
Paul Rolleri, Chief of Police, City of Alameda, District 3 Appointee
Dave Winnacker, Alameda County Fire Department, Rep. for Fire Chiefs Association

Alternates:
Lily Haskell, Stop Urban Shield
Tom Wright, Division Commander, Alameda County Sheriff's Office
Mike Dayton, Deputy Director, SF Department of Emergency Management

County Staff:
Rhonda Bailey, Clerk of the Board (COB), Alameda County
Briana Brown, BOS District 5, Alameda County
Pete Coletto, Principal Analyst, CAO staff
Scott Dickey, County Counsel
Shahidah Lacy, BOS Dist 5, Alameda County
Raymond Lara, County Counsel
Tisa Potter, COB, Alameda County

Facilitators:
Frank J. Omowale Satterwhite
Kathleen Harris

OVERVIEW

Established by the Alameda County Sheriff's Office, the overarching goals of Urban Shield are to provide a multi-layered training exercise to enhance the skills and abilities of regional first responders, and those responsible for coordinating and managing large scale events. This exercise is designed to identify and stretch regional resources to their limits, test core capabilities, while expanding regional collaboration and building positive relationships. In addition, this exercise provides increased local business and critical infrastructure collaboration.[1] The Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) provides oversight for Urban Shield and ensures compliance with Federal funding guidelines. States and urban areas are required to dedicate 25 percent of UASI funding to law enforcement terrorism prevention activities.

In FY15 the Board of Supervisors authorized $1.7 million for Urban Shield with the intent to assess and strengthen the Bay Area's integrated response capabilities. Consideration of continued funding of Urban Shield will come before the Board of Supervisors in FY18.

STATEMENT OF POSITIONS

[1] San Francisco Bay Area Urban Shield 2013 Overview Presentation, https://publicintelligence.net/alameda-urban-shield-2013.

Proponents state Urban Shield is the only multi-jurisdictional opportunity for law enforcement and other first responders to participate in realistic, full-scale emergency response scenarios, such as a catastrophic earthquake, fire or terrorism. Advocates state that an organized field experience and integrated information sharing system are essential to mitigate the loss of property, and to minimize the effects of hazards to the public during a full-scale emergency.

Urban Shield opponents state that high priority should be given to implementing a "whole community approach"; that there should be much more focus on preparing for and recovering from a natural disaster or an act of terrorism than on responding to such emergencies; that other agencies besides law enforcement should be funded to support communities in addressing emergencies; and that community members are also "first responders" and should be provided adequate training by Urban Shield.

Opponents contend that emergency personnel such as EMTs and firefighters need training that advances their skills and readiness to handle the medical and mental health crises that make up the vast majority of emergencies in Alameda County. By prioritizing Urban Shield/Yellow Command as the dominant emergency response training, the County subjects emergency personnel to an orientation which suggests that every crisis could be a terrorist attack and must be handled with military-like mindset and possible force. Rather than receiving training to save lives, emergency personnel are taught to defer to law enforcement and follow the chain of command even when that might mean withholding care or treatment.[2]

Opponents advocate for a "whole community" approach, as called for by Presidential Policy Directive (PPD-8): National Preparedness,[3] and aim to focus preparedness on safety and protection of people, rather than exclusively of other assets, such as infrastructure, technology, or landmarks. Additionally, the whole community approach can dovetail with FEMA's efforts to initiate local dialogue on "approaches that position local residents for leadership roles in planning, organizing, and sharing accountability for the success of local disaster management efforts" which can align nationwide preparedness efforts to Alameda County.

PROCESS & METHODOLOGY

The Urban Shield Task Force (USTF) was initially scheduled 6 meetings, but required an additional meeting, to fulfill its charge from the Board of Supervisors – namely to examine 5 key issues and make recommendations to the Board about the future of Urban Shield in Alameda County. The meeting dates were: March 10, 2017, April 7,

[2] See Items 7 and 8 in July 2017 BAUASI Approval Authority Meeting Master, at http://bauasi.org/sites/default/files/resources/071317%20Approval%20Authority%20July%20Meeting%20Master.pdf.

[3] President Barack Obama, "Presidential Policy Directive 8 (PPD-8): National Preparedness," March 30, 2011, which states "This directive is aimed at strengthening the security and resilience of the United States through systematic preparation for the threats that pose the greatest risk to the security of the Nation, including acts of terrorism, cyber attacks, pandemics, and catastrophic natural disasters. Our national preparedness is the shared responsibility of all levels of government, the private and nonprofit sectors, and individual citizens. Everyone can contribute to safeguarding the Nation from harm. As such, while this directive is intended to galvanize action by the Federal Government, it is also aimed at facilitating an integrated, all-of-Nation, capabilities-based approach to preparedness… It (the National Preparedness System) shall provide an all-of-Nation approach for building and sustaining a cycle of preparedness activities over time."

2017, May 12, 2017; June 9, 2017; August 11, 2017, August 25, 2017 and September 22, 2017.

The first meeting on March 10 was an orientation session with the following agenda topics: (1) USTF's purpose, role, and meeting schedule; (2) meeting protocols; (3) Urban Shield overview; and (4) learning questions and data needs.

The second meeting on April 7 was in informational session with detailed presentations by representatives from the Alameda County Sheriff's Department and Stop Urban Shield. The USTF also reviewed, edited, and supplemented the learning questions and identified data needed to support its deliberations.

The third meeting on May 12 was an open forum where USTF members shared their viewpoints and perspectives about the 5 learning questions and related issues. In addition, task force members identified desired outcomes for USTF, discussed a conflict management process, and finalized the list of learning questions and data requirements.

The fourth meeting on June 9 was a strategy session where USTF members discussed the 5 learning questions and how to address them in 3 small groups:

1. Compliance: (1) Does the Urban Shield Project meet federal guidelines set out in the UASI grant? (2) Is Urban Shield strictly an emergency preparedness program?

2. Emergency Preparedness: (3) In the event of an emergency/ attack or natural disaster, will public safety agencies, public health and other emergency response departments, be adequately trained and equipped to respond to such disasters without the training offered by Urban Shield? (4) Do the terms, conditions and guidelines of this program meet the demand for the Bay Area Region to be prepared to respond to natural disaster (fire, earthquake, etc.) or a terrorist act?

3. Community Relations: (5) What is the impact of Urban Shield on the community's relationship with law enforcement and other emergency preparedness responders such as the public health department; health care agencies; public education agencies; public transportation agencies; fire departments; and emergency medical services?

The fifth meeting on August 11 was a work session where the 3 small groups (Compliance, Emergency Preparedness and Community Relations) formulated responses to the 5 learning questions and shared their basic recommendations with the full task force.

The sixth meeting on August 25 was devoted to review and approval of the findings and recommendations for learning questions 1, 2 and 3 by the full task force.

The seventh meeting on September 22 was devoted to review and approval of the findings and recommendations for learning question 4. The USTF, by majority vote, decided to suspend discussion of learning question 5 and to not make any recommendations to the Board of Supervisors regarding this matter.

QUESTION #1 **Does the Urban Shield Project meet federal guidelines set out in the Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) grant?**

ACCOUNTABILITY & TRANSPARENCY

Q1 DISCUSSION SUMMARY

The USTF concluded that Urban Shield meets the federal guidelines set out in the UASI grant. Evidence shows that Urban Shield training receives approval from the Bay Area UASI Approval Authority, which uses the criteria for regional funding proposals. Urban Shield also meets federal Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP) guidelines, which require the development of exercise plans, exercise evaluator handbooks, Master Scenario Events Lists (MELS), Team Binders, Exercise Evaluation Guides and After-Action Reports (AARs). Additionally, the Bay Area UASI funds[4] have been spent in accordance to the federal guidelines that govern the UASI grant as specified in the Homeland Security Act of 2002.

Q1 RECOMMENDATIONS

I. ACCOUNTABILITY & TRANSPARENCY

A. Require and ensure execution of the following Principles and Guidelines established and outlined in the Sheriff's January 6, 2017, Board Letter for the Fiscal Year 2016 Urban Area Security Initiative Agreement. Before each UASI funding request, require reporting on adherence to these principles and guidelines.

- Expand community involvement and awareness
- Urban Shield will be free from racist stereotyping
- Work to expand training the medical profession for critical incidents
- Urban Shield will not include surveillance training
- Continue to examine new technology and equipment
- Urban Shield will not include crowd control training
- Continue to evaluate existing equipment
- Urban Shield will exclude any and all vendors who display derogatory or racist messages in any form
- Urban Shield will exclude the sale or transfer of any assault weapons and firearms
- Will exclude vendors displaying non-law enforcement related tactical uniforms and equipment
- Urban Shield will strive to maintain the finest first responder training possible

[4] Bay Area Urban Area Security Initiative Project Proposal Guidance for Fiscal Year 2017 - August 2016, http://www.bayareauasi.org/sites/default/files/resources/FY2017%20Project%20Proposal%20Guidance%20-%20Final.pdf.

Recommendation 1A passed by majority vote.

B. Ensure inclusion and execution of the following, "Urban Shield should disallow countries from participating in Urban Shield who have documented Human Rights abuses", which was previously approved by the Alameda County Board of Supervisors, in the above Principles and Guidelines.

Recommendation 1B passed by majority vote.

C. The Sheriff's Office shall provide an annual report to the Board of Supervisors prior to the consideration of UASI funding for 2018 by the Board of Supervisors.

Recommendation 1C passed by majority vote.

D. *Motion was made and seconded to add language to the draft recommendation:*

"The Sheriff shall report to the Alameda County Board of Supervisors on the implementation of the twelve (12) guidelines for Urban Shield approved by the Board in January 2017. Such report shall be public, and shall include, for each of the 12 guidelines: description of steps taken to implement the guideline; who was responsible for implementing the guideline; definitions used in implementation of the guidelines for key terms, including but not limited to: 'human rights', 'racists stereotyping', 'crowd control' and 'surveillance' and, for the guideline on international human rights violations, a list of all sources of information consulted and implementation of other Task Force recommendations that may be adopted by the Board."

Recommendation to add 1D failed by majority.

E. The Sheriff's Office shall report to the Alameda County Board of Supervisors on the implementation of the twelve (12) guidelines for Urban Shield approved by the Board in January 2017 and implementation of other Task Force recommendations that may be adopted by the Board.

Recommendation 1E passed unanimously.

QUESTION #2 **Is Urban Shield strictly an emergency preparedness program?**

AN EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM

Q2 DISCUSSION SUMMARY

The USTF concluded that Urban Shield is strictly an emergency preparedness program, with room for improvement in implementing the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) "Whole Community" approach to emergency management through activities for a) preparedness, b) crisis response, c)

community and economic recovery. (See included footnotes and the final *Additional Info* section.)

Preparedness is defined by the national Department of Homeland Security (DHS)/Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) as: 'a continuous cycle of planning, organizing, training, equipping, exercising, evaluating and taking corrective action in an effort to ensure effective coordination during incident response' and, a shared responsibility; it calls for the involvement of everyone – not just the government – in preparedness efforts. By working together, everyone can help keep the nation safe from harm and help keep it resilient when struck by hazards such as natural disasters, acts of terrorism and pandemics.'

Because the federal UASI grant program's objective is to assist 'high-threat, high-density Urban Areas in efforts to build, sustain, and deliver the capabilities necessary to prevent, protect against, mitigate, respond to and recover from acts of terrorism' and 25% of the grant funding is to be used for law enforcement, Urban Shield activities have focused mainly on trainings and exercises for law enforcement but have expanded to include first responders and other emergency management personnel. It has also recently implemented the Grey (and Green) Command to include some activities for community preparedness.

The Urban Shield Task Force remains unclear on both the determination and application of the Threat Hazard Identifications and Risk Assessment (THIRA) in drafting exercise scenarios, prioritizing capability targets and gaps, and selecting capabilities to be tested and gaps to be addressed each year and over multiple years and, for this reason, did not make specific recommendations about these topics.

Some members expressed deep concerns that Bay Area UASI's Risk Relevance Ratings show core capabilities such as 'Health and Human Services', 'Economic and Community Recovery', 'Long-Term Vulnerability Reduction', 'Housing', 'Public Health and Medical Services', and 'Natural and Cultural Resources', ALL as having low risk relevance, while 'Cyber Security', 'On-Scene Security and Protection', and 'Screening, Search and Detection' are rated as having the highest risk relevance.

<u>Q2 RECOMMENDATIONS</u>

II. WHOLE COMMUNITY APPROACH

A. Develop and implement a plan for FEMA's "Whole Community" approach, in Alameda County. Residents, emergency management practitioners, organizational and community leaders and government officials can collectively understand and assess the needs of the communities and determine the best ways to organize and strengthen their assets, capacities and interest to prepare for, respond to and recover from a natural disaster.

Recommendation 2A failed by majority vote.

B. Include the "Whole Community" in planning and exercises, e.g., conduct tabletop exercises with the community in the 13 Bay Area UASI counties

leading up to a full-scale exercise in September. The example could be 4 tabletop exercises using the UASI Urban Area HUB (East Bay, West Bay, South Bay and North Bay).

Recommendation 2B passed by majority vote.

C. Report on emergency preparedness activities in publicly available exercise documentation and/or summary reports, if not done already.

Recommendation 2C passed by majority vote.

D. Train and exercise non-terrorism scenarios that can justifiably support terrorism preparedness, including prevention and recovery and be in alignment with FEMA's "Whole Community" approach to emergency management. (See *Additional Info* section below.)

Recommendation 2D passed by majority vote.

E. *Motion was made and seconded to add language to the draft recommendation:*

"2e. Alameda County and multi-jurisdictional emergency preparedness shall dedicate as many or more resources and time to prevention of and recovery from critical emergencies than to respond to such emergencies."

Recommendation 2E failed by majority vote.

Question #3 FUNDING

In the event of an emergency/attack or natural disaster, will public safety agencies, public health and other emergency response departments, be adequately trained and equipped to respond to such disasters without the training offered by Urban Shield?

Q3 DISCUSSION SUMMARY

In relationship to public safety, public health and other emergency response departments that have been involved, interagency coordination between them has improved with Urban Shield.

No other significant sources of funding appear to be available for regional large-scale preparedness trainings and full-scale exercises.

Q3 RECOMMENDATIONS

III. FUNDING

A. Identify and seek additional grant funding for local regional large full-scale training and exercises for community preparedness and response

training activities that is consistent with the Urban Shield Task Force recommendations.

Recommendation 3A passed by majority vote.

B. *Motion was made and seconded to add to the draft recommendation:*

"The funding source for multi-jurisdictional disaster preparedness exercises coordinated by Alameda County shall not require that the exercise have a 'nexus to terrorism'."

Recommendation 3B failed by majority vote.

C. *Motion was made and seconded to add to the draft recommendation:*

"The funding source for future multi-jurisdictional disaster preparedness exercises, outside of UASI, funding coordinated by Alameda County shall not require that the exercise have a 'nexus to terrorism'."

Recommendation 3C failed by majority vote.

D. *Motion was made and seconded to add to the recommendation:*

"The Board of Supervisors advocate to revise the priorities of federal emergency preparedness funding to remove the requirement of 'a nexus to terrorism'."

Recommendation 3D failed by majority vote.

E. *Motion was made and seconded to add to the recommendation:*

"The Board of Supervisors assess emergency preparedness funding and activities in relationship to the twelve (12) guidelines previously approved by the Board of Supervisors, applicable to Urban Shield."

Recommendation 3E failed by majority vote.

A motion was made by Lara Kiswani, seconded by John Lindsay-Poland, to record in the minutes the way each task member voted.

Motion passed by majority vote.
Ayes: Lara Kiswani, John Lindsay-Poland, Tash Nguyen, Glenn Katon, Susan Abdallah, Anne Kronenberg, Dan Bellino, Travis Kusman

Noes: Cheryl Miraglia, Marla Blagg, Mike Grant, Brett Keteles, Dave Winnacker

Question #4
TRAINING EXERCISES

Do the terms, conditions and guidelines of this program meet the demand for the Bay Area Region to be prepared to respond to natural disaster (fire, earthquake, etc.) or a terrorist act?

Q4 DISCUSSION SUMMARY

The USTF was unable to come to agreement on this question in relationship to Urban Shield. It remains unclear 1) how the assessment of the risk relevance, level of capability, and gap level is determined, and 2) how the Regional Threat Hazard Identifications and Risk Assessment (THIRA) is applied when selecting and drafting exercise scenarios, prioritizing capability targets and gaps, and selecting capabilities to be tested and gaps to be addressed each year and over multiple years.

Bay Area UASI's Risk Relevance ratings show core capabilities such as "Health and Human Services," "Economic and Community Recovery," "Long-Term Vulnerability Reduction," "Housing," "Public Health and Medical Services," and "Natural and Cultural Resources" ALL as having low risk relevance, while "Cyber Security," "On-Scene Security and Protection," and "Screening, Search and Detection" are rated as having the highest risk relevance.[5]

The USTF was in agreement that more could be done to meet the demand for whole community preparedness. Urban Shield has included a component for community preparedness. This component is separate from the full-scale exercise activities with first responders and emergency management personnel.

Motion was made by Marla Blagg and seconded to accept the above draft response.

Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Q4 RECOMMENDATIONS:

IV. TRAINING & EXERCISES

A. Training and exercises should also focus emergency preparedness efforts on prevention of and recovery from emergencies in addition to response to such emergencies.

Cheryl Miraglia made a motion, seconded by Marla Blagg, to accept recommendation 4a as amended above.

Recommendation 4A passed by majority vote.
Ayes: Cheryl Miraglia, Marla Blagg, Tash Nguyen, John Lindsay-Poland, Dave Winnacker, Jim Betts, Dan Bellino, Travis Kusman, Anne Kronenberg, Brett Keteles, Mike Grant, Susan Abdallah

Noes: n/a

Abstain: Lara Kiswani, Glenn Katon

[5] See Items 7 and 8 in July 2017 Bay Aare UASI Approval Authority Meeting Master, at http://bauasi.org/sites/default/files/resources/071317%20Approval%20Authority%20July%20Meeting%20Master.pdf.

B. Incorporate, where applicable, risks to people especially those who are vulnerable to harm in emergencies in Alameda County.

Recommendation 4B passed by majority vote.
Ayes: Marla Blagg, Jim Betts, Dan Bellino, Travis Kusman, Mike Grant, Brett Keteles, Anne Kronenberg, Dave Winnacker

Noes: n/a

Abstain: Cheryl Miraglia, Lara Kiswani, Susan Abdallah, Tash Nguyen, John Lindsay-Poland, Glenn Katon

C. Increase funding for the Urban Shield exercise to incorporate additional preparedness activities to support FEMA's "whole community" inclusion approach. By doing so, the County will be better prepared and more resilient to emergencies.

Recommendation 4C passed by majority vote.
Ayes: Marla Blagg, Anne Kronenberg, Cheryl Miraglia, Dan Bellino, Dave Winnacker, Brett Keteles, Mike Grant, Jim Betts, Travis Kusman, Dave Winnacker, Jim Betts, Dan Bellino, Travis Kusman, Anne Kronenberg, Brett Keteles, Mike Grant

Noes: John Lindsay-Poland, Tash Nguyen, Susan Abdallah, Glenn Katon

D. Motion was made by John Lindsay-Poland, seconded by Tash Nguyen, to add to the following recommendation for Q4.

Proposal for study: The Obama and Trump administrations sought steep cuts in UASI grant funds for FY 2017 and FY 2018, respectively. The Trump administration has stated that it will cut federal funds to sanctuary jurisdictions, which may include several within BAUSI area. The Alameda County Board of Supervisors shall send a request to jurisdictions within the BAUSI 12-county area to identify non-UASI grants and/or funds from their own resources for disaster preparedness, in order to replace dependence on UASI funds. In addition, the Board will survey the below-named jurisdictions that have not participated in Urban Shield for a number of years, requesting the following information:

a) Why have you not participated in Urban Shield? What has the effect been, if any?
b) What programs have been implemented to address preparedness for critical emergencies?
c) How have community-based programs responded or grown since the city stopped participating in Urban Shield?

d) Who participates in them (name departments)? Do community members or civilians participate?
e) What are the contents of the trainings, and who runs them?
f) What do these trainings emphasize? (Ex. natural disaster, mass casualty, terrorist attack, etc.)
g) What are the stated objectives of these trainings?
h) How do these trainings facilitate relationships between emergency workers and the community?
i) What is the number of professional development days?
j) Do you receive training in projects for recovery from critical emergencies?
k) How do you meet your budget for these trainings? Through city or county?
l) What is the general procedure for responding to mass casualty events? (Who responds)
m) (For emergency services) Do you have trainings or events coming up that are open to the public?

The Alameda County Sheriff's Office shall verify which law enforcement tactical teams of the following jurisdictions did not participate in Urban Shield for three or more of the last ten years or did not apply to participate in 2016: Menlo Park PD; Palo Alto PD; Mountain View PD; Santa Clara County Sheriff; Vallejo PD; Santa Cruz PD; Watsonville PD; Pacifica PD; Napa County city PDs; Sonoma County city PDs; Marin County city PDs; except Novato.

Motion passed by majority.
Ayes: Susan Abdallah, Lara Kiswani, Tash Nguyen, John Lindsay-Poland, Glenn Katon, Dave Winnacker, Jim Betts, Dan Bellino, Travis Kusman, Anne Kronenberg, Brett Keteles, Marla Blagg

Noes: Cheryl Miraglia, Mike Grant

E. **Motion was made by John Lindsay-Poland and seconded by Tash Nguyen to add to the following recommendation for Q4**.

Risk Relevance ratings should prioritize risks to people in the Bay Area, especially those who are vulnerable to harm in emergencies, not to non-human assets.

Motion passed by majority.
Ayes: John Lindsay-Poland, Tash Nguyen, Lara Kiswani, Susan Abdallah, Glenn Katon, Dave Winnacker, Jim Betts, Dan Bellino, Travis Kusman, Anne Kronenberg, Brett Keteles, Mike Grant

Noes: n/a

Abstain: Cheryl Miraglia, Marla Blagg

QUESTION #5
IMPACT ON THE COMMUNITY

What is the impact of Urban Shield on the community's relationship with law enforcement and other emergency preparedness responders such as the public health department; health care agencies; public education agencies; public transportation agencies; fire departments; and emergency medical services?

A motion was made by Lara Kiswani, seconded by John Lindsay-Poland, to suspend discussion on Question 5 and to not vote on the draft response or draft recommendations, given that the Urban Shield Task Force does not represent vulnerable communities or those most impacted by it and that this is not the right body to make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors about community impact of Urban Shield.

It was suggested that because the composition of the USTF was disproportionally not representative of vulnerable communities and the community most impacted by policing in Alameda County and because of a stated concern for potential conflicts of interest with some USTF members, the USTF could not legitimately answer this question.

It was also suggested that being a participant in Urban Shield exercises (i.e. Sheriff's Office, participating police and fire departments, etc.) equated to having a "material or financial interest" in Urban Shield. Therefore, participants with such a "material interest" were incapable of making an impartial judgement of Urban Shield's impacts on community-law enforcement relations.

Others suggested that being a participant in the Urban Shield exercises did not equate to having a "material interest". Comments included that the funding from Urban Shield to participant organizations is a pass through to pay for consumables and the other things that make the exercise possible; it is not "payment" for participation. It was also suggested that being a participant did not mean that you were incapable of making an impartial observation or of providing input or participating in the discussion about what Urban Shield should look like going forward.

Others expressed a desire for the USTF to, at a minimum, discuss the draft recommendations under Q5 if we did not answer the proposed learning question.

After additional discussion by the Task Force members, followed by 28 public comments and a song by public participants in opposition to Urban Shield and about the negative impacts on vulnerable communities, **the motion passed by majority vote to suspend discussion of learning question 5 and to not make any recommendations to the Board of Supervisors regarding this question.**

Ayes: Lara Kisawani, John Lindsay-Poland, Tash Nguyen, Susan Abdallah, Glenn Katon, Dave Winnacker, Travis Kusman, Anne Kronenberg

Noes: Cheryl Miraglia, Marla Blagg, Mike Grant

Abstain: Dan Bellino, Brett Keteles, Jim Betts

SUMMARY OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS:

John Lindsay-Poland made a motion, which was seconded, that the report to the Board of Supervisors include a summary of substantive points made in the last two meetings of Task Force.

Motion failed by majority vote.
Ayes: N/A

Noes: Cheryl Miraglia Glenn Katon, Dave Winnacker, Jim Betts, Dan Bellino, Travis Kusman, Anne Kronenberg, Brett Keteles, Marla Blagg

Abstain: Susan Abdallah, Lara Kiswani, Tash Nguyen, John Lindsay-Poland

CONCLUSION: The USTF appreciates the opportunity to represent Alameda County's 5 districts, to assist the Board of Supervisors in gaining a more comprehensive understanding of Urban Shield, our first responders' capabilities, and to shed light on the needs and impacts in communities served by the Urban Shield. It is our hope that our efforts will assist the Board of Supervisors to improve preparedness for large scale emergencies while safeguarding the rights of every resident in Alameda County.

ADDITIONAL TASK FORCE MATERIALS

Draft Responses and Recommendations
Master List of Recommendations
Minutes
USTF Webpage with Research & Data submitted for consideration by the USTF

ADDITIONAL INFO

(Provided to clarify the term "'Whole Community' approach" referenced in a few of the recommendations submitted for consideration by Task Force members during the discussion.)

Excerpts from FEMA's *A Whole Community Approach to Emergency Management: Principles, Themes, and Pathways for Action*: "As a concept, Whole Community is a means by which residents, emergency management practitioners, organizational and community leaders, and government officials can collectively understand and assess the needs of their respective communities and determine the best ways to organize and strengthen their assets, capacities, and interests. By doing so, a more effective path to societal security and resilience is built. In a sense, Whole Community is a philosophical approach on how to think about conducting emergency management.

Benefits include:

- Shared understanding of community needs and capabilities
- Greater empowerment and integration of resources from across the community
- Stronger social infrastructure
- Establishment of relationships that facilitate more effective prevention, protection, mitigation, response, and recovery activities
- Increased individual and collective preparedness
- Greater resiliency at both the community and national levels

…

Whole Community Principles and Strategic Themes

Numerous factors contribute to the resilience of communities and effective emergency management outcomes. However, three principles that represent the foundation for establishing a Whole Community approach to emergency management emerged during the national dialogue.

Whole Community Principles:

- **Understand and meet the actual needs of the whole community.** Community engagement can lead to a deeper understanding of the unique and diverse needs of a population, including its demographics, values, norms, community structures, networks, and relationships. The more we know about our communities, the better we can understand their real-life safety and sustaining needs and their motivations to participate in emergency management-related activities prior to an event.
- **Engage and empower all parts of the community.** Engaging the whole community and empowering local action will better position stakeholders to plan for and meet the actual needs of a community and strengthen the local capacity to deal with the consequences of all threats and hazards. This requires all members of the community to be part of the emergency management team, which should include diverse community members, social and community service groups and institutions, faith-based and disability groups, academia, professional associations, and the private and nonprofit sectors, while including government agencies who may not traditionally have been directly involved in emergency management. When the community is engaged in an authentic dialogue, it becomes empowered to identify its needs and the existing resources that may be used to address them.
- **Strengthen what works well in communities on a daily basis.** A Whole Community approach to building community resilience requires finding ways to support and strengthen the institutions,

assets, and networks that already work well in communities and are working to address issues that are important to community members on a daily basis. Existing structures and relationships that are present in the daily lives of individuals, families, businesses, and organizations before an incident occurs can be leveraged and empowered to act effectively during and after a disaster strikes.

In addition to the three Whole Community principles, six strategic themes were identified through research, discussions, and examples provided by emergency management practitioners. These themes speak to the ways the Whole Community approach can be effectively employed in emergency management and, as such, represent pathways for action to implement the principles.

Whole Community Strategic Themes:

- Understand community complexity.
- Recognize community capabilities and needs.
- Foster relationships with community leaders.
- Build and maintain partnerships.
- Empower local action.
- Leverage and strengthen social infrastructure, networks, and assets."

USTF DRAFT RESPONSES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

For Discussion

GROUP 1: COMPLIANCE

Question	*Draft Responses*	*Draft Recommendations*
(1) Does the Urban Shield Project meet federal guidelines set out in the Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) grant?	Yes. The Urban Shield training receives approval from the Bay Area UASI Approval Authority, which uses the criteria for regional funding proposals. "All proposals must meet the following criteria: • Have a clear "nexus to terrorism," – i.e., the proposal must specify how the activities will support terrorism preparedness • Directly benefit at least two operational areas • Enhance the region's priority capability objectives (see Section 12) • Include only allowable expenses under UASI grant guidelines (See Section 15)"[1] It is our understanding that 1. Urban Shield also meets federal Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP) guidelines, which require the development of exercise plans, exercise evaluator handbooks, Master Scenario Events Lists (MSEL), Team Binders, Exercise Evaluation Guides and After Action Reports (AARs); and 2. the Bay Area UASI funds have been spent in accordance to the federal guidelines that govern the UASI grant as specified in the Homeland Security Act of 2002.	1a. <u>Require and ensure execution of the following Principles and Guidelines</u> established and outlined in the Sheriff's January 6, 2017, Board Letter for the Fiscal Year 2016 Urban Area Security Initiative Agreement. • Expand community involvement and awareness • Urban Shield will be free from racist stereo-typing • Work to expand training the medical profession for critical incidents • Urban Shield will not include surveillance training • Continue to examine new technology and equipment • Urban Shield will not include crowd control training • Continue to evaluate existing equipment • Urban Shield will exclude any and all vendors who display derogatory or racist messages in any form • Urban Shield will exclude the sale or transfer of any assault weapons and firearms • Will exclude vendors displaying non-law enforcement related tactical uniforms and equipment • Urban Shield will strive to maintain the finest first responder training possible 1b. Before each UASI funding request, <u>require reporting on adherence to these principles and guidelines</u>.

[1] Bay Area Urban Area Security Initiative Project Proposal Guidance for Fiscal Year 2017 - August 2016, http://www.bayareauasi.org/sites/default/files/resources/FY2017%20Project%20Proposal%20Guidance%20-%20Final.pdf

Question	*Draft Responses*	*Draft Recommendations*
(2) Is Urban Shield strictly an emergency preparedness program?	Yes, with room for improvement in implementing the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) "Whole Community" approach to emergency management through activities for a) preparedness, b) crisis response and c) community and economic recovery.[2] Preparedness is defined by the national Department of Homeland Security (DHS)/Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) as (1) "a continuous cycle of planning, organizing, training, equipping, exercising, evaluating, and taking corrective action in an effort to ensure effective coordination during incident response" *and* (2) "a shared responsibility; it calls for the involvement of everyone — not just the government — in preparedness efforts. By working together, everyone can help keep the nation safe from harm and help keep it resilient when struck by hazards, such as natural disasters, acts of terrorism, and pandemics."[3] Because the federal UASI grant program's objective is to assist "high-threat, high-density Urban Areas in efforts to build, sustain, and deliver the capabilities necessary to prevent, protect against, mitigate, respond to, and recover from acts of terrorism" and 25 percent (25%) of the grant funding is to be used for law enforcement[4], Urban Shield activities have focused mainly on trainings and exercises for law enforcement, but have expanded to include first responders	2a. Develop and implement a plan for FEMA's "Whole Community" approach in Alameda County. Residents, emergency management practitioners, organizational and community leaders, and government officials can collectively understand and assess the needs of the communities and determine the best ways to organize and strengthen their assets, capacities, and interests to prepare for, respond to and recover from a natural disaster or an act of terrorism. 2b. Include the "Whole Community" in planning and exercises, e.g., conduct tabletop exercises with the community in the 13 Bay Area UASI counties leading up to the full scale exercise in September. The example could be 4 table top exercises using the UASI Urban Area HUB model (East Bay, West Bay, South Bay, and North Bay). 2c. Report on emergency preparedness activities in publicly available exercise documentation and/or summary reports, if not done already. 2d. Train and exercise non-terrorism scenarios that can justifiably support terrorism preparedness, including prevention and recovery, and be in alignment FEMA's "Whole Community" approach to emergency management. (See Additional Info section below.)

[2] FEMA's *A Whole Community Approach to Emergency Management: Principles, Themes, and Pathways for Action* https://www.fema.gov/media-library-data/20130726-1813-25045-0649/whole_community_dec2011__2_.pdf
[3] FEMA Whole Community webpage, https://www.fema.gov/whole-community
[4] U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) Fiscal Year 2017 Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP), https://www.fema.gov/media-library-data/1496691855715-4d78d65ebb300900ce6c945931eff2c6/FY_2017_HSGP_NOFO_20170601v2014_605.pdf

	and other emergency management personnel. It has also recently implemented the Grey Command to include some activities for community preparedness. The Urban Shield Task Force remains unclear on both the determination and application of the Threat Hazard Identifications and Risk Assessment (THIRA) in drafting exercise scenarios, prioritizing capability targets and gaps, and selecting capabilities to be tested and gaps to be addressed each year and over multiple years.	

GROUP 2: EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

Question	*Draft Responses*	*Draft Recommendations*
(3) In the event of an emergency/ attack or natural disaster, will public safety agencies, public health and other emergency response departments, be adequately trained and equipped to respond to such disasters without the training offered by Urban Shield?	In relationship to public safety, public health and other emergency response departments, inter-agency coordination between them has improved with Urban Shield. No other significant sources of funding appear to be available for large scale preparedness trainings and full scale exercises.	3a. Assess county and regional willingness to commit local funds for large full scale trainings and exercises. This would allow for more local/regional flexibility for preparedness and response training activities.

Question	*Draft Responses*	*Draft Recommendations*
(4) Do the terms, conditions and guidelines of this program meet the demand for the Bay Area Region to be prepared to respond to natural disaster (fire, earthquake, etc.) or a terrorist act?	The Task Force was unable to come to agreement on this question in relationship to Urban Shield. It remains unclear: (1) how the assessment of the risk relevance, level of capability, and gap level is determined and (2) how the Regional Threat Hazard Identifications and Risk Assessment (THIRA) is applied when selecting and drafting exercise scenarios, prioritizing capability targets and gaps, and selecting capabilities to be tested and gaps to be	4a. Training and exercises should focus emergency preparedness efforts on prevention of and recovery from emergencies as much as or more than response to such emergencies. 4b. Ensure risks to people, especially those who are vulnerable to harm in emergencies, in Alameda County are more highly considered, not only risks to non-human assets.

	addressed each year and over multiple years. Bay Area UASI's Risk Relevance ratings show core capabilities such as "Health and Human Services," "Economic and Community Recovery," "Long-Term Vulnerability Reduction," "Housing," "Public Health and Medical Services," and "Natural and Cultural Resources" ALL as having low risk relevance, while "Cyber Security," "On-Scene Security and Protection," and "Screening, Search and Detection" are rated as having the highest risk relevance.[5] The Task Force was in agreement that more could be done to meet the demand for whole community preparedness. Urban Shield has included a component for community preparedness. This component is separate from the full-scale exercise activities with first responders and emergency management personnel.	4c. Increase funding for the Urban Shield exercise to incorporate additional preparedness activities to support FEMA's "whole community" inclusion approach. By doing so, the County will be better prepared and more resilient to emergencies.

GROUP 3: COMMUNITY RELATIONS

Question	*Draft Responses*	*Draft Recommendations*
(5) What is the impact of Urban Shield on the community's relationship with law enforcement and other emergency preparedness responders such as the public health department; health care agencies; public education agencies; public transportation agencies; fire departments; and emergency medical services?	There are two differing views among Task Force members: ***Negative*** • Impacted communities have mistrust • There is a perception of militarized response by these agencies • They are seen as one in the same…all the agencies that are work (sic) ***Positive*** • Safer communities • Higher collaboration of 1st responders • Greater confidence in our ability to respond to MCI • Better relationship between law partners and volunteers • Community is better prepared	5a. Change the name of the training, e.g.,"*Integrated* Urban Shield". 5b. Rebrand Urban Shield to be more inclusive and community friendly. 5c. Increase its activities for non-law enforcement and "whole community" preparedness. (See Recommendations 2a, 2b, and 2d above.) 5d. Modify the vendor show to include only on "non-weapon" tools of the trade for first responders and emergency management personnel.

[5] See Items 7 and 8 in July 2017 BAUASI Approval Authority Meeting Master, at http://bauasi.org/sites/default/files/resources/071317%20Approval%20Authority%20July%20Meeting%20Master.pdf.

	A few sources of the negative concerns were the competitive aspects of the training, the vendor show, and the Urban Shield promotional material.	5e. Receive reports on implementation the Sheriff's Principles and Guidelines with definitions of the terms used in them, such as "human rights", "racist stereo-typing", "crowd control", and "surveillance", to name a few. 5f. Training and exercises should focus emergency preparedness efforts on prevention of and recovery from emergencies as much as or more than response to such emergencies. (Repeated above.) 5g. Provide some public access to the training and exercises. 5h. Report on emergency preparedness activities in publicly available exercise documentation and/or summary reports, if not done already. 5i. Develop a plan for coordination of the Green and Gray Commands by community agencies, such as Community Emergency Response Teams (CERT)/Neighborhood Emergency Response Teams (NERT) or similar programs. 5j. Continue reviewing and monitoring public concerns for Urban Shield.

ADDITIONAL INFO

(Provided to clarify the term "'Whole Community' approach" referenced in a few of the recommendations submitted for consideration by Task Force members.)

Excerpts from FEMA's *A Whole Community Approach to Emergency Management: Principles, Themes, and Pathways for Action*: "As a concept, Whole Community is a means by which residents, emergency management practitioners, organizational and community leaders, and government officials can collectively understand and assess the needs of their respective communities and determine the best ways to organize and strengthen their assets, capacities, and interests. By doing so, a more effective path to societal security and resilience is built. In a sense, Whole Community is a philosophical approach on how to think about conducting emergency management.

Benefits include:

- Shared understanding of community needs and capabilities
- Greater empowerment and integration of resources from across the community
- Stronger social infrastructure
- Establishment of relationships that facilitate more effective prevention, protection, mitigation, response, and recovery activities
- Increased individual and collective preparedness
- Greater resiliency at both the community and national levels

...

Whole Community Principles and Strategic Themes

Numerous factors contribute to the resilience of communities and effective emergency management outcomes. However, three principles that represent the foundation for establishing a Whole Community approach to emergency management emerged during the national dialogue.

Whole Community Principles:

- **Understand and meet the actual needs of the whole community.** Community engagement can lead to a deeper understanding of the unique and diverse needs of a population, including its demographics, values, norms, community structures, networks, and relationships. The more we know about our communities, the better we can understand their real-life safety and sustaining needs and their motivations to participate in emergency management-related activities prior to an event.
- **Engage and empower all parts of the community.** Engaging the whole community and empowering local action will better position stakeholders to plan for and meet the actual needs of a community and strengthen the local capacity to deal with the consequences of all threats and hazards. This requires all members of the community to be part of the emergency management team, which should include diverse community members, social and community service groups and institutions, faith-based and disability groups, academia, professional associations, and the private and nonprofit sectors, while including government agencies who may not traditionally have been directly involved in emergency management. When the community is engaged in an authentic dialogue, it becomes empowered to identify its needs and the existing resources that may be used to address them.
- **Strengthen what works well in communities on a daily basis.** A Whole Community approach to building community resilience requires finding ways to support and strengthen the institutions, assets, and networks that already work well in communities and are working to address issues that are

important to community members on a daily basis. Existing structures and relationships that are present in the daily lives of individuals, families, businesses, and organizations before an incident occurs can be leveraged and empowered to act effectively during and after a disaster strikes.

In addition to the three Whole Community principles, six strategic themes were identified through research, discussions, and examples provided by emergency management practitioners. These themes speak to the ways the Whole Community approach can be effectively employed in emergency management and, as such, represent pathways for action to implement the principles.

Whole Community Strategic Themes:

- Understand community complexity.
- Recognize community capabilities and needs.
- Foster relationships with community leaders.
- Build and maintain partnerships.
- Empower local action.
- Leverage and strengthen social infrastructure, networks, and assets"

USTF MASTER LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS

From Urban Shield Task Force Members

MASTER LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS
FROM URBAN SHIELD TASK FORCE MEMBERS
AUGUST 24, 2017

COMPLIANCE

Question #1:
Does the Urban Shield Project meet federal guidelines set out in the UASI grant?

Response A: It seems that the consensus answer from the Task Force members who have researched this question is "Yes." However, are the federal guidelines in alignment with the values and needs of Alameda County? I think this relates to my response to question #4, regarding who is the driving force behind the Risk Relevance and Gap Level rankings.

Response B: Urban Shield has generated controversy, opposition, and fear in impacted and other communities in the Bay Area. It disproportionately prepares for terrorist incidents by requiring a "nexus to terrorism," which according to Alameda County's own Emergency Operations Plan, is less important than seven other disaster scenarios.[1] Several Urban Shield trainees at home and internationally have been involved in human rights violations.[2] (In the case of Rio de Janeiro participants from Brazil, after three years of Urban Shield participation, Rio police killings increased by hundreds per year over the last two years, according to Amnesty International.[3]) It centers disaster preparedness for what should be non-force prevention, response and recovery on SWAT teams. Moreover, UASI requires 25% of all grant funds be used by law enforcement for "terrorism prevention activities," marginalizing other prevention efforts. For these and other reasons, the funding source for multi-jurisdictional disaster preparedness exercises coordinated by Alameda County shall not require that the exercise have a "nexus to terrorism." Questions 1, 3, 5

Proposal for a study: The Obama and Trump administrations sought steep cuts in UASI grant funds for FY2017 and FY2018, respectively. The Trump administration has stated that it will cut federal funds to sanctuary jurisdictions, which may include several within BAUASI area. The Alameda County Board of Supervisors shall send a request to jurisdictions within the BAUASI 12-county area to identify non-UASI grants and/or funds from their own resources for disaster preparedness, in order to replace dependence on UASI funds. In addition, the Board will survey the below-named jurisdictions that have not participated in Urban Shield for a number of years, requesting the following information:

---

[1] *Alameda County Emergency Operations Plan*, p. 13, at https://www.acgov.org/ready/documents/EmergencyOperationsPlan.pdf.
[2] "Not Making All of Us Safer," *Berkeleyside*, Dec. 10, 2015: http://www.berkeleyside.com /2015/12/10/op-ed-not-making-all-of-us-safer-police-militarization-in-berkeley/; "Oakland Council Gets Earful Over 'Urban Shield' War Games," *East Bay Express*, Sept. 25, 2013: http://www.eastbayexpress.com/SevenDays/archives/2013/09/25/oakland-council-gets-earful-over-urban-shield-war-games.
[3] "In 2016, there were 920 killings by police documented in the city, up from 419 in 2012." https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2017/05/brazil-spike-in-killings-by-rio-police-as-country-faces-un-review/. Rio police participated in Urban Shield in 2012, 2013, and 2014.

a. Why have you not participated in Urban Shield? What has the effect been, if any?
b. What programs have been implemented to address preparedness for critical emergencies?
c. How have community-based programs responded or grown since the city stopped participating in Urban Shield?
d. Who participates in them (names of the departments)? Do community members or civilians participate?
e. What are the contents of the trainings, and who runs them?
f. What do these trainings emphasize? (ex. natural disaster, mass casualty, terrorist attack, etc)
g. What are the stated objectives of these trainings?
h. How do these trainings facilitate relationships between emergency workers and the community?
i. What is the number of professional development days?
j. Do you receive training in projects for recovery from critical emergencies?
k. How do you meet your budget for these trainings? Through the city or county?
l. What is the general procedure for responding to mass casualty events? Who responds?
m. (For emergency services) Do you have trainings or events coming up that are open to the public?

The Alameda County Sheriff's Office shall verify which law enforcement tactical teams of the following jurisdictions did not participate in Urban Shield for three or more of the last ten years OR did not apply to participate in 2016: Menlo Park PD; Palo Alto PD; Mountain View PD; Santa Clara County Sheriff; Vallejo PD; Santa Cruz PD; Watsonville PD; Pacifica PD; Napa County city PDs; Sonoma County city PDs; Marin County city PDs, except Novato.

Response C: Urban Shield also meets the guide line set forth by FEMA.

Response D: Continue to accept UASI Grant Funding and include the Urban Shield Exercise as one of the funding priorities.

Response E: Yes, Urban Shield meets federal guidelines. This is a requirement in order for the funding to be approved by the federal government.

COMPLIANCE

Question #2
Is Urban Shield strictly an emergency preparedness program?

Response A: The National Preparedness Goal is "a secure and resilient Nation with the capabilities required across the whole community to prevent, protect against, mitigate, respond to, and recover from the threats and hazards that pose the greatest risk." Prevention capabilities are needed, e.g. to prevent fires currently affecting the Bay Area. Alameda County and multi-jurisdictional exercises for emergency preparedness shall dedicate as many resources and time to prevention of and recovery from critical emergencies as much as or more than response to such emergencies. Questions 2, 3 and 5

Alameda County and multi-jurisdictional exercises for emergency preparedness shall dedicate as many or more resources and time to prevention of and recovery from critical emergencies than to response to such emergencies. Questions 2, 3 and 5

Response B: Urban Shield is a training program for all first responders, Fire, EMS, and Police and without this training the public could be in harm's way. Improvement has been in existence for several years and an example of this is the Grey command that will be open for the public to attend and participate this year Sept 9th in Castro Valley.

Review the vendor show: The vendor show is a display of items available for viewing. There are no weapons for sale. Pursuant to California and Federal law weapons are sold at the place of business with the Federal and CA COE paper work properly displayed. The display of T-shirts by a few Vendors in the past is not going to be allowed in the future per the Sheriff department. I believe this to be a true statement by the Sheriff department and the will watched very close by all who are in charge of the vendor show.

In my opinion, the name Urban Shield is consistent with serve and protect.

Update on the 12 guide lines: I believe that the Sheriff department will follow these guide lines and be very open to this process that was put forth in January. Again, this process will be open to all of the Task Force members to see and follow along with the public. The big question that should be asked of the Stop Urban Shield group is will they accept the results of this TF?

Based on the information and participation I believe Urban Shield is for the first responders. The public can participate in this training with the Grey Command. Today our awareness and

ongoing education and training such as the Urban Shield Program for our first responders are absolutely necessary so that they may continue to serve and protect.

Response C: Highlight emergency preparedness activities in the Urban Shield exercise documentation if it is not already listed.

Response D: Yes, Urban Shield is an emergency preparedness program. The Urban Shield program involves several aspects which include preparedness. Progress has been made with involving larger numbers of citizens with 2017 including more community involvement than ever before i.e. Gray Command and Green Command. Yellow Command has also been recovery training, such as establishing community points of distribution and plans to stand up mass care and shelter infrastructure.

Response E: On the surface, yes. However, again related to my Q4 response, it seems that terrorism preparedness is driving our emergency preparedness. That then prioritizes certain assets, tactics, and situations over others.

Response F: Yes, with room for improvement: i.e., exercise to focus on emergency preparedness efforts on prevention of and recovery from critical emergencies (TBD: efforts focusing on prevention and recovery should be equal to or more than efforts focusing on response)

MASTER LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS
FROM URBAN SHIELD TASK FORCE MEMBERS
AUGUST 24, 2017

EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

Question #3
In the event of an emergency/attack or natural disaster, will public safety agencies, public health and other emergency response departments, be adequately trained and equipped to respond to such disasters without the training offered by Urban Shield?

Response A: No, what urban shield brings is the coordination across agencies. Negative aspects of urban shield are in regards to the community impact not emergency preparedness. Alameda County is better prepared with Urban Shield interagency training however there are some negative effects and there are possible alternatives to aid with improved interagency operations.

Response B: No because of the multidisciplinary approach to disaster. This includes natural disaster but also terrorism. Could be scaled down or scaled up. The system alone is not prepared to handle this. Urban Shield is evolving and still needs to evolve.

- There is an idea that law enforcement has to be pulled out of this. Think that law enforcement should be involved.
- Now includes the other agencies. Just as important for NERT and CERT to be a part of this.
- The participation of who reacts to event depends on the nature of the event – are you trained? If not, should probably just shelter in place. In Dallas and Boston urban shield helped.
- Green and Grey command can help with getting public involved.
- Militarization of law enforcement is scalable. There are bad actors in every sector, including cops and fire and teachers. A lot of people don't want to step into a fist fight or altercation.

Response C: We are behind in the aspect of the public being involved in its own safety. Grey and green command do this through urban shield but there have to be other aspects.

- We need the law enforcement involved for active shooter
- Urban Shield is needed but the public needs to be involved in training
- Are we ever prepared for anything that could happen except our motor skills?
- How do we get the public more involved in certain aspects of de-escalation? Grey command could be extra step of getting public involved.

Response D: Alameda County and multi-jurisdictional exercises for emergency preparedness shall dedicate as many or more resources and time to **prevention** of and **recovery** from critical emergencies than **response to** such emergencies. Questions 2, 3 and 5

Urban Shield has generated controversy, opposition, and fear in impacted and other communities in the Bay Area. It disproportionately prepares for terrorist incidents by requiring a "nexus to terrorism," which according to Alameda County's own Emergency Operations Plan, is less important than seven other disaster scenarios.[4] Several Urban Shield trainees at home and internationally have been involved in human rights violations.[5] (In the case of Rio de Janeiro participants from Brazil, after three years of Urban Shield participation, Rio police killings increased by hundreds per year Rio police killings increased by hundreds per year over the last two years, according to Amnesty International. [6]) It centers disaster preparedness for what should be non-force prevention, response and recovery on SWAT teams. Moreover, UASI requires 25% of all grant funds be used by law enforcement for "terrorism prevention activities," marginalizing other prevention efforts. For these and other reasons, the funding source for multi-jurisdictional disaster preparedness exercises coordinated by Alameda County shall not require that the exercise have a "nexus to terrorism." Questions 1, 3, 5

The Green and Grey Commands shall be coordinated by agencies involved in CERT and similar programs, not by law enforcement. Questions 3 and 5

Response E: Alameda County interagency coordination is improved through Urban Shield, however there are some negative effects in terms of community impact (related to question 5) which need further review and ongoing monitoring, and there are possible alternatives (examples CERT or NERT) which could aid with improved interagency operations and community relations and engagement.

Response F: I do believe that this training has helped the public safety agencies, public health and emergency response departments get better at their jobs. The job is to save lives and protect the public and thus training is doing this. The negative effects that impacts the community has not come from the "Urban Shield training" but I believe has come from across the country from groups who don't want police and don't trust them. Are there bad cops? Yes, but there are bad doctors bad attorneys bad airline pilots too. This TF has an opportunity to help bridge this gap in the community and help change this perception and image. The first thing is

---

[4] *Alameda County Emergency Operations Plan*, p. 13, at https://www.acgov.org/ready/documents/EmergencyOperationsPlan.pdf.

[5] "Not Making All of Us Safer," *Berkeleyside*, Dec. 10, 2015: http://www.berkeleyside.com /2015/12/10/op-ed-not-making-all-of-us-safer-police-militarization-in-berkeley/; "Oakland Council Gets Earful Over 'Urban Shield' War Games," *East Bay Express*, Sept. 25, 2013: http://www.eastbayexpress.com/SevenDays/archives/2013/09/25/oakland-council-gets-earful-over-urban-shield-war-games.

[6] "In 2016, there were 920 killings by police documented in the city, up from 419 in 2012." https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2017/05/brazil-spike-in-killings-by-rio-police-as-country-faces-un-review/. Rio police participated in Urban Shield in 2012, 2013, and 2014.

that all members on this Task Force need to embrace the process and stop the spinning of the details and look at the good we can do rather than stir the pot.

Response G: Do not change the existing organizational structure or design of the Urban Shield exercise, including but not limited to, exercise participants, as it supports emergency response training and preparedness efforts.
However, where appropriate and/or applicable, expand participants in Yellow, Green or Grey Command to include the whole community such as the private sector, non-governmental organizations, community-based organizations, faith-based and the public.

Response H: There is absolutely no doubt that Alameda County is better prepared to respond to critical incidents as a result of Urban Shield. There have been countless success stories of lives being saved and critical incidents being resolved in the most efficient possible way which have been attributed to Urban Shield by first responders. Other types of training and exercises such as classroom courses and table top exercises are much less effective in preparing emergency responders and managers for critical incidents that are not routine occurrences.

Response I: No. The inter-agency coordination that Urban Shield provides a platform for is invaluable. Could it be accomplished through other means? Yes, but it would require significant resources and prioritization from local and regional government budgets – which would mean a trade-off for some other local or regional priority. There are negative effects of Urban Shield, such as a perception of militarization, that lead some communities to distrust and fear first responder agencies, thereby creating the potential for actually lowering levels of community preparedness.

Response J: The question is misleading. There are many gaps in emergency preparedness but Urban Shield is not the answer.

- Urban shield is not a training, it's a competition
- We are missing information – there are other programs and resources that can connect agencies to coordinate services, examples COOP and ACS that are done in Palo Alto
- Types of models that are community based could give good ways to move forward in community preparedness – gave example of Oakland Power Projects at Critical Resistance

EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

Question #4
Do the terms, conditions and guidelines of this program meet the demand for the Bay Area Region to be prepared to respond to natural disaster (fire, earthquake, etc.) or a terrorist act?

Response A: The Alameda County Sheriff's Office has proven to be incapable of addressing concerns regarding human rights, racism and militarized tactics, including those outlined in guidelines approved by the Board of Supervisors, and should not lead an exercise for the County's preparation for the most serious disasters. Emergency preparedness exercises shall have co-chairs to plan, lead and coordinate, which may include within the 12-county area: A. EMT agency or Public Health Department, B. city or county emergency management agency, C. community groups representing those most vulnerable to emergencies, D. fire department.
Questions 4 and 5

Proposal for a study: The Obama and Trump administrations sought steep cuts in UASI grant funds for FY2017 and FY2018, respectively. The Trump administration has stated that it will cut federal funds to sanctuary jurisdictions, which may include several within BAUASI area. The Alameda County Board of Supervisors shall send a request to jurisdictions within the BAUASI 12-county area to identify non-UASI grants and/or funds from their own resources for disaster preparedness, in order to replace dependence on UASI funds. In addition, the Board will survey the below-named jurisdictions that have not participated in Urban Shield for a number of years, requesting the following information:

a. Why have you not participated in Urban Shield? What has the effect been, if any?
b. What programs have been implemented to address preparedness for critical emergencies?
c. How have community-based programs responded or grown since the city stopped participating in Urban Shield?
d. Who participates in them (names of the departments)? Do community members or civilians participate?
e. What are the contents of the trainings, and who runs them?
f. What do these trainings emphasize? (ex. natural disaster, mass casualty, terrorist attack, etc)
g. What are the stated objectives of these trainings?
h. How do these trainings facilitate relationships between emergency workers and the community?
i. What is the number of professional development days?
j. Do you receive training in projects for recovery from critical emergencies?

k. How do you meet your budget for these trainings? Through the city or county?
l. What is the general procedure for responding to mass casualty events? (who responds)
m. (For emergency services) Do you have trainings or events coming up that are open to the public?

The Alameda County Sheriff's Office shall verify which law enforcement tactical teams of the following jurisdictions did not participate in Urban Shield for three or more of the last ten years OR did not apply to participate in 2016: Menlo Park PD; Palo Alto PD; Mountain View PD; Santa Clara County Sheriff; Vallejo PD; Santa Cruz PD; Watsonville PD; Pacifica PD; Napa County city PDs; Sonoma County city PDs; Marin County city PDs, except Novato.

BAUASI's Risk Relevance ratings show core capabilities such as "Health and Human Services," "Economic and Community Recovery," "Long-Term Vulnerability Reduction," "Housing," "Public Health and Medical Services," and "Natural and Cultural Resources" ALL as having low risk relevance, while "Cyber Security," "On-Scene Security and Protection," and "Screening, Search and Detection" are rated as having the highest risk relevance. Alameda County should revise Risk Factor Levels for Core Capabilities.[7]

a. Ratings should prioritize risks to people in the Bay Area, especially those who are vulnerable to harm in emergencies, not to non-human "assets."
b. Review should examine why social needs are rated as having less risk relevance than capabilities related to law enforcement.
c. New reviewers should be brought on-board to address these issues.

Questions 4 and 5

Response B: "Yes" on the terms, conditions and guidelines do meet the demands for the Bay Area to be prepared for natural disasters and terrorist acts.

Response C: No, the Urban Shield exercise does not meet the need or demand for the Bay Area Region to be prepared to, respond to, and recover from a natural disaster or terrorist act. The Bay Area needs MORE training, drills, exercises and public education. It needs to incorporate the whole community, so we are more prepared, and more resilient to a natural disaster or terrorist act.

Increase funding to the Urban Shield exercise to incorporate additional preparedness activities to support a **whole community** inclusion concept.

Response D: Yes, Urban Shield prepares the Bay Area Region to respond to terrorist attacks and natural disasters. Urban Shield allows all first responders the get hands on realistic training through various scenarios. There has never been a higher level of collaboration and cooperation among all first responders and private sector partners. This has happened through Urban Shield

[7] See Items 7 and 8 in July 2017 BAUASI Approval Authority Meeting Master, at http://bauasi.org/sites/default/files/resources/071317%20Approval%20Authority%20July%20Meeting%20Master.pdf.

training. Scenarios are located at critical infrastructure sites throughout the Bay Area, similar to sites where critical incidents have taken place in other metropolitan areas. This includes protection of people where there are typically mass gatherings. Scenarios are based on real world events, that have already occurred throughout the world. Realistic scenarios allow first responders to utilize equipment that would be used in actual incidents.

Response E: This is very unclear. The Risk and Gap Report seems to define our emergency preparedness needs, but the Task Force does not know what factors are in the equation to define Risk Relevance, how they are weighted and calculated, and who makes the decisions regarding the rankings. Additionally, the July 2017 cover letter to the Bay Area UASI Approval Authority clearly states that the Bay Area's emergency preparedness plan is driven by terrorism preparedness. ("While the risk assessment is driven by terrorism risk, most, if not all of the capabilities involved in the assessment can be used to address natural hazards as well.")

i. The Risk and Gap report needs to be better understood – even though I understand it is a complex task to evaluate emergency preparedness need.

ii. In the process of making it better understood, it also needs to have greater input (and perhaps decision-making) from a broader range of stakeholders, including key community leaders that will carry the voice of . Perhaps a triennial plan that involves a year of stakeholder input and decision-making sessions.

Response F: Need to understand regional risk and gap report. Sheriff's Dept as the stewards of Urban Shield should, moving forward, understand some of the alternatives and needs that would better serve the community and the public, integrated into Fire, EMS, Community Services (CERT/NERT), and Law Enforcement.

Response G: Integration of all agencies, including CERT/NERT, cannot carve law enforcement out of it. Have to use equipment that will protect them without using lethal force.

Response H: Risks should be considered not only to non-human "assets" but to people in the Bay Area, especially those how are vulnerable to harm in emergencies.

Response I: Has to take into consideration all of the scenarios.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS

Question #5
What is the impact of Urban Shield on the community's relationship with law enforcement and other emergency preparedness responders such as the public health department; health care agencies; public education agencies; public transportation agencies; fire departments; and emergency medical services?

Response A: Urban Shield has generated controversy, opposition, and fear in impacted and other communities in the Bay Area. It disproportionately prepares for terrorist incidents by requiring a "nexus to terrorism," which according to Alameda County's own Emergency Operations Plan, is less important than seven other disaster scenarios.[8] Several Urban Shield trainees at home and internationally have been involved in human rights violations.[9] (In the case of Rio de Janeiro participants from Brazil, after three years of Urban Shield participation, Rio police killings increased by hundreds per year over the last two years, according to Amnesty International.[10]) It centers disaster preparedness for what should be non-force prevention, response and recovery on SWAT teams. Moreover, UASI requires 25% of all grant funds be used by law enforcement for "terrorism prevention activities," marginalizing other prevention efforts. For these and other reasons, the funding source for multi-jurisdictional disaster preparedness exercises coordinated by Alameda County shall not require that the exercise have a "nexus to terrorism." Questions 1, 3, 5

Alameda County and multi-jurisdictional exercises for emergency preparedness shall dedicate as many or more resources and time to **prevention** of and **recovery** from critical emergencies than to **response to** such emergencies. Questions 2, 3, and 5

[8] *Alameda County Emergency Operations Plan*, p. 13, at https://www.acgov.org/ready/documents/EmergencyOperationsPlan.pdf.
[9] "Not Making All of Us Safer," *Berkeleyside*, Dec. 10, 2015: http://www.berkeleyside.com /2015/12/10/op-ed-not-making-all-of-us-safer-police-militarization-in-berkeley/; "Oakland Council Gets Earful Over 'Urban Shield' War Games," *East Bay Express*, Sept. 25, 2013: http://www.eastbayexpress.com/SevenDays/archives/2013/09/25/oakland-council-gets-earful-over-urban-shield-war-games.
[10] "In 2016, there were 920 killings by police documented in the city, up from 419 in 2012." https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2017/05/brazil-spike-in-killings-by-rio-police-as-country-faces-un-review/. Rio police participated in Urban Shield in 2012, 2013, and 2014.

No later than September 30, 2017, the Sheriff shall report to the Alameda County Board of Supervisors on the implementation of the 12 guidelines for Urban Shield approved by the Board in January 2017. Such report shall be public, and shall include, for each of the 12 guidelines: description of steps taken to implement the guideline; who was responsible for implementing the guideline; definitions used in implementation of the guidelines for key terms, including but not limited to: "human rights," "racist stereo-typing", "crowd control", and "surveillance"; and for the guideline on international human rights violations, a list of all sources of information consulted. Question 5

Alameda County shall suspend the vendor show, as unnecessary and provocative. Question 5

The exclusion from Urban Shield of international teams from countries with documented rights violations shall be extended to U.S. teams from departments with documented civil and human rights violations. Question 5

The Alameda County Board of Supervisors shall make a statement of opposition to using terrorism as the principle framework for disaster preparedness in Alameda County. Questions 4, 5

In emergency preparedness exercises coordinated by Alameda County, evaluations of all human conflict scenarios shall reward de-escalation and penalize all fatalities. Question 5

Alameda County shall provide public and press access to all exercise materials and plans, and observer access for those who request it at exercise planning meetings, vendor show, and all commands and scenarios in the exercise itself. Observers shall be authorized to film and record all aspects of the exercise. Question 5

BAUASI's Risk Relevance ratings show core capabilities such as "Health and Human Services," "Economic and Community Recovery," "Long-Term Vulnerability Reduction," "Housing," "Public Health and Medical Services," and "Natural and Cultural Resources" ALL as having low risk relevance, while "Cyber Security," "On-Scene Security and Protection," and "Screening, Search and Detection" are rated as having the highest risk relevance. Alameda County should revise Risk Factor Levels for Core Capabilities.

a. Ratings should prioritize risks to people in the Bay Area, especially those who are vulnerable to harm in emergencies, not to non-human "assets."
b. Review should examine why social needs are rated as having less risk relevance than capabilities related to law enforcement.
c. New reviewers should be brought on-board to address these issues. Questions 4, 5

Proposal for a study: The Obama and Trump administrations sought steep cuts in UASI grant funds for FY2017 and FY2018, respectively. The Trump administration has stated that it will cut federal funds to sanctuary jurisdictions, which may include several within BAUASI area. The Alameda County Board of Supervisors shall send a request to jurisdictions within the BAUASI 12-county area to identify non-UASI grants and/or funds from their own resources for disaster preparedness, in order to replace dependence on UASI funds. In addition, the Board will survey the below-named jurisdictions that have not participated in Urban Shield for a number of years, requesting the following information:

a. Why have you not participated in Urban Shield? What has the effect been, if any?
b. What programs have been implemented to address preparedness for critical emergencies?
c. How have community-based programs responded or grown since the city stopped participating in Urban Shield?
d. Who participates in them (names of the departments)? Do community members or civilians participate?
e. What are the contents of the trainings, and who runs them?
f. What do these trainings emphasize? (ex. natural disaster, mass casualty, terrorist attack, etc)
g. What are the stated objectives of these trainings?
h. How do these trainings facilitate relationships between emergency workers and the community?
i. What is the number of professional development days?
j. Do you receive training in projects for recovery from critical emergencies?
k. How do you meet your budget for these trainings? Through the city or county?
l. What is the general procedure for responding to mass casualty events? (who responds)
m. (For emergency services) Do you have trainings or events coming up that are open to the public?

The Alameda County Sheriff's Office shall verify which law enforcement tactical teams of the following jurisdictions did not participate in Urban Shield for three or more of the last ten years OR did not apply to participate in 2016: Menlo Park PD; Palo Alto PD; Mountain View PD; Santa Clara County Sheriff; Vallejo PD; Santa Cruz PD; Watsonville PD; Pacifica PD; Napa County city PDs; Sonoma County city PDs; Marin County city PDs, except Novato. Questions 3, 4, 5

The Green and Grey Commands shall be coordinated by agencies involved in CERT and similar programs, not by law enforcement. Questions 3, 5

Urban Shield Guidelines Adopted by Alameda County Sheriff and Board of Supervisors in January 2017[11]:

- Expand community involvement and awareness
- Urban Shield will be free from racist stereo-typing
- Work to expand training the medical profession for critical incidents
- Urban Shield will not include surveillance training
- Continue to examine new technology and equipment
- Urban Shield will not include crowd control training
- Continue to evaluate existing equipment
- Urban Shield will exclude any and all vendors who display derogatory or racist messages in any form
- Urban Shield will exclude the sale or transfer of any assault weapons and firearms
- Will exclude vendors displaying non-law enforcement related tactical uniforms and equipment
- Urban Shield will strive to maintain the finest first responder training possible
- That no invitations to participate in Urban Shield be extended to teams from countries with documented human rights violations

Response B: The first View mistrust of the Law enforcement comes from a much larger point of view other than Urban Shield. The lack of respect to authority is what drives this mistrust by the public. Again, there are bad people on both sides of the fence and we on this Task Force needs to make sure the public see both sides.

The perception of being militarized. This perception started back after the north Hollywood bank robbery shooting when the bad guys had AK47 full auto and the LA PD only had 9MM berretta side arms. They were out gunned by the 2 bad guys till Swat showed up. So the police went and purchased the same weapons that the bad guys have with vehicles that will stop these high speed rifle caliber rounds. Bring the video up on this shooting and you will understand the reason why we need better protection from the bad guys. Urban Shield is not militarizing our police departments.

Second View: I agree with all they wrote and support their views for all these 5 bullet points.

In closing I feel we are a better society with Urban Shield in place around northern CA than we were before. I also trust the first responders to follow the guide lines set up by the Sheriff and County supervisors. My suggestion to the sheriff department is to expand this training next year and make the grey command a much larger operation to include Active shooter classes, being alert while riding on Bart trains and what to do if you're attacked or being robbed.

[11] See Sheriff's Letter, January 6, 2017: http://www.acgov.org/board/bos_calendar/documents/DocsAgendaReg_01_10_17/PUBLIC%20PROTECTION/Regular%20Calendar/Sheriff_244881.pdf, and Board of Supervisors Minutes, Item 34, January 10, 2017: http://alamedacounty.granicus.com/DocumentViewer.php?file=alamedacounty_8d9833edaf6e048b88a1cdcfbb9625fc.pdf&view=1

Response C: Recommendations (increase funding to meet new objectives):

- Include the whole community where appropriate to help provide education, outreach and/or messaging of the Urban Shield Exercise.
- Rebrand the Urban Shield name or exercise to be more inclusive and community friendly.
- Include the whole community in all-hazards workshops and/or tabletop exercise to enhance preparedness, resilience and recovery.
- Redesign vendor show to support first responders', receivers and emergency managers the tools they need to enhance preparedness, planning and mitigation efforts (less on tactical operational equipment) and include or create a public community preparedness component if appropriate.

Response D: The community's relationship with emergency responders and managers is improved through the expanded training and involvement of the public. Understanding there are some community members and groups that do not approve of the training, the majority want their police to be properly trained to handle critical incidents. It is beneficial for the community to see that police are training with other first responders and the private sector so that they are protected as efficiently as possible.

Response E: It is negative. Look at the Urban Shield website. The most prominent image at the top banner is of a heavily-armed, military-looking raid taking place. That's not what Urban Shield is all about, but that is the primary image Urban Shield leaders have chosen. The same can be said for the many years of the Urban Shield programs. The images on the front of the programs are consistently focused on a militarized response force. While the public image absolutely needs to change, that public image is a lens into some of the unseen priorities that Urban Shield decision-makers have. Is there an agency other than the Sheriff's office that can lead Urban Shield? I don't know if that is possible, but perhaps that may help lessen the heavy law enforcement focus of Urban Shield – but again, the reason for that goes back to the federal guidelines, terrorism preparedness being the primary purpose.

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS

Response A: The Taskforce supports the Principles and Guidelines established and outlined by the Sheriff in his January 6, 2017, letter to the Board of Supervisors and believe the execution of those to be sufficient to address community concern. To that end, however, the Sheriff should report out to the Board and community in detail regarding status six months prior to each fund request for the continuation of Urban Shield.

The Taskforce supports the Principles and Guidelines established and outlined by the Sheriff in his January 6, 2017, letter to the Board of Supervisors but believe that even greater emphasis should be placed on community participation, including stakeholder workshops for VOADs, CBO, NGO, faith based groups. The primary focus, however, should still remain preparedness and response.

The name Urban Shield should not be changed as it adequately reflects the message of safeguarding our community. Having said that, if there will be a recommendation that the name be changed, it should be attached to a definitive name – not just that it should be changed. In reflecting on the types of change in which there was a majority, if not a consensus, in terms of answers to the five questions, IF the name was to be changed, I think adding something like "Integrated" might work to meld the idea of prevention with response and that of more community involvement within emergency preparedness- therefore in order to convey the message that the community is an integral part of Urban Shield, the name should be changed to "Integrated Urban Shield"

Response B: Involve the Whole Community in planning and executing Urban Shield. This might be achieved by conducting table top exercises with the community in each of the 13 SF Bay Area Urban Counties covered by UASI leading up to the full scale Urban Shield exercise in September. If this is too big a lift we could conduct four table top exercises using the UASI Urban Area HUB model (East Bay, West Bay, South Bay, North Bay)

Scale back the vendor show so that no guns are displayed. Keep the vendor show limited to other "tools of the trade" for first responders and emergency managers.

Consider eliminating the competitive aspect of Urban Shield.

Change the name of Urban Shield and the branding to more properly reflect the whole community components of the regional exercises. For the most part, the current posters and

brochures are populated by white men in uniforms carrying assault weapons. I do not believe that Urban Shield is militarizing our police departments, however these images suggest that in fact that is exactly what we are doing in Urban Shield.

Response C: Overall, I think Urban Shield is valuable and it is worth Alameda County continuing to participate - only if the militarized-focus and racial concerns that lead to negative community relations are eliminated and Supervisors or other community leaders can better understand and guide the Risk and Gap report to determine our community's emergency preparedness priorities. There are tactics used in preparation for responses to relatively irregular events (natural disasters and terrorist attacks) that are negatively impacting the regular interactions between some communities and law enforcement. We should prioritize the daily/normal/regular over the rare/infrequent/irregular, even if it might mean that we are slightly less prepared when rare occurrences happen.

Response D: Five Key Issues and Recommendations
Compliance

1. Does the Urban Shield Project meet Federal Guidelines set out in the UASI Grant?

Recommendation: Continue to accept UASI Grant Funding and include the Urban Shield Exercise as one of the funding priorities.

2. Is the Urban Shield an emergency preparedness program?

Recommendation: Highlight emergency preparedness activities in the Urban Shield exercise documentation if it is not already listed.

Emergency Preparedness

3. In the event of an emergency, attack or natural disaster, will public safety agencies, public health, and other emergency response departments be adequately trained and equipped to respond to such disasters without the training offered by Urban Shield?

Recommendation: Do not change the existing organizational structure or design of the Urban Shield exercise, including but not limited to, exercise participants, as it supports emergency response training and preparedness efforts. However, where appropriate and/or applicable, expand participants in Yellow, Green or Grey Command to include the whole community such as the private sector, non-governmental organizations, community-based organizations, faith-based and the public.

4. Do the terms, conditions and guidelines of this program meet the demand for the Bay Area Region to be prepared to respond to natural disaster or terrorist act?

Discussion: No, the Urban Shield exercise does not meet the need or demand for the Bay Area Region to be prepared to, respond to, and recover from a natural disaster or terrorist act. The Bay Area needs MORE training, drills, exercises and public education. It needs to incorporate the whole community, so we are more prepared, and more resilient to a natural disaster or terrorist act.

Recommendation: Increase funding to the Urban Shield exercise to incorporate additional preparedness activities to support a whole community inclusion concept.

Community Relations:

5. What is the impact of Urban Shield on the community's relationship with law enforcement and other emergency preparedness responders such as the public health department; health care agencies; public education agencies; public transportation agencies; fire departments; and emergency medical services?

Recommendations (increase funding to meet new objectives):

1. Include the whole community where appropriate to help provide education, outreach and/or messaging of the Urban Shield Exercise.
2. Rebrand the Urban Shield name or exercise to be more inclusive and community friendly.
3. Include the whole community in all-hazards workshops and/or tabletop exercise to enhance preparedness, resilience and recovery.
4. Redesign vendor show to support first responders', receivers and emergency managers the tools they need to enhance preparedness, planning and mitigation efforts (less on tactical operational equipment) and include or create a public community preparedness component if appropriate.

USTF MEETING MINUTES

Note: The 9/22/17 minutes are draft because the USTF completed its duties on and did not meet after that date.

Urban Shield Task Force

Friday, March 10, 2017
9:00 a.m.

Dr. Muntu Davis, Chair

Location: County Administration Building
1221 Oak Street, Room 255, 2nd floor
Oakland, CA 94612

Summary Minutes

Call to Order/Roll Call

Dr. Muntu Davis, Chair, Urban Shield Task Force, called the meeting to order.

Introductions

Aisha Brown, Chief of Operations, Alameda County Supervisor Keith Carson's Office, District 5
Dan Bellino, Alameda County Office Education, Chief of Staff to Superintendent Karen Monroe
Marla Blagg, BART Police, Emergency Manager for BART District
Dave Winnacker, Alameda County Fire Department, Representative for Fire Chiefs Association
Travis Kusman, Director, Emergency Medical Services, Alameda County
Rhonda Bailey, Clerk of the Board, Alameda County
Jim Betts, Surgeon-in-Chief, Assistant Director, Trauma Services, Children's Hospital Oakland
Muntu Davis, Alameda County Health Officer, Chair, Urban Shield Task Force
Mike Grant, Owner, Guns Unlimited Training Center
Mike Dayton, Deputy Director, SF Department of Emergency Management
Dave Ebarle, SF Department of Emergency Management
Brett Keteles, Assistant Sheriff, Alameda County Sheriff's Office
Ann Kronenberg, Director, SF Department of Emergency Management; Chair, Bay Area UASI
Paul Rolleri, Chief of Police, City of Alameda
Bob McGinnis, Alameda County Chiefs of Police and Sheriff's Association
Kathleen Harris, Facilitator
Omowale Satterwhite, Facilitator
Carol Burton, Chief Executive Officer, Jeweld Legacy Group, consultant to Supervisor Keith Carson
John Lindsay-Poland, American Friends Service Committee (on the phone)
Lara Kiswani, Executive Director, Arab Resource and Organizing Center, Stop Urban Shield Coalition
Tash Nguyen, Ella Baker Center, Advocate, Stop Urban Shield Coalition
Glen Katon, Civil Rights attorney, Oakland
Susan Abdallah, pediatric nurse, Kaiser Oakland

Welcome

Supervisor Keith Carson, District 5, welcomed the task force participants and presented introductory comments.

The Urban Shield Task Force was established to try to determine the fine line of preparation for an emergency and use of police powers beyond a direct emergency. The Board of Supervisors has tried to reflect a variation of interest groups and this could be an opportunity to have a real balanced approach.

The focus on Urban Shield has continuously grown and this process will allow the Board to look at emergency operations and if things can be done differently.

Purpose/Role of Task Force and Meeting Schedule

Carol F. Burton, CEO, Jeweld Legacy, presented a PowerPoint presentation to review the purpose of the task force.

The Board of Supervisors created the Urban Shield Task Force in response to growing support and opposition for the continuation of Urban Shield in Alameda County. The Task Force will assess Urban Shield and make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors. In addition the task force will:

Examine if the Urban Shield projects meet the Federal Guidelines set in the Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI) grant

Ensure Urban Shield is strictly an emergency preparedness program

Assess whether terms, conditions, guidelines of the program meet the demand for the Bay Area Region to respond to a natural disaster or terrorist attack.

Meeting Schedule

April 7, 2017 – 9:00 a.m. -11:00 a.m.
May 12, 2017– 9:00 a.m. -11:00 a.m.
June 9, 2017– 9:00 a.m. -11:00 a.m.
August 11, 2017– 9:00 a.m. -11:00 a.m.
August 25, 2017– 9:00 a.m. -11:00 a.m.

A final report will be delivered to the full Alameda County Board of Supervisors prior to the Board consideration of future funding for Urban Shield.

Meeting Protocols

Omowale Satterwhite, meeting facilitator, reviewed the following meeting protocols with the Urban Shield Task Force:

1) Actively participate
2) Allow each voice to be heard
3) One speaker at a time
4) Respect differences
5) Critique ideas, not people
6) Be forward thinking
7) Seek common ground and understanding
8) Silence cell phones

Dr. Muntu Davis added that the task force should stay focused on the task at hand. This initial meeting was informational and there will be opportunity for public comment at future meetings. The Urban Shield Task Force will follow the Brown Act guidelines for public meetings.

Bay Area Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) -Overview

Anna Kronenberg, Executive Director, San Francisco City and County of Emergency Management, presented a PowerPoint presentation to give an overview on the Urban Area Security Initiative.

Bay Area Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) –Overview (continued)

The Bay Area Urban Areas Security Initiative's (UASI) mission is to strengthen regional capacity to prevent, protect against, respond to and recover from catastrophic events. The UASI uses Homeland Security grant funds to analyze regional risks, identify capability gaps, to build a secure, prepared and resilient region.

The Department of Homeland Security established high risk urban areas and determined federal funding allocations in 2003 in compliance with the Homeland Security Act of 2002. In 2006, major cities were consolidated into the Bay Area Urban Area and by 2011 the Bay Area UASI expanded to its current twelve county membership.

UASI Counties: Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Monterey, Napa, San Benito, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Solano and Sonoma. The Bay Area UASI has received approximately $295 million since 2006; last year the Bay Area UASI received approximately $23 million.

The Bay Area UASI focus areas include:

- Community resiliency and recovery
- Cybersecurity
- Emergency medical and public health preparedness
- Catastrophic planning
- Chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear and explosives
- Interoperable communications
- Public Information and warning
- Training and exercise

Anne Kronenberg answered questions from task force members regarding the Bay Area UASI.

Learning Questions and Data Needs

Omowale Satterwhite, meeting facilitator, requested the task force members to review questions regarding Urban Shield to encourage discussion.

Questions

1. Does the Urban Shield project meet the Federal Guidelines set out in the UASI grant?
2. Is Urban Shield strictly an emergency preparedness program?
3. Does Urban Shield guidelines meet the demand for the Bay Area Region to prepare for a natural disaster or terrorist attack?
4. Can responders (public safety, public health, emergency response department) be adequately trained without training offered by Urban Shield?
5. Does Urban Shield have an impact on the community's relationship with law enforcement?

After group discussions the following feedback was given in response to the questions regarding Urban Shield:

- Community relationship does not apply
- Bringing various jurisdictions together in Urban Shield is a critical element
- Maybe misperceptions of the purpose of Urban Shield
- First three (3) questions are not central to the task force
- Community preparedness is large part of Urban Shield; communities should be prepared for a disaster of any kind, not just law enforcement and emergency responders

- UASI is for prevention, recovery and resiliency; to what extent is urban shield preparing in these areas
- Understand how the region prepared itself before Urban Shield existed
- Jurisdictions not with Urban Shield (SWAT) compare their training and how SWAT is used
- To what extent do US participants involved in any kind of abuses
- What is the definition of community; gain clarity
- Ask the community what impact in US has on the community (community participants)
- More knowledge about who is a part of US (encouraged participants of US)
- Expand the question of the "community's relationship with law enforcement to include; fire, public health, emergency management services, school districts and transit operators
- Task force would need a list of all participants in Urban Shield; information on stories from the community of human rights abuses and SWAT raids;
- Schedule of activities on what actually happens at Urban Shield
- Attendees and vendors, RFP process and guidelines and what the "ask" is in the RFP;
- Basic understanding of the risk assessment
- Demands and needs
- Impact of Urban Shield, the concerns about potential abuses from law enforcement; have not heard from questioning abuses from public health and fire; focus is on SWAT and the militarization of police;
- Adequate training without Urban Shield; need to work with all the jurisdictions to respond more effectively; relationships between public health, law enforcement, fire and EMS helps the response to a disaster; it is a tremendous benefit; law enforcement will expand community involvement
- Because Urban Shield has been tied to a response to terrorist attacks it creates a fear in the community; what are we doing to prepare the community for a natural disaster
- The vast majority of law enforcement do not have SWAT officers on a full time basis; if the concern is about SWAT in individual communities, focus on that; What is the impact if we are not prepared or do not adequately respond; if we fail or have a dismal response
- What is the relationship between SWAT actions and human rights abuses
- Understand and acknowledge differences of perception; give some space to have the community heard; be clear what we see as the perceptions of the community
- Specialized teams don't exist because of Urban Shield, if Urban Shield did not exist there would still be tactical teams on a smaller scale;
- Urban Shield is particularly impactful in some communities; what are the alternatives outside of Urban Shield
- In Monterrey County Urban Shield teaches the community response teams and there will be more community involvement in the coming year; keep community involvement at a greater participation
- Since 911, it was evident that the country was not prepared, Urban Shield has been a benefit; without the training exercises it would be difficult to put into real life situations
- The issue with Urban Shield is not the collaboration of preparing for disasters; the Task Force needs to get to the crux of the issue people have with Urban Shield

Omowale Satterwhite gave a brief summary of the responses to the Learning & Data Questions.

There was a basic consensus that the first three (3) questions could be answered concerning the federal guidelines, emergency preparedness and meeting the demand to prepare for natural disasters or terrorist attacks. Information on risk assessment is needed including what are the risks and what are the gaps.

For the remaining questions, Task Force members want to learn the benefits of Urban Shield and some clarity of law enforcement and other agencies' involvement in Urban Shield. There was agreement on training and preparation in real time. Information on the breakdown of the Urban Shield budget, activities and, vendors will be necessary to respond to questions and concerns. Clarity around addressing community concerns about Urban Shield will also be a focus of the task force.

The next meeting the Sheriff's Office and Stop Urban Shield will make presentations. For meetings three (3) and four (4) the task force will focus on strategy development, key issues, and brainstorming. In meetings five (5) and six (6) the task force will form and finalize recommendations to the Board of Supervisors.

Meeting Feedback

Several Task Force members expressed the meeting was a good start to begin to look at Urban Shield and its activities.

Materials for the task force will be posted on the ACGOV website. For any questions in between meetings should be sent to Carol Burton carol.burton@acgov.org.

Public Comment
None

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned to Friday, April 7, 2017.

Urban Shield Task Force

Friday, April 7, 2017
9:00 a.m.

Dr. Muntu Davis, Chair

Location: Alameda County Training and Conference Center
125 ~ 12th Street, 4th Floor
Oakland Room
Oakland, CA 94612

Summary Minutes

I. Call to Order/Roll Call/Welcome

Chairman, Muntu Davis, MD, Department of Public Health, called the meeting to order.

II. Introductions

Task Force members, county staff and facilitation team

Omowale Satterwhite, Facilitator
Kathleen Harris, Facilitator
Pete Colleto, Principal Analyst, CAO staff
Carol Burton, CEO, Jeweld Legacy Group, consultant to Supervisor Keith Carson
Travis Kusman, Director, Emergency Medical Services, Alameda County
Mike Grant, Owner, Guns Unlimited Training Center
Brett Keteles, Assistant Sheriff, Alameda County Sheriff's Office
Muntu Davis, Alameda County Health Officer, Chair, Urban Shield Task Force
Ann Kronenberg, Dir., SF Department of Emergency Management; Chair, Bay Area UASI
Paul Rolleri, Chief of Police, City of Alameda
Jim Betts, Surgeon-in-Chief, Asst. Director, Trauma Services, Children's Hospital Oakland
Dave Winnacker, Alameda County Fire Department, Rep. for Fire Chiefs Association
Tash Nguyen, Ella Baker Center, Advocate, Stop Urban Shield Coalition
Cheryl Miraglia, Castro Valley resident, District 4
John Lindsay-Poland, American Friends Service Committee**,** District 5
Rhonda Bailey, Clerk of the Board, Alameda County
Mike Dayton, Deputy Director, SF Department of Emergency Management
Katheryn Giliya, Interfaith Committee on Black Lives
Tom Wright, Division Commander, Alameda County Sheriff's Office
Dan Bellino, Chief of Staff, Alameda County Office of Education

III. Presentation by the Sheriff's Office – Bay Area Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) Regional Training Program

Attachment

Tom Wright, Division Commander, Alameda County Sheriff's Department, presented a PowerPoint presentation on Bay Area Urban Security Initiative (UASI) Regional Training and Exercise Program.

The presentation included information on UASI funding, principles & guidelines, training courses provided, integrated critical infrastructure, equipment & technology and vendor sponsors.

IV. Debriefing

Dr. Muntu Davis, Chair, facilitated questions and discussion on the Bay Area Urban Security Initiative (UASI) Regional Training Program presentation.

Q & A/Discussion

Q. The requirement that 25% of UASI funds be used for counterterrorism activities; why are more teams dedicated to law enforcement and SWAT activities than to the Fire Department or Emergency Management Services, hazardous materials, etc.?

A. The exercise started out as a law enforcement only exercise and over the years it has expanded and added Fire and Medical components, in addition to including more training for citizens. It's easier for a law enforcement team to be out on an exercise training for 48 hours than some other agencies. Urban Shield began as a team building exercise (competition), navigating various scenarios in the Kirkwood Mountains and was later brought to urban environments.

Q. Can anyone attend the Gray Command?
A. Yes anyone can attend.

Q. Principles & Guidelines; how do you plan to measure and implement and report back to the public on the principles and guidelines?

A. Board of Supervisors; drafting guidelines and Sheriff's Office has agreed to follow and track, willing to provide report if requested by the Board of Supervisors.

Q. CERT teams included in this year's Urban Shield training which is different than previous years; Are there any reservations about involving the CERT teams? CERT teams could be used in a different way; questions bringing in community teams to keep the mindset; there are other ways to enhance the training. Concerned that all the responders, communities, medical, emergency personnel come together under the nexus of terrorism.

A. Yes, Urban Shield will involve community CERT teams this year; Gray Command is more specific to the public; more training conducted through the Office of Emergency Services.

A. NERT and NERF teams in San Francisco do not have the opportunity to train regionally outside of UASI funding; this is a new opportunity for San Francisco.

A. The Green Command is putting together exercises for CERT & NERT teams to respond to earthquake, reconnaissance, mass prophylaxis, mass casualty, life, search & rescue and building damage control scenarios.

Q. One of the Learning Questions of the USTF: Do the terms, conditions and guidelines of Urban Shield meet the demand for the Bay Area Region to be prepared to respond to a natural disaster or terrorist attack: How do you determine what the demand is; how is it determined which trainings take place? – **To be discussed at a future meeting.**

Q. More information is requested about the vendors/sponsors of Urban Shield and their relationship to law enforcement. – **To be discussed at a future meeting.**

Q. More information was requested about de-escalation emphasis and who leads those trainings; are there any mental health worker/social worker led training? Is there any discussion about mental health workers response instead of law enforcement? – **To be discussed at a future meeting.**

Q. Has there been any discussion around preparing low-income neighborhoods/neighbors for first responder training, as they are usually the first people on the scene? – **To be discussed at a future meeting.**

V. Presentation from Stop Urban Shield

Attachment

Tash Nguyen, Ella Baker Center, and John Lindsay-Poland, American Friends Service Committee, presented a PowerPoint presentation entitled "Invest in Community Safety: Stop Urban Shield". Task force participants were given a binder of information that includes the Stop Urban Shield Coalition's data, research, analysis and opposition to urban shield.

The presentation included: local and international calls to end Urban Shield, unions & interfaith groups opposed to Urban Shield and a summary of statistics on they have gathered on Urban Shield's participants disproportionate impact on communities of color.

VI. Debriefing

Dr. Muntu Davis, Chair, facilitated questions and discussion on the Stop Urban Shield presentation.

Q & A/Discussion

Comment: Mitigation does not exclude law enforcement's efforts at prevention.

Comment: The "Stop Urban Shield" PowerPoint referenced agencies opposed to Urban Shield, including the City and County of San Francisco; there has been no action from the City and County of San Francisco to oppose Urban Shield and that reference should be removed.

Comment: Send portions of the PowerPoint slides from the presentation that are not in the binder to the USTF participants.

Q. The statistics about armed and unarmed persons shot by police; how many of the 11 SWAT Urban Shield participants shot at unarmed persons? The presentation showed a chart of SWAT deployment by race; could you also show a chart with crimes by race and the crime rate in those areas?

A. It is unknown if the persons shot were armed or not; Showing crimes by race and crime rates in certain areas is complicated because of the disproportionate number of people of color that laws are enforced against.

Q. Can the USTF be provided a copy of the grant?

A. A copy of the grant can be found on the website. http://acgov.org/board/calendarcom.htm

Omowale Satterwhite, facilitator, reminded the USTF of the meeting schedule of the Task Force and the agenda topics for the next meetings: meetings 3 & 4 will include discussions; meetings 5 & 6 will be around formulating and finalizing the recommendations.

Mr. Satterwhite asked the participants to review the Learning Questions and Data Needs document and if anyone has any additional questions or data needs to please send the information to Carol Burton, via e-mail. Dr. Davis admonished to try to stick to the task force questions.

VIII. Public Comment

Brian Geiser, Oakland Privacy Working Group, supports Stop Urban Shield. The Federal guidelines should be questioned. Focus on community needs.

Kathryn Giliya, Interfaith Community on Black Lives, is deeply concerned about police militarization, it continues to create tension and violence. Ask that you think how are these guidelines are going to be met and to stick to the guidelines. Should have communities of color at the table to talk about Urban Shield.

Ellen Brotsky, Jewish Voice for Peace, encouraged law enforcement to think outside the box; militarized policing has a negative effect on communities of colors; figure out another way for training.

Katie Joaquin works with immigrant women and they have not had a positive response to SWAT raids and their children are being traumatized. In one of the rallies of “Stop Urban Shield” her family endured a SWAT raid, preparing for an emergency are not the approaches that are good for their communities; ask is this the right model for emergency preparedness. Tactics, weaponry shared with international government has created problems internationally.

Blair Beekman supports are trying to offer alternatives for Urban Shield and more community oriented policing and preparing the community for disasters.

Cindy Shambar, Jewish Voice for Peace, contradictions within the cities, sanctuary cities, the idea of the nexus of terrorism, a certain mindset with the police that it takes a long time to work that out, and focus on what it means to build community; Change the culture of what is going on; encourage the task force to focus on medical and mental health services;

Laura Menotti, American Friends Service Committee, relayed a story about an inmate who experienced law enforcement treatment before and after Urban Shield training. After the training corrections officers were “war-like”, and that is the primary approach of SWAT. Law enforcement has to respond in a different way; de-escalation has to be at the center of training.

IX. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned to Friday, May 12, 2017.

Urban Shield Task Force

Friday, May 12, 2017
9:00 a.m.

Dr. Muntu Davis, Chair

Location: Alameda County Training and Conference Center
125 ~ 12th Street, 4th Floor
Oakland Room
Oakland, CA 94612

Summary Minutes

I. Call to Order/Roll Call

Chairman, Muntu Davis, MD, Department of Public Health, called the meeting to order and roll was called.

Travis Kusman, Director, Emergency Medical Services, Alameda County
Jim Betts, Surgeon-in-Chief, Asst. Director, Trauma Services, Children's Hospital Oakland
Marla Blagg, BART Police
Mike Grant, Owner, Guns Unlimited Training Center
Mike Dayton, Deputy Director, SF Department of Emergency Management
Lara Kiswani, Executive Director, Arab Resource and Organizing Center
Tash Nguyen, Ella Baker Center for Human Rights
Cheryl Miraglia, Castro Valley resident, District 4
John Lindsay-Poland, American Friends Service Committee**,** District 5
Rhonda Bailey, Clerk of the Board, Alameda County
Muntu Davis, Alameda County Health Officer, Chair, Urban Shield Task Force
Scott Dickey, Alameda County, County Counsel
Tom Wright, Division Commander, Alameda County Sheriff's Office
Omowale Satterwhite, Facilitator
Kathleen Harris, Facilitator
Paul Rolleri, Alameda Police Department
Dan Bellino, Chief of Staff, Alameda County Office of Education
Carol Burton, Supervisor Keith Carson's Office, District 5

II. Desired Outcomes for Urban Shield Task Force (USTF) – Facilitation Team

Omowale Satterwhite, Urban Shield Task Force facilitator, asked members what they would like to see accomplished with Task Force. Task Force members' responses included the following:

- To be able to come together as a group and come to an understanding of both sides
- See more understanding and consideration of alternatives to the dominant paradigm of law enforcement in response to mass emergencies
- The Task Force has an opportunity to educate the public on training programs; a lot of the public don't know what Urban Shield actually is, which is a program that will help the public safety
- Would like to see an acknowledgement that the Task Force does not actually reflect the diversity of the community in Alameda County or the different perspectives

- Some people would like Urban Shield to go away, such as the Stop Urban Shield group, others would like it to continue with adjustments and modifications to the training; it would be good to get to a place where people would be comfortable with a good outcome.
- Urban Shield has had a broader focus it has grown to much more than law enforcement; public health and fire has been integrated into Urban Shield

III. Conflict Management Process

Omowale Satterwhite asked the task members to have a brief discussion on appropriate ways to manage conflict when there are different views. Mr. Satterwhite defined conflict as "…as a difference of opinion amidst a high level of tension; disruptive". Task Force members' responses included:

- Focus on issues and not people
- Try to understand where the origin of some perspectives come from and why something might be offensive to one person and not another
- Opportunity to agree and disagree; be respectful; give each person an opportunity to voice their opinion; being able to step back, seek to understand and be reflective, looking through another lens.
- The Task Force is not an independent party there are many people who are part of law enforcement that participate in Urban Shield and coming to an agreement on the impact of Urban Shield; find common ground shared values; understand that there may be tension that does not get resolved
- Respect and understanding; if it is not possible to get consensus from everyone, identify where there is commonality
- Find common ground where there are truths that are not necessarily recommendations
- Asking questions to get clarity

IV. Learning Questions, Discussion Topics & Data Sources

Attachment

Omowale Satterwhite asked the task members to give additional feedback on learning questions.

On Learning Questions 3, a task force member asked that "community" be included, as follows: "...In the event of an emergency/ attack or natural disaster, will public safety agencies, public health and other emergency response departments, **(and the community)** be adequately trained and equipped to respond to such disasters without the training offered by Urban Shield?"

In addition, members requested that community be added to the discussion topics and also questions about preparedness of the community should also be added.

V. Sharing Viewpoints & Perspectives: Issues and Options

Task Force member had an opportunity to share their viewpoints and perspectives related to the Learning Questions and Discussion Topics.

- The question about Urban Shield being strictly an emergency preparedness program; we have not defined what emergency preparedness is; we need to develop criteria for what we are measuring
- One goal is to identify and build on how we prepare for and respond to significant events that affect the community; to continue to build resiliency

- We have an opportunity to provide recommendations on how to prepare the community for emergency preparedness; regarding prioritizations: some of the lower prioritizations are still important on the spectrum of resiliency and who would need to be prepared;
- Regarding the two presentations from the last meeting, is there any way of tracking how many lives have been saved due to participation in Urban Shield
- How to define emergency preparedness: does everyone agree with the National Preparedness Goal and their five mission areas and their 32 core capabilities outlined by FEMA
- If we can't come up with a consensus we should go with the national mandate
- Official Urban Shield videos or brochures; is Urban Shield promoting a public narrative about the role of law enforcement and SWAT teams
- The narrative is more about mutual aid and bringing agencies together as with the Alameda County/East Bay Hills Fire (standardized emergency management systems are in use in California)
- The image that is put forward is not a friendly image in terms of preparedness; in terms of the reaction that the public has, that narrative is not seen in a positive light; and is this preparedness
- Learning question 1: federal guidelines are changing; how does the County, how do we respond when guidelines and priorities change;
- Regarding Federal guidelines: The Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP), any regional exercise that is grant funded with Homeland Security funds must be HSEEP compliant to qualify for the funding. Urban Shield is HSEEP compliant. Does everyone know what the 32 core capabilities are? That is a good question for the Task Force.
- The Federal guidelines are designed to be flexible, which may be a struggle for the Task Force due to the lack of specificity
- There may come a time where Alameda County does not want to comply with federal guidelines, such as sanctuary cities being in conflict with the Federal government. The government could redefine terrorism and task force members could be classified as terrorists; Is it a good idea to fit the guidelines?
- Comfortable to sit on both sides of the issues; I feel like we are just spinning our wheels until we actually dig into the facts; we haven't looked at the guidelines as a group; we need to dig into the data so we can move forward as a group; the narrative piece is really important; last month's presentation showed a video of a Fremont police officer regarding a train derailment, but in the background is a heavily armored Fremont police vehicle and that image is at the crux of what the two sides are wrestling with;
- We need to understand the context in which Urban Shield came into existence; why Urban Shield; how were things done prior to 2007
- Prior to 2007 Urban Shield was a rural training exercise; since 2007 EMS, Fire Teams, and emergency management were integrated for mass care and shelter training; moving forward members should keep an open mind; armored vehicles are needed;
- The data is really important and I'm struggling with it; in order for us to talk about priorities and rankings, we really need data; collected information from FEMA and UASI there is a lot to learn before getting to the point of making recommendations
- Data is important from multiple and diverse streams; we need to know what are the unmet emergency preparedness needs in the community; attended an Urban Shield planning meeting and there is more community involvement; we need to know how the gray and green commands were organized and receive community feedback; difficult to come to a set of recommendations asking to extend the Task Force;
- There are some metrics and mechanics that community members can attend such as meetings and participate in some of the events, and be a part of the after action plan; each event has an evaluator and is critiqued

- It's important to note that everyone cannot participate in Urban Shield; if you attempt to volunteer you are vetted and many Stop Urban Shield members have not been allowed to participate

- Militarization and images; the City of Alameda has an armored vehicle, which does not look like community policing; those are not military vehicles as they have no weapons in or attached to them; their use is to shield people and personnel in certain situations
- We should bring the ideas from this discussion back and develop recommendations and strategies; we need a discussion about community involvement; we could make a recommendation that particular community or group be involved in certain aspects
- There are more substantive issues than just the narrative; people are worried about being co-opted into a new public relations initiative that rebrands Urban Shield with the substance not being that different

Omowale Satterwhite summarized that the Task Force needs to properly flush out the range of activities to see where it is in emergency preparedness; know what the guidelines are and where are the gaps, and be intentional to linking to community readiness and preparedness.

VI. Data Collection/Review Process

Omowale Satterwhite and the facilitation team proposed to address Data Collection/Review & Process by inviting individual Task Force members to compile and share any information that they think is relevant to the Learning Questions or Discussion Topics for each question. All information compiled and shared must be linked to a Learning Question or Discussion Topic.

The team will take the information, synthesize it and disseminate to the Task Force. This information will be used in diversified discussion groups within the Task Force at future meetings.

Scott Dickey, County Counsel will give facilitators direction on The Brown Act requirements for distribution of the information collected and discussed.

Carol Burton, District 5, informed the Task Force members that the recommendations must be brought to the Board of Supervisors in the time frame allotted, which could include extending the Task Force.

VII. Public Comment

Blair Beekman thanked everyone for the meeting. The audio recordings of the meeting are available on a CD for $5.00 and they should be made free to the public. It is a good idea to extend the Task Force. There were some good thoughts and ideas that came from today's meeting that can be put into the narrative the Task Force is forming.

Dr. Muntu Davis will get clarity on the timeline for the Task Force and reminded members that the reason Task Force was created relates to community concern about Urban Shield. The Task Force recommendations should reflect the community concern.

VIII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned to Friday, June 9, 2017.

Urban Shield Task Force

Friday, June 9, 2017
9:00 a.m.

Dr. Muntu Davis, Chair

Location: Alameda County Training and Conference Center
125 ~ 12th Street, 4th Floor
Oakland Room
Oakland, CA 94612

Summary Minutes

I. Call to Order/Roll Call

Chairman, Muntu Davis, MD, Department of Public Health, called the meeting to order and roll was called.

Travis Kusman, Director, Emergency Medical Services, Alameda County
Jim Betts, Surgeon-in-Chief, Asst. Director, Trauma Services, Children's Hospital Oakland
Marla Blagg, BART Police
Mike Grant, Owner, Guns Unlimited Training Center
Mike Dayton, Deputy Director, SF Department of Emergency Management
Lara Kiswani, Executive Director, Arab Resource and Organizing Center
Tash Nguyen, Ella Baker Center for Human Rights
Cheryl Miraglia, Castro Valley resident, District 4
John Lindsay-Poland, American Friends Service Committee**,** District 5
Muntu Davis, Alameda County Health Officer, Chair, Urban Shield Task Force
Scott Dickey, Alameda County, County Counsel
Tom Madigan, Division Commander, Alameda County Sheriff's Office
Omowale Satterwhite, Facilitator
Kathleen Harris, Facilitator
Paul Rolleri, Alameda Police Department
Dan Bellino, Chief of Staff, Alameda County Office of Education
Carol Burton, Supervisor Keith Carson's Office, District 5
Susan Abdullah, Pediatric nurse, Kaiser Oakland
Ann Kronenberg Director, SF Department of Emergency Management
David Wanneker, Alameda County Fire Department
Dan Bellino, Alameda County Office of Education

II. Approval of Minutes: 3/10/17, 4/7/17, and 5/12/17 – (Chairman, Muntu Davis, MD, Department of Public Health and Task Force

A motion was made by Cheryl Miraglia and seconded by Jim Betts that the minutes of March 10, 2017, April 7, 2017 and May 12, 2017 be approved as submitted.

Motion to approve passed unanimously.

III. Revised Resource Documents: Learning Questions, Discussion Topics & Data Sources, Meeting Protocols

Omowale Satterwhite, Facilitator, gave a recap of the three previous meetings and an overview what will be covered in subsequent meetings.

The first meeting was an orientation where information was shared about the charge from the Board of Supervisors and a presentation on UASI with opportunities for Q &A and public input.

The second meeting there were two (2) primary presentations, one from the Sheriff's Office regarding Bay Area Urban Shield and one from the Stop Urban Shield coalition, with opportunities for Q & A and public input.

The third meeting was an open forum with opportunities to ask questions, ask for clarification and share information and offer ideas to the task force for consideration.

Today's meeting will be focused on group discussions about the Learning Questions.

The August meetings will be focused on making specific recommendations to the Board of Supervisors. It has also been acknowledged that additional time may be needed, which could also be a part of the recommendations to the Board.

Mr. Satterwhite thanked the Task Force members who submitted data for review. Task force members discussed and gave clarification on information that was received/submitted by various task force members.

IV. Task Force Discussion Groups

Omowale Satterwhite, USTF Facilitator, arranged the task force members into three groups for the purpose of discussing the Learning Questions.

Group 1 discussed Learning Questions 1 & 2:

Compliance

1) Does the Urban Shield Project meet the Federal guidelines set out in the Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI) grant?

2) Is Urban Shield strictly an emergency preparedness program?

Group 2 discussed Learning Questions 3 & 4, Emergency preparedness:

3) In the event of an emergency/attack or natural disaster, will public safety agencies, public health and other emergency response departments and the community be adequately trained and equipped to respond to such disasters without the training offered by Urban Shield?

4) Do the terms, conditions and guidelines of this program meet the demand, needs and/or gaps for the Bay Area Region to be prepared to respond to natural disaster (fire, earthquake, etc.) or a terrorist act?

Group 3 discussed Learning Question 5, Community Relations:

5) What is the impact of Urban Shield on the community's relationship with law enforcement and other emergency preparedness responders, such as the public health department, health care agencies, public education agencies, public transportation agencies, fire departments and emergency medical services?

V. Task Force Discussion Group Reports

Members from each group reported out on their discussion.

Group 1:

- The County would not receive the money for the grant if the program did not meet the federal guidelines
- In order to determine if guidelines are being met, task force members need to define what terrorism is
- Should the County be seeking the grant?
- Discussion about FEMA guidelines, however the guidelines are not under the purview of the task force
- Opportunities in moving forward more involvement in the community;
- More involvement from the Public Works Agency and Planning Departments
- More prevention programs
- Issues around vendors at Urban Shield

Group 2

- How did emergency preparedness occur prior to 2007?
- Prior to 2007 it was very disjointed between agencies, primarily a training for law enforcement;
- After 2007 there is more inclusion across agencies, moving in the direction for more community involvement
- What are non-participating municipalities doing for emergency preparedness
- Gap analysis from the Risk and Gap Analysis report: need to understand the risk relevant rankings
- Risk ranking are higher for terrorism; however risks such as health and social services may not be given the attention; look at how those gaps/risks are determined and it might conflict with federal guidelines
- De-escalation – what is de-escalation for community preparedness and what does professional de-escalation mean
- Daily impact Urban Shield has on community interactions; relationships between agencies

Group 3

- What is the community concern around Urban Shield and why? Is it about training or implementation and practices
- Why do EMT and fire need to train under Urban Shield
- Militarized presence
- Why isn't the community more invested
- Very useful to coordinate across agencies
- What would an alternative to Urban Shield Look like

Meeting 5 – focus will be answering the questions

Meeting 6 – what recommendations to move forward to the Board of Supervisors

VII. Public Comment

Dan Robinson stated he was very concerned about the health and wellness of Bay Area residents in the event of a disaster. He believes Urban Shield is making our communities less safe. Urban Shield is a competition not a training.

Community based planning should be representative of members of the community and also be involved. The country has learned important lessons from Hurricane Katrina. The people who are going to bear the brunt of hardships should be included in the conversation.

Blair Beekman stated that UASI has an annual meeting with a specific conference on community involvement could be useful to the Task Force.

VIII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned to Friday, August 11, 2017.

Urban Shield Task Force

Friday, August 11, 2017
9:00 a.m.

Dr. Muntu Davis, Chair

Location: Alameda County Training and Conference Center
125 ~ 12th Street, 4th Floor
Oakland Room
Oakland, CA 94612

Summary Minutes

I. Call to Order

Muntu Davis, MD, Department of Public Health, Chair, called the meeting to order.

Dr. Davis reported that he sent an e-mail to Task Force members to recap the process. Dr. Davis clarified the process for requests for information. All persons have the right to requests information, however if an individual or group requests information, he asked that they not identify as a member of the Urban Shield Task Force. If there are requests for information from the Task Force members, those requests should be sent to Dr. Davis or Carol Burton to facilitate. Dr. Davis acknowledged that there was a formal complaint lodged regarding an e-mail request for information.

Dr. Davis acknowledged that the time given to the Urban Shield Task Force to develop recommendations to the Board of Supervisors may not have been sufficient, however the task force will keep with the original timeline. He is hopeful that there will be consensus on the recommendations, but noted that may not be the case.

Dr. Davis announced that Susan Abdullah, Task Force member is listening in to the meeting on the phone and Lilly Haskell is sitting in for Task Force member Tash Nguyen, Ella Baker Center for Human Rights.

II. Approval of Minutes: June 9, 2017

A motion was made by Paul Rolleri and seconded by Dan Bellino the minutes of June 9, 2017, be approved with the following corrections:

Page 3, Group report 1:
Discussion about FEMA guidelines, however the guidelines are **not** under the purview of the task force.

Page 3, Group report 2:
Deleted - Grey Command could benefit from a different leadership structure as Red Command

Motion to approve passed unanimously.

III. Task Force Discussion Groups

Omowale Satterwhite gave a recap of the four previous meetings and an update on what will be covered in subsequent meetings.

- 1st meeting orientation
- 2nd meeting – time was spent on detailed presentations from the Sheriff's Office and Stop Urban Shield
- 3rd meeting – open forum
- 4th meeting – Task force members were divided into small groups with the learning questions to develop answers

In today's meeting the deliverable is the best answers to the questions assigned to each group.

- Each small group will get time to report out to the entire group and other groups can weigh in on the report out. If a group has finished their answers to the questions assigned, that group may deliberate on other learning questions.

- At the 6th meeting recommendations will be formed from the information gathered today.

Roll call

Jim Betts, Surgeon-in-Chief, Asst. Director, Trauma Services, Children's Hospital Oakland
Marla Blagg, BART Police
Mike Grant, Owner, Guns Unlimited Training Center
Lara Kiswani, Executive Director, Arab Resource and Organizing Center
Lilly Haskell, Ella Baker Center for Human Rights
Cheryl Miraglia, Castro Valley resident, District 4
John Lindsay-Poland, American Friends Service Committee**,** District 5
Muntu Davis, Alameda County Health Officer, Chair, Urban Shield Task Force
Ray Lara, Alameda County, County Counsel
Brett Keteles, Assistant Sheriff, Alameda County Sheriff's Office
Omowale Satterwhite, Facilitator
Paul Rolleri, Alameda Police Department
Dan Bellino, Chief of Staff, Alameda County Office of Education
Carol Burton, Supervisor Keith Carson's Office, District 5
Susan Abdullah, Pediatric nurse, Kaiser Oakland – on the phone
Ann Kronenberg Director, SF Department of Emergency Management
David Wanneker, Alameda County Fire Department
Dan Bellino, Alameda County Office of Education
Shahidah Lacy, Supervisor Keith Carson's Office, District 5
Dieudonné Brou, Intern, Jeweld Legacy Group

IV. Task Force Discussion Group Reports

Omowale Satterwhite, USTF Facilitator, arranged the task force members into three groups for the purpose of discussing the Learning Questions.

Members from each group reported out on their discussion.

Group 1:

1) Does the Urban Shield Project meet the Federal guidelines set out in the Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI) grant?
   Yes. The County would not receive the funding if the guidelines were not met.

2) Is Urban Shield strictly an emergency preparedness program?

   - There was agreement that it is an emergency preparedness program with one dissention.

   - Dissention; The FEMA definition of emergency preparedness is the continuous cycle of planning, organizing, training, equipping, exercising, evaluating, taking corrective action in an effort to ensure effective coordination for an emergency response. All those deliverables are not being met. The Task Force has not received any information on how Urban Shield organizes or takes a corrective action. It is not training, but rather testing of capabilities and it does not provide any equipment.

   - There are different understandings of definitions for emergency preparedness Urban Shield does planning, it is highly structured and organized with varying stakeholders

   - Urban Shield does training and equipping, such as firefighters, bringing in equipment to exercises;

   - There is an evaluation process; there is a corrective action plan (After Action plan, per Sheriff's Office) at the end of the training

   - There is room for improvement; expand preparedness activities and involve the community, focus on preparedness prevention and recovery; discussion around recovery; strategies or suggestions workshops, incorporate the community; volunteer assisting in disaster (VAID), faith based; certs, salvation army, red cross,

Other suggestions from the discussion

- Identify other funding streams available
- Vendor show recommendations: either eliminate, review, enhance or improve
- Look at the name of Urban Shield, possibly changing it
- An update in the implementation of guidelines in the Sheriff's Office letter; how they are being implemented and by whom

Group 2

3) In the event of an emergency/attack or natural disaster, will public safety agencies, public health and other emergency response departments and the community be adequately trained and equipped to respond to such disasters without the training offered by Urban Shield?

   - Three group members felt that we are better prepared because of Urban Shield and one member disagreed.

- Alameda County's interagency coordination is improved, however there are some negative effects in terms of community impact, which need further review and ongoing monitoring
- There are possible alternatives or options to aid in improved interagency operations and community relations or engagement;
- Unpacking the impact on community relationships; how it impacts preparedness (Are we better prepared or not?) negative interactions that are taking place, is that negatively impacting preparedness?
- There was not consensus on being better prepared
- There was consensus on negative community impacts as a result of Urban Shield
- There was consensus on alternatives and more information on what counties do for interagency coordination
- Is coordination improved? There was some dissent on specifics of improvement

4) Do the terms, conditions and guidelines of this program meet the demand, needs and/or gaps for the Bay Area Region to be prepared to respond to natural disaster (fire, earthquake, etc.) or a terrorist act?

    - There was consensus; to answer the questions the group needs a clear understanding of the Regional Risk and Gap Report;
    - How and who determines the information in the Regional Risk and Gap Report
    - This report is driving the emergency preparedness scenarios and risk relevance
    - Risks and risk relevance should consider not only infrastructure but human aspects
    - The focus should be on preparedness not just response
    - Look outside of Urban Shield for emergency preparedness
    - Focus efforts on prevention
    - EMS healthcare addresses response and coordination, integrate it into the scenario
    - There is room for improvement
    - CERT Teams are not equipped to deal with any large disaster
    - Allow the opportunity to allow preparedness vendors

Group 3

5) What is the impact of Urban Shield on the community's relationship with law enforcement and other emergency preparedness responders, such as the public health department, health care agencies, public education agencies, public transportation agencies, fire departments and emergency medical services?

    - It is difficult to assess community relationships with the various responders (such as fire, transportation agencies) because the problem with Urban Shield is the coupling of all of them and the highly militarized training
    - One of the impacts to communities is lack of trust, generated by the perception of militarized response by agencies including transportation, EMS and other non-law enforcement first responders
    - Discussion on if all these agencies are grouped under the same umbrella, does that have a negative impact of decreasing mistrust and they all tied back to a militarized response; (did not come to a consensus but there was a lot of discussion

    - The group is diverse and there was some disagreement on impacts to the community given the diversity of the group

- Discussion on who is the community and what does impact actually mean
- Urban Shield makes the community feel safer, higher collaboration and better response to multiple casualty incidents (MCI)
- The collaboration with law enforcement and other entities and volunteers the community is better prepared (did not reach consensus)
- Urban Shield actually damages community relationships with law enforcement
- Could Urban Shield be repackaged as something else and what would that look like?
- Conversation around decoupling law enforcement from all the other trainings such as Red Command and other trainings that don't seem to be militarized; why do they have to be a part of Urban Shield
- Look at framework, funding and infrastructure to do something alternative and outside of Urban Shield
- Would like more community involvement, but not as is with its current framework and infrastructure
- Organized regimented response not necessarily militarized
- Decoupling is not the answer, given the community, environment and where we live;
- Urban Shield has evolved and is a unified command
- Militarized definition: using military style weapons, trainings and practices; armored vehicles;
- Impact of the relationships is negative; create concern as to why agencies are participating in highly militarized trainings;

VII. Public Comment

Susan Abdullah stated that Urban Shield creates big gap between law enforcement and the community. As a nurse she has not received any emergency training; a lot of the funding goes to law enforcement, she would like to see funding go for training medical and public health training, community members training to build stronger networks between community members and law enforcement.

Malik AboRashid thanked the task force for taking the time to participate. Urban Shield is a great benefit to the community, state and nation. Mr. AboRashid has participated in Urban Shield and is impressed with the execution and deliverables, he encourages continuing Urban Shield; it is a unique exercise; grateful for the opportunity; community participation is already taking place.

Sarah Ismail- read letter on behalf of the Public Health Justice Collective, a group of 300 public health professional and advocates who have reservations about Urban Shield. The letter asks that the County reject participation in Urban Shield in the future. They are disturbed that the majority of funding is used for militarized practices by law enforcement with a negative impact disproportionately on communities of color.

Amber Piatt, Alameda County Human Relations Commission, was interested in attending today's meeting and asked if the Task Force is open to receiving recommendations from the Human Relations Commission around community relations.

Michael Yoshii, Pastor of United Methodist Church, Alameda, was invited by Alameda Police Chief Paul Rolleri. Mr. Yoshii recommended to close out Urban Shield as the name, continue under a new name, and include more agencies and communities and the faith community, which will allow for more funding opportunities and be a more inclusive interagency program.

Brett Keteles announced that on August 17, 2017 at 1:30 p.m. will be the last Urban Shield Planning meeting taking place at the Office of Emergency Services; feel free to attend. Assistant Sheriff Keteles will also be making arrangements for members of the Task Force to observe all aspects of Urban Shield and the emergency operations.

Next steps: get the notes; think about recommendations – ask everyone to get information back in a week;

Send Recommendations by Wednesday, August 16, 2017 to Carol Burton.

VIII. Adjournment

Dr. Davis announced that the next meeting will be extended to 1:00 p.m. for those members who can stay until that time.

The meeting was adjourned to Friday, August 25, 2017.

Urban Shield Task Force
Friday, August 25, 2017
9:00 a.m.

Dr. Muntu Davis, Chair

Location: Alameda County Training and Conference Center
125 ~ 12th Street, 4th Floor
Oakland Room
Oakland, CA 94612

Summary Minutes

I. Call to Order

Muntu Davis, MD, Department of Public Health, Chair, called the meeting to order.

Roll call

Jim Betts, Surgeon-in-Chief, Asst. Director, Trauma Services, Children's Hospital Oakland
Marla Blagg, BART Police
Mike Grant, Owner, Guns Unlimited Training Center
Lara Kiswani, Executive Director, Arab Resource and Organizing Center
Lily Haskell, Ella Baker Center for Human Rights
Cheryl Miraglia, Castro Valley resident, District 4
John Lindsay-Poland, American Friends Service Committee**,** District 5
Muntu Davis, Alameda County Health Officer, Chair, Urban Shield Task Force
Scott Dickey, Alameda County, County Counsel
Brett Keteles, Assistant Sheriff, Alameda County Sheriff's Office
Omowale Satterwhite, Facilitator
Kathleen Harris, Facilitator
Paul Rolleri, Alameda Police Department
Dan Bellino, Chief of Staff, Alameda County Office of Education
Carol Burton, Supervisor Keith Carson's Office, District 5
Ann Kronenberg, Director, SF Department of Emergency Management
Glen Katon, Katon Law
Meryl Klein, County Administrator's Office
David Wanneker, Alameda County Fire Department
Bob Maginnis, Sheriff's Association
Travis Kusman, Alameda County Emergency Medical Services

II. Approval of Minutes: August 11, 2017

A motion was made and seconded that the minutes of August 11, 2017, be approved with the following corrections/amendments:

Page 4, Group report 2:

Alameda County's interagency coordination is improved, **with 1 member dissenting**, however there are some negative effects in terms of impact, which need further review and ongoing monitoring.

Page 4, Group report 2:
Deleted – There was consensus on negative community impacts as a result of Urban Shield.

Page 5, Group report 3:
Add "There was a statement made that there is a negative impact on the community.**"** The following comments were made by different Task Force members during the discussion:

- It is difficult to assess community relationships with the various responders (such as fire, transportation agencies) because the problem with Urban Shield is the coupling of all of them and the highly militarized training.
- One of the impacts to communities is lack of trust, generated by the perception of militarized response by agencies including transportation, EMS and other non-law enforcement first responders.
- Discussion on if all these agencies are grouped under the same umbrella, does that have a negative impact of increasing mistrust and they all tied back to a militarized response - Did not come to a consensus but there was a lot of discussion.
- The group is diverse and there was some disagreement on impacts to the community given the diversity of the group.
- Discussion on who is the community and what does impact actually mean.
- Urban Shield makes the community feel safer, higher collaboration and better response to multiple casualty incidents (MCI).
- The collaboration with law enforcement and other entities and volunteers the community is better prepared - Did not reach consensus.
- Urban Shield actually damages community relationships with law enforcement.
- Could Urban Shield be repackaged as something else and what would that look like?
- Conversation around decoupling law enforcement from all the other trainings such as Red Command and other trainings that don't seem to be militarized. Why do they have to be a part of Urban Shield?
- Look at framework, funding and infrastructure to do something alternative and outside of Urban Shield.
- Would like more community involvement, but not as is with its current framework and infrastructure.
- Organized regimented response not necessarily militarized.
- Decoupling is not the answer, given the community, environment and where we live.
- Urban Shield has evolved and is a unified command.
- Militarized definition: Using military style weapons, trainings and practices; armored vehicles.
- The Impact of the relationships is negative; creates concern as to why agencies are participating in highly militarized trainings.

Motion passed unanimously to accept the minutes with the corrections, deletions and amendments.

III. Recommendations to be considered by the Urban Shield Task Force

Dr. Muntu Davis distributed a list of draft responses to the learning questions and draft recommendations to be considered by the Urban Shield Task Force at today's meeting.

Scott Dickey, County Counsel, addressed a question regarding Task Force member Susan Abdullah not being allowed to participate by phone. Ms. Abdullah submitted information as to her location, to be contacted by phone to participate in the meeting, however it was not submitted in time for the Brown Act posting deadline of 72 hours prior to the meeting. Since phone participation was not offered to the general public, Susan Abdullah would not be allowed to participate by phone.

IV. Discussion of Recommendations: Learning Questions 1 & 2

Dr. Davis explained that the Task Force would go through each learning question response and recommendation separately and make motions and votes on each.

Learning Question 1: Does the Urban Shield Project meet federal guidelines set out in the Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) grant?

Draft Response: **"**Yes. The Urban Shield training receives approval from the Bay Area UASI Approval Authority, which uses the criteria for reginal funding proposals.

All proposals must meet the following criteria:

- Have a clear "nexus to terrorism", - i.e., the proposal must specify how the activities will support terrorism preparedness
- Directly benefit at least two operational areas
- Enhance the region's priority capability objectives (see Section 12)
- Include only allowable expenses under UASI grant guidelines (see Section 15)"

It is our understanding that:

1. Urban Shield also meets federal Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP) guidelines, which require the development of exercise plans, exercise evaluator handbooks, Master Scenario Events Lists (MELS), Team Binders, Exercise Evaluation Guides and After Action Reports (AARs); and
2. The Bay Aurea UASI funds have been spent in accordance to the federal guidelines that govern the UASI grant as specified in the Homeland Security Act of 2002.**"**

Public Comment

Brian Geiser stated that the public does not have access to the Draft Responses and Recommendations document. In addition he stated that the draft recommendations include **"**…free from racists stereotypes…**"** however the Sheriff's Office includes racist stereotypes; the equipment for Urban Shield has very vague terminology.

Blair Beekman thanked the Urban Shield Task Force for their work on the recommendations.

Motion was made and seconded to accept the draft response to Learning Question 1..– ***Motion passed unanimously*** *to accept the draft response to Learning Question 1.*

Draft Recommendation

"1a. Require and ensure execution of the following Principles and Guidelines established and outlined in the Sheriff's January 6, 2017, Board Letter for the Fiscal Year 2016 Urban Area Security Initiative Agreement.

- Expand community involvement and awareness
- Urban Shield will be free from racist stereotyping
- Work to expand training the medical profession for critical incidents

- Urban Shield will not include crown control training
- Continue to evaluate existing equipment
- Urban Shield will exclude any and all vendors who display derogatory or racists messages in any form
- Urban Shield will exclude the sale or transfer or any assault weapons and firearms
- Will exclude vendors displaying non-law enforcement related tactical uniforms and equipment
- Urban Shield will strive to maintain the finest first responder training possible.

1b. Before each UASI funding request, require reporting on adherence to these principles and guidelines.**"**

Discussion
Motion was made and seconded to accept the draft recommendation and add to the bulleted list: "Urban Shield should disallow countries from participating in Urban Shield who have documented Human Rights abuses, which was previously approved by the Alameda County Board of Supervisors.**"** – ***Motion passed by majority*** *and the language will be added to the recommendation.*

Motion was made and seconded to add: **"**The Sheriff's Office shall provide an annual report to the Board of Supervisor prior to the consideration of UASI funding for 2018 by the Board of Supervisors.**"** – ***Motion passed by majority*** *and the language will be added to the recommendation.*

Motion was made and seconded to add: "The Sheriff shall report to the Alameda County Board of Supervisors on the implementation of the twelve (12) guidelines for Urban Shield approved by the Board in January 2017. Such report shall be public, and shall include, for each of the 12 guidelines: description of steps taken to implement the guideline; who was responsible for implementing the guideline; definitions used in implementation of the guidelines for key terms, including but not limited to: 'human rights', 'racists stereotyping', 'crowd control' and 'surveillance' and, for the guideline on international human rights violations, a list of all sources of information consulted and implementation of other Task Force recommendations that may be adopted by the Board**."** – ***Motion failed by majority*** *and the language will not be added to the recommendation.*

Motion was made and seconded to modify recommendation 1b to read as follows: "The Sheriff's Office shall report to the Alameda County Board of Supervisors on the implementation of the twelve (12) guidelines for Urban Shield approved by the Board in January 2017 and implementation of other Task Force recommendations that may be adopted by the Board.**"** – ***Motion passed unanimously*** *and the language will be added to the recommendation.*

Learning Question 2: Is Urban Shield strictly an emergency preparedness program?

Draft Response: "Yes, with room for improvement in implementing the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) "Whole Community" approach to emergency management through activities for a) preparedness, b) crisis response, c) community and economic recovery.

Preparedness is defined by the national Department of Homeland Security (DHS)/Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) as:

1) ‘a continuous cycle of planning, organizing, training, equipping, exercising, evaluating and taking corrective action in an effort to ensure effective coordination during incident response’ and;
2) ‘a shared responsibility; it calls for the involvement of everyone – not just the government – in preparedness efforts. By working together, everyone can help keep the nation safe from harm and help keep it resilient when struck by hazards such as natural disasters, acts of terrorism and pandemics.’

Because the federal UASI grant program’s objective is to assist ‘high-threat, high-density Urban Areas in efforts to build, sustain, and deliver the capabilities necessary to prevent, protect against, mitigate, respond to and recover from acts of terrorism’ and 25% of the grant funding is to be used for law enforcement, Urban Shield activities have focused mainly on trainings and exercises for law enforcement but have expanded to include first responders and other emergency management personnel. It has also recently implemented the Grey (and Green) Command to include some activities for community preparedness.

The Urban Shield Task Force Remains unclear on both the determination and application of the Threat Hazard Identifications and Risk Assessment (THIRA) in drafting exercise scenarios, prioritizing capability targets and gaps, and selecting capabilities to be tested and gaps to be addressed each year and over multiple years.**”**

Public Comment
Laura Magnani does not agree that Urban Shield is strictly emergency preparedness, as long as the framework is seen through the lens of terrorism. The biggest threats to communities are fires and earthquakes.

Michael Yoshi stated that he does not think Urban Shield is strictly an emergency preparedness program; it’s not comprehensive; there needs to be an expansive preparedness program with more of a buy-in from others including the faith community.

Blair Beekman stated that he hopes the County will not be trading new emergency preparedness programs for others that have been working.

Sharif, Arab Resource Organizing Center, expressed that with a nexus on terrorism this is not the emergency preparedness that the County needs. As a member of the Arab/Muslim community, it is very disingenuous that they say they support our community while simultaneously using tactics against us.

Motion was made and seconded to accept the draft response and add: **“**Some members expressed deep concerns that Bay Area UASI’s Risk Relevance Ratings show core capabilities such as ‘Health and Human Services’, ‘Economic and Community Recovery’, ‘Long-Term Vulnerability Reduction’, ‘Housing’, ‘Public Health and Medical Services’, and ‘Natural and Cultural Resources’, ALL as having low risk relevance, while ‘Cyber Security’, ‘On-Scene Security and Protection’, and ‘Screening, Search and Detection’ are rated as having the highest risk relevance.**”** – ***Motion passed by majority*** *and the language will be added to the draft response.*

Draft Recommendations
“2a. Develop and implement a plan for FEMA’s “Whole Community” approach, in Alameda County. Residents, emergency management practitioners, organizational and community leaders and government officials can collectively understand and assess the needs of the communities and

determine the best ways to organize and strengthen their assets, capacities and interest to prepare for, respond to and recover from a natural disaster.

2b. Include the "Whole Community" in planning and exercise, e.g., conduct tabletop exercises with the community in the 13 Bay Area UASI counties leading up to a full scale exercise in September. The example could be 4 tabletop exercises using the UASI Urban Area HUB (East Bay, West Bay, South Bay and North Bay).

2c. Report on emergency preparedness activities in publicly available exercise documentation and/or summary reports, if not done already.

2d. Train and exercise non-terrorism scenarios that can justifiably support terrorism preparedness, including prevention and recovery and be in alignment with FEMA's "Whole Community" approach to emergency management.**"**

Motion was made and seconded to accept the draft recommendation and delete 2a. from the draft recommendation. – ***Motion passed by majority*** *to accept the recommendation with the deletion of 2a.*

Public Comment
Cindy Shamban it's ironic that part of the process, move it towards a community planning approach, and taking it away from the nexus of terrorism. The discussion has assumed that Urban Shield will continue, it seems contradictory.

Blair Beekman stated that the County may have to think about a whole community approach.

Motion was made and seconded to add language to the draft recommendation: "2e. Alameda County and multi-jurisdictional emergency preparedness shall dedicate as many or more resources and time to prevention of and recovery from critical emergencies than to respond to such emergencies.**"** – ***Motion failed by majority*** *and the language will not be added to the recommendation.*

V. Discussion of Recommendations: Learning Questions 3 & 4

Learning Question 3: In the event of an emergency/attack or natural disaster, will public safety agencies, public health and other emergency response departments, be adequately trained and equipped to respond to such disasters without the training offered by Urban Shield?

Draft Response: **"**In relationship to public safety, public health and other emergency response departments, interagency coordination between them has improved with Urban Shield.

No other significant sources of funding appear to be available for large scale preparedness trainings and full scale exercises.**"**

Public Comment
Laura Magnani stated that communities don't see enough alternatives as long as we continue to only look at Urban Shield.

Megan Clark expressed that question three (3) is misleading; it surmises that Urban Shield is the only option and it's vital; it is concerning that she has put money into Urban Shield while it is criminalizing and policing black and brown communities.

Mohamed stated that prioritizing Urban Shield has led to deprioritizing and defunding other programs; local funding no longer allocated for local emergency preparedness.

Katie Joaquin has deep concerns with responses to the question three (3) and its nexus to terrorism; people of the community feel they are being treated as the enemy. Urban Shield can't be reformed, it must be ended.

Katie Loncke stated that the County should find other non-militarized ways of protecting the community; Urban Shield causes disproportionate harm to already marginalized communities.

Sharif Zackout stated that Urban Shield creates the responses they see in the communities. It doesn't make sense to respond to environmental disasters in a militarized fashioned; need creativity in understanding an autocratic community response.

Lauren Holtzman stated that people feel powerless to stop the police militarization; communities respond and prepare for what the police exacerbate and it has an impact on generations.

Motion was made and seconded to accept the draft response with the following additions (underlined): "In relationship to public safety, public health and other emergency response departments <u>that have been involved</u>, interagency coordination between them has improved with Urban Shield.

No other significant sources of funding appear to be available for <u>regional</u> large scale preparedness trainings and full scale exercises.**"** – ***Motion passed by majority*** *to accept the draft recommendation with the amendments.*

Draft Recommendation: "Assess County and regional willingness to commit local funds for large full scale trainings and exercises. This would allow for more local/regional flexibility for preparedness and response training activities.**"**

Public Comment
Jesse Yurow stated that his concern is that they only way to adequately fund emergency preparedness training is to participate in this program that has a history of demonstrated racism, which is unacceptable. To incorporate the concerns of the community find an "out" to Urban Shield and recommend it to the Board of Supervisors.

Mohamed is concerned that Urban Shield style militarized policing is being used to criminalize Arab, Hispanic and African American communities as part of the war on terrorism. If the nexus to terrorism is at the root of all of the bad treatment, why should it be a requirement?

Motion made and seconded to accept the following draft recommendation: "Identify and seek additional grant funding for local regional large full scale training and exercises for community preparedness and response training activities that is consistent with the Urban Shield Task Force Recommendations.**"** – ***Motion passed by majority*** *to accept the new draft recommendation.*

Motion was made and seconded to add 3b to the draft recommendation: **"**The funding source for multi-jurisdictional disaster preparedness exercises coordinated by Alameda County shall not require that the exercise have a 'nexus to terrorism'.**"** – ***Motion failed by majority*** *and the language will not be added to the recommendation.*

Motion was made and seconded to add to the draft recommendation: **"**The funding source for future multi-jurisdictional disaster preparedness exercises, outside of UASI, funding coordinated by Alameda County shall not require that the exercise have a 'nexus to terrorism'.**"** – **Motion failed by majority and the language will not be added to the recommendation.**

Motion was made and seconded to add to the recommendation: "The Board of Supervisors advocate to revise the priorities of federal emergency preparedness funding to remove the requirement of 'a nexus to terrorism'.**"** – ***Motion failed by majority*** *and the language will not be added to the recommendation.*

Motion was made and seconded to add to the recommendation: "The Board of Supervisors assess emergency preparedness funding and activities in relationship to the twelve (12) guidelines previously approved by the Board of Supervisors, applicable to Urban Shield.**"** – ***Motion failed by majority*** *and the language will not be added to the recommendation.*

Continued to September 22, 2017
Learning Question 4: Do the terms, conditions and guidelines of this program meet the demand for the Bay Area Region to be prepared to respond to natural disaster (fire, earthquake, etc.) or a terrorist act?

VI. *Continued to September 22, 2017*
Learning Question 5: **"**is the impact of Urban Shield on the community's relationship with law enforcement and other emergency preparedness responders such as the public health department; health care agencies; public education agencies; public transportation agencies; fire departments; and emergency medical services?**"**

VII. *Continued to September 22, 2017*
Summary of Recommendations to the Board of Supervisors

VIII. Public Comment
Blair Beekman thanked the Urban Shield Task Force for their work.

IX. Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned to Friday, September 22, 2017.

DRAFT

Urban Shield Task Force
Friday, September 22, 2017
9:00 a.m.

Dr. Muntu Davis, Chair

Location: Alameda County Training and Conference Center
125 ~ 12th Street, 4th Floor
Oakland Room
Oakland, CA 94612

Summary Minutes

I. Call to Order/Welcome

Muntu Davis, MD, Department of Public Health, Chair, called the meeting to order.

Roll call

Jim Betts, Surgeon-in-Chief, Asst. Director, Trauma Services, Children's Hospital Oakland
Marla Blagg, BART Police
Mike Grant, Owner, Guns Unlimited Training Center
Lara Kiswani, Executive Director, Arab Resource and Organizing Center
Tash Nguyen, advocate
Cheryl Miraglia, Castro Valley resident, District 4
John Lindsay Poland, American Friends Service Committee, District 5
Muntu Davis, Alameda County Health Officer, Chair, Urban Shield Task Force
Ray Lara, Alameda County, County Counsel
Brett Keteles, Assistant Sheriff, Alameda County Sheriff's Office
Omowale Satterwhite, Facilitator
Kathleen Harris, Facilitator
Dan Bellino, Chief of Staff, Alameda County Office of Education
Carol Burton, Supervisor Keith Carson's Office, District 5
Anne Kronenberg, Director, SF Department of Emergency Management
Glenn Katon, Katon Law
David Winnacker, Alameda County Fire Department
Travis Kusman, Alameda County Emergency Medical Services
Susan Abdullah, pediatric

II. Approval of Minutes: August 25, 2017

A motion was made and seconded by that the minutes of August 25, 2017, be approved with the following corrections/amendments:

Correct spelling of David Winnacker, Alameda County Fire Department, Anne Kronenberg, to record the number of ayes and nayes on each vote.

Motion passed: Ayes: 11; Abstain: 3

Lara Kiswani made a motion to record in the minutes the way each task member voted seconded by John Lindsay Poland.

Motion passed
Ayes: Lara Kiswani, Jon Lindsay Poland, Tash Nguyen, Glenn Katon, Susan Abdullah, Anne Kronenberg, Dan Bellino, Travis Kusman

Noes: Cheryl Miraglia, Marla Blagg, Mike Grant, Brett Keteles, Dan Winnacker

III. Discussion of Recommendations Learning Question 4

Learning Questions 4: Do the terms, conditions and guidelines of this program meet the demand for the Bay Area Region to be prepared to respond to natural disaster (fire, earthquake, etc.) or a terrorist attack?

Draft Response: The Task Force was unable to come to agreement on this question in relationship to Urban Shield. It remains unclear:

1) How the assessment of the risk relevance, level of capability and gap level is determined and
2) How the Regional Threat Hazard Identifications and Risk Assessment (THIRA) is applied when selecting and drafting exercise scenarios, prioritizing capability targets, and gaps and selecting capabilities to be tested and gaps to be addressed each year and over multiple years.

Bay Area UASI's Risk Relevance rating show core capabilities such as "Health and Human Services", "Economic and Community Recovery", "Long-Term Vulnerability Reduction", Housing", "Public Health and Medical Services", and "Natural and Cultural Resources" ALL as having low risk relevance, while "Cyber Security", "On-Scene Security and Protection", and "Screening, Search and Detection", are rated as having the highest risk relevance.

The Task Force was in agreement that more could be done to meet the demand for whole community preparedness. Urban Shield has included a component for community preparedness. This component is separate from the full-scale exercise activities with first responders and emergency personnel.

Motion was made by Marla Blagg and seconded to accept the draft response.

Motion passed: Unanimous

Draft Recommendation:

4a. Training and exercise should focus emergency preparedness efforts on prevention of and recovery from emergencies as much as or more than response to such emergencies.

4b. In addition to risks to people, ensure, especially those who are vulnerable to harm in emergencies, in Alameda County who are more highly considered not only risks to non-human assets.

4c. Increase funding for the Urban Shield exercise to incorporate additional preparedness activities to support FEMA's "whole community" inclusion approach. By doing so, the County will be better prepared and more resilient.

Jon Lindsay Poland made a motion, seconded by Tash Nguyen to add to the draft recommendation for Learning Question 4: Proposal for study: The Obama and Trump administrations sought steep cuts in USAI grant funds for FY 2017 and FY 2018, respectively. The Trump administration has stated that it will cut federal funds to sanctuary jurisdictions, which may include several within BAUSI area. The Alameda County Board of Supervisors shall send a request to jurisdictions within the BAUSI 12-county area to identify non-UASI grants and/or funds from their own resources for disaster preparedness, in order to replace dependence on UASI funds. In addition, the Board will survey the below-named jurisdictions that have not participated in Urban Shield for a number of years, requesting the following information:

a) Why have you not participated in Urban Shield? What has the effect been, if any?
b) What programs have been implemented to address preparedness for critical emergencies?
c) How have community-based programs responded or grown since the city stopped participating in Urban Shield?
d) Who participates in them (name departments)? Do community members or civilians participate?
e) What are the contents of the trainings, and who runs them?
f) What do these trainings emphasize? (ex. natural disaster, mass casualty, terrorist attack, etc.)
g) What are the stated objectives of these trainings?
h) How do these trainings facilitate relationships between emergency workers and the community?
i) What is the number of professional development days?
j) Do you receive training in projects for recovery from critical emergencies?
k) How do you meet your budget for these trainings? Through city or county?
l) What is the general procedure for responding to mass casualty events? (Who responds)
m) (For emergency services) Do you have trainings or events coming up that are open to the public?

The Alameda County Sheriff's Office shall verify which law enforcement tactical teams of the following jurisdictions did not participate in Urban Shield for three or more of the last ten years or did not apply to participate in 2016: Menlo Park PD; Palo Alto PD; Mountain View PD; Santa Clara County Sheriff; Vallejo PD; Santa Cruz PD; Watsonville PD; Pacifica PD; Napa County city PDs; Sonoma County city PDs; Marin County city PDs; except Novato.

Speaker
Cindy Shamban supports the recommendation proposed to be added to Learning Question 4 regarding assessing non participating jurisdictions.

Motion passed.
Ayes: Susan Abdullah, Lara Kiswani, Tash Nguyen, Jon Lindsay Poland, Glenn Katon, Dave Winnacker, Jim Betts, Dan Bellino, Travis Kusman, Anne Kronenberg, Brett Keteles, Marla Blagg

Noes: Cheryl Miraglia, Mike Grant

Cheryl Miraglia made a motion seconded by Marla Blagg to accept recommendation 4a as amended: Training and exercises should also focus emergency preparedness efforts on prevention of and recovery from emergencies in addition to response to such emergencies.

Speaker
Laura Magnani stated that training should be about prevention, not response.

Motion passed.
Ayes: Cheryl Miraglia, Marla Blagg, Tash Nguyen, Jon Lindsay Poland, Dave Winnacker Jim Betts, Dan Bellino, Travis Kusman, Anne Kronenberg, Brett Keteles, Mike Grant Susan Abdullah

Noes: n/a

Abstain: Laura Kiswani, Glenn Katon

Marla Blagg made a motion seconded by Jim Betts to accept recommendation 4b as amended: Incorporate, where applicable, risks to people especially those who are vulnerable to harm in emergencies in Alameda County.

Motion passed.
Ayes: Marla Blagg, Jim Betts, Dan Bellino, Travis Kusman, Mike Grant, Brett Keteles, Anne Kronenberg, Dave Winnacker

Noes: n/a
Abstain: Cheryl Miraglia, Laura Kiswani, Susan Abdullah, Tash Nguyen, Jon Lindsay-Poland Glenn Katon

Motion was made by Jon Lindsay Poland seconded by Tash Nguyen to add the following recommendation: Risk Relevance ratings should prioritize risks to people in the Bay Area, especially those who are vulnerable to harm in emergencies, not to non-human assets.

Motion passed.
Ayes: Jon Lindsay Poland, Tash Nguyen, Lara Kiswani, Susan Abdullah, Glenn Katon, Dave Winnacker, Jim Betts, Dan Bellino, Travis Kusman, Anne Kronenberg, Brett Keteles, Mike Grant

Noes: n/a
Abstain: Cheryl Miraglia, Marla Blagg

Marla Blagg made a motion seconded by Anne Kronenberg to accept recommendation 4c as written: Increase funding for the Urban Shield exercise to incorporate additional preparedness activities to support FEMA's "whole community" inclusion approach. By doing so, the County will be better prepared and more resilient.

Motion passed.
Ayes: Marla Blagg, Anne Kronenberg, Cheryl Miraglia, Dan Bellino, Dave Winnacker, Brett Keteles, Mike Grant, Jim Betts, Travis Kusman, Dave Winnacker, Jim Betts, Dan Bellino, Travis Kusman, Anne Kronenberg, Brett Keteles, Mike Grant

Noes: Jon Lindsay Poland, Tash Nguyen, Susan Abdullah, Glenn Katon

IV. Discussion of Recommendations Learning Question 5

Learning Questions 5: What is the impact of Urban Shield on the community's relationship with law enforcement and other emergency preparedness responders such as the public health department; health care agencies, public education agencies, public transportation agencies, fire departments and emergency medical services?

Draft Response: There are two different views among Task Force members:

Negative

- Impacted communities have mistrust
- There is a perception of militarized response by these agencies
- They are seen as one in the same

Positive

- Safer communities
- Higher collaborations of 1st responders
- Greater confidence in our ability to respond to mass casualty incident
- Better relationship between law partners and volunteers
- Community is better prepared

Lara Kiswani made a motion seconded by Jon Lindsay Poland to suspend discussion on Learning Question 5 and not vote on the draft response or draft recommendations, given that the Urban Shield Task Force does not represent vulnerable communities or those impacted, and that this is not the right body to make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors about community impact of Urban Shield.

Speakers

Mickey Duxbury, Hussain Falah, Jade Sullivan, Reverend Terry de Grace-Morris, Itsan, Woods Erman, Lily Haskell, Mohamed, Charlene Khoo, Laura Magnani, Eleanor Levine, Dawn Haney, Kasi Chakravartula, Vanessa Riles, Jay Salazar, Carrie Schiff, Jean Jefferess, LiZhen Wang, Ceclia Luces, Dylan Cooke, Nichola Torbett, Carol Robison, Marcia Lovelace, Max Airborne, Lacey Hunter, Sharon Fenneman, Susie Kisder, and Katie Loncke all spoke in opposition to Urban Shield and talked about negative impacts on vulnerable communities.

Stop Urban Shield members sang a song to oppose Urban Shield.

Motion passed.
Ayes: Lara Kisawani, Jon Lindsay Poland, Tash Nguyen, Susan Abdullah, Glenn Katon, Dave Winnacker, Travis Kusman, Anne Kronenberg

Noes: Cheryl Miraglia, Marla Blagg, Mike Grant
Abstain: Dan Bellino, Bret Keteles, Jim, Betts

V. Summary of Board of Supervisors Recommendations

Dr. Muntu Davis, written report submitted with all recommendations including the master list of recommendations. Trying to determine a date and will work with Supervisor Carson's office. Will notify by e-mail. Will have an opportunity to see it before it goes to the Board of Supervisors.

Questions or concerns about the report can referred to Dr. Davis

Jon Lindsay Poland made a motion and seconded by that the report to the Board of Supervisors include a summary of substantive points made in the last two meetings of Task Force.

Motion failed.
Ayes: N/A

Noes: Cheryl Miraglia Glenn Katon, Dave Winnacker, Jim Betts, Dan Bellino, Travis Kusman, Anne Kronenberg, Brett Keteles, Marla Blagg

Abstain: Susan Abdullah, Lara Kiswani, Tash Nguyen, Jon Lindsay Poland,

VI. Next Steps and Acknowledgements

Dr. Davis thanked the Task Force for their work, the facilitators Omowale Satterwhite and Kathleen Harris and the Clerk of the Board staff.

Carol Burton thanked all who participated on the Task Force and Dr. Muntu Davis for chairing the Task Force.

VII. Public Comment

None.

VIII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:05 p.m.

USTF WEBPAGE

With Research & Data submitted for consideration

ALAMEDA COUNTY, CA
acgov.org

Skip County Header

Alameda County
Board of Supervisors

Skip Header | About the Board

County of Alameda Administration Building
1221 Oak Street, #536, Oakland, CA 94612

District 1 | District 2 | District 3 | District 4 | District 5

Home | About he Board | LIVE! Broadcasts | Regular Calendar - Agendas & Minutes | Committee Calendar - Agendas & Minutes

Committee Meetings - Agendas & Minutes

The following documents are provided in Portable Document Format (PDF) and require the free Adobe Reader. Audio/video files require either the free RealPlayer or Windows Media Player. To access the Sunol Citizen's Advisory Committee agenda/minutes prior to 8/1/2015, click here.

Show: **Urban Shield Task Force**

Date	Time	Meeting Type	Meeting Documents	Audio
09/22/2017	09:00 AM	Urban Shield Task Force	• Agenda • Audio part one • Audio part two	
08/25/2017	09:00 AM	Urban Shield Task Force	• Agenda • Audio Part 1 • Audio Part 2	
08/11/2017	09:00 AM	Urban Shield Task Force	• Agenda • audio • audio	
06/09/2017	09:00 AM	Urban Shield Task Force	• Agenda • Audio • Bay Area UASI Emergency Preparedness Program • Bay Area UASI Priority Objectives • Letter from Blair Beekman • Sheriff's Office Urban Shield Task Force Questions • Stop Urban Shield Urban Shield Trainees involved in fatal shootings • Stop Urban Shield Additional Data • Stop Urban Shield Data Docket • Stop Urban Shield East Bay Times OFD Badly Managed • Stop Urban Shield FEMA Terrorism • Stop Urban Shield Long Gap in Fire Inspections • Stop Urban Shield Man Killed by Cop had replica gub • Stop Urban Shield Participant List 2007-2015 • Stop Urban Shield Polic Departments Not Participating in Urban Shield • Stop Urban Shield Project Proposal Guidance • Stop Urban Shield Taskforce Data Docket • Stop Urban Shield Trump "Black Lives Matter calls for Police Killings" • Stop Urban Shield US General Border Security Threat • Urban Shield Acronyms	
05/12/2017	09:00 AM	Urban Shield Task Force	• Agenda • Minutes	
04/07/2017	09:00 AM	Urban Shield Task Force	• Agenda • Minutes	
03/10/2017	09:00 AM	Urban Shield Task Force	• Agenda • Introduction to the Bay Area UASI • Purpose_Role and Meeting Schedule • UASI Annual Grant Funding Cycle • UASI Grant Investments by Category FY 2013-16	

- UASI Initiative Agreement
- UASI Spending by Jurisdiction FY 2013-16
- Urban Shield Task Force Meeting Schedule
- Minutes

The Urban Shield Task Force recommendations are listed below:

I. ACCOUNTABILITY & TRANSPARENCY

A. Require and ensure execution of the following Principles and Guidelines established and outlined in the Sheriff's January 6, 2017, Board Letter for the Fiscal Year 2016 Urban Area Security Initiative Agreement. Before each UASI funding request, require reporting on adherence to these principles and guidelines.
   - Expand community involvement and awareness
   - Urban Shield will be free from racist stereotyping
   - Work to expand training the medical profession for critical incidents
   - Urban Shield will not include surveillance training
   - Continue to examine new technology and equipment
   - Urban Shield will not include crowd control training
   - Continue to evaluate existing equipment
   - Urban Shield will exclude any and all vendors who display derogatory or racist messages in any form
   - Urban Shield will exclude the sale or transfer of any assault weapons and firearms
   - Will exclude vendors displaying non-law enforcement related tactical uniforms and equipment
   - Urban Shield will strive to maintain the finest first responder training possible

B. Ensure inclusion and execution of the following, "Urban Shield should disallow countries from participating in Urban Shield who have documented Human Rights abuses", which was previously approved by the Alameda County Board of Supervisors, in the above Principles and Guidelines.

C. The Sheriff's Office shall provide an annual report to the Board of Supervisors prior to the consideration of UASI funding for 2018 by the Board of Supervisors.

D. The Sheriff's Office shall report to the Alameda County Board of Supervisors on the implementation of the twelve (12) guidelines for Urban Shield approved by the Board in January 2017 and implementation of other Task Force recommendations that may be adopted by the Board.

II. WHOLE COMMUNITY APPROACH

A. Include the "Whole Community" in planning and exercises, e.g., conduct tabletop exercises with the community in the 13 Bay Area UASI counties leading up to a full-scale exercise in September. The example could be 4 tabletop exercises using the UASI Urban Area HUB (East Bay, West Bay, South Bay and North Bay).

B. Report on emergency preparedness activities in publicly available exercise documentation and/or summary reports, if not done already.

C. Train and exercise non-terrorism scenarios that can justifiably support terrorism preparedness, including prevention and recovery and be in alignment with FEMA's "Whole Community" approach to emergency management.

III. FUNDING

A. Identify and seek additional grant funding for local regional large full-scale training and exercises for community preparedness and response training activities that is consistent with the Urban Shield Task Force recommendations.

IV. TRAINING & EXERCISES

A. Training and exercises should also focus emergency preparedness efforts on prevention of and recovery from emergencies in addition to response to such emergencies.

B. Incorporate, where applicable, risks to people especially those who are vulnerable to harm in emergencies in Alameda County.

C. Increase funding for the Urban Shield exercise to incorporate additional preparedness activities to support FEMA's "whole community" inclusion approach. By doing so, the County will be better prepared and more resilient to emergencies.

D. Proposal for study: The Obama and Trump administrations sought steep cuts in UASI grant funds for FY 2017 and FY 2018, respectively. The Trump administration has stated that it will cut federal funds to sanctuary jurisdictions, which may include several within BAUSI area. The Alameda County Board of Supervisors shall send a request to jurisdictions within the BAUSI 12-county area to identify non-UASI grants and/or funds from their own resources for disaster preparedness, in order to replace dependence on UASI funds. In addition, the Board will survey the below-named jurisdictions that have not participated in Urban Shield for a number of years, requesting the following information:
   a) Why have you not participated in Urban Shield? What has the effect been, if any?
   b) What programs have been implemented to address preparedness for critical emergencies?
   c) How have community-based programs responded or grown since the city stopped participating in Urban Shield?
   d) Who participates in them (name departments)? Do community members or civilians participate?
   e) What are the contents of the trainings, and who runs them?
   f) What do these trainings emphasize? (Ex. natural disaster, mass casualty, terrorist attack, etc.)
   g) What are the stated objectives of these trainings?
   h) How do these trainings facilitate relationships between emergency workers and the community?
   i) What is the number of professional development days?
   j) Do you receive training in projects for recovery from critical emergencies?
   k) How do you meet your budget for these trainings? Through city or county?
   l) What is the general procedure for responding to mass casualty events? (Who responds?)
   m) (For emergency services) Do you have trainings or events coming up that are open to the public?

   The Alameda County Sheriff's Office shall verify which law enforcement tactical teams of the following jurisdictions did not participate in Urban Shield for three or more of the last ten years or did not apply to participate in 2016: Menlo Park PD; Palo Alto PD; Mountain View PD; Santa Clara County Sheriff; Vallejo PD; Santa Cruz PD; Watsonville PD; Pacifica PD; Napa County city PDs; Sonoma County city PDs; Marin County city PDs; except Novato

E. Risk Relevance ratings should prioritize risks to people in the Bay Area, especially those who are vulnerable to harm in emergencies, not to non-human assets.

V. IMPACT ON THE COMMUNITY

A. By majority vote, the USTF suspended its discussion on Question 5 and did not vote on the draft response or draft recommendations for this question. The rationale provided was that because the Urban Shield Task Force does not represent vulnerable communities or those most impacted by Urban Shield, it is not the right body to make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors about the community impact of Urban Shield.

ALAMEDA COUNTY URBAN SHIELD TASK FORCE: SUMMARY REPORT

Muntu Davis, Chair, Urban Shield Task Force (USTF)

Feb 27, 2018

Alameda County Board of Supervisors

THE TASK FORCE: 17 MEMBERS

- 5 appointees – 1 from each office of the Alameda County Board of Supervisors
- 1 member appointed by Alameda County Sheriff's Office
- 1 association member appointed by Alameda County Chiefs of Police and Sheriff's Association
- 1 staff member from the Red Cross Alameda County
- Health Officer, appointed by the Alameda County Health Care Services Agency
- 1 member from the Alameda and Contra Costa County Medical Association
- 2 members from Stop Urban Shield Coalition
- 1 local Civil Rights Attorney appointed by the Alameda County Bar Association
- 1 staff member or Superintendent appointed by the Alameda County Board of Education
- 1 staff member appointed from BART/AC Transit system
- County Fire Chief, selected by Alameda County Fire Chiefs Association
- Director of Alameda County Emergency Medical Services

THE TASK FORCE: PROCESS

Seven (7) meetings

1. Orientation
2. Presentation and discussion about information from the County Sheriff's Department and Stop Urban Shield
3. Open forum discussion by Task Force about the questions and related issues
4. Small group strategy session
5. Small group response formation and recommendations
6. Review and approval of draft responses and recommendations for questions 1, 2, and 3
7. Review and approval of draft responses and recommendations for questions 4 and 5

DOES THE URBAN SHIELD PROJECT MEET FEDERAL GUIDELINES SET OUT IN THE URBAN AREA SECURITY INITIATIVE (UASI) GRANT?

Question #1 (Q1)

TASK FORCE Q1 RESPONSE

The USTF concluded that Urban Shield meets the federal guidelines set out in the UASI grant. Evidence shows that Urban Shield training receives approval from the Bay Area UASI Approval Authority, which uses the criteria for regional funding proposals. Urban Shield also meets federal Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP) guidelines, which require the development of exercise plans, exercise evaluator handbooks, Master Scenario Events Lists (MELS), Team Binders, Exercise Evaluation Guides and After-Action Reports (AARs). Additionally, the Bay Area UASI funds[4] have been spent in accordance to the federal guidelines that govern the UASI grant as specified in the Homeland Security Act of 2002.

[4] Bay Area Urban Area Security Initiative Project Proposal Guidance for Fiscal Year2017 -August 2016, http://www.bayareauasi.org/sites/default/files/resources/FY2017%20Project%20Proposal%20Guidance%20-%20Final.pdf.

TASK FORCE Q1 RECOMMENDATIONS

I. ACCOUNTABILITY & TRANSPARENCY

A. **Require and ensure execution of the following Principles and Guidelines established and outlined in the Sheriff's January 6, 2017, Board Letter** for the Fiscal Year 2016 Urban Area Security Initiative Agreement. **Before each UASI funding request, require reporting on adherence to these principles and guidelines.**

- Expand community involvement and awareness
- Urban Shield will be free from racist stereotyping
- Work to expand training the medical profession for critical incidents
- Urban Shield will not include surveillance training
- Continue to examine new technology and equipment

I. ACCOUNTABILITY & TRANSPARENCY

- Urban Shield will not include crowd control training
- Continue to evaluate existing equipment
- Urban Shield will exclude any and all vendors who display derogatory or racist messages in any form
- Urban Shield will exclude the sale or transfer of any assault weapons and firearms
- Will exclude vendors displaying non-law enforcement related tactical uniforms and equipment
- Urban Shield will strive to maintain the finest first responder training possible

I. ACCOUNTABILITY & TRANSPARENCY

B. **Ensure inclusion and execution of the following, "Urban Shield should disallow countries from participating in Urban Shield who have documented Human Rights abuses",** which was previously approved by the Alameda County Board of Supervisors, in the above Principles and Guidelines.

C. **The Sheriff's Office shall provide an annual report to the Board of Supervisors prior to the consideration of UASI funding** for 2018 by the Board of Supervisors.

D. **The Sheriff's Office shall report to the Alameda County Board of Supervisors on** the implementation of the twelve (12) guidelines for Urban Shield approved by the Board in January 2017 and **implementation of other Task Force recommendations that may be adopted by the Board.**

IS URBAN SHIELD STRICTLY AN EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM?

Question #2 (Q2)

TASK FORCE Q2 RESPONSE

The USTF concluded that Urban Shield is strictly an emergency preparedness program, with room for improvement in implementing the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) "Whole Community" approach to emergency management through activities for a) preparedness, b) crisis response, c) community and economic recovery. (See included footnotes and the final *Additional Info* section of the Summary Report.)

Preparedness is defined by the national Department of Homeland Security (DHS)/Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) as "a continuous cycle of planning, organizing, training, equipping, exercising, evaluating and taking corrective action in an effort to ensure effective coordination during

TASK FORCE Q2 RESPONSE

incident response, and a shared responsibility; it calls for the involvement of everyone – not just the government – in preparedness efforts. By working together, everyone can help keep the nation safe from harm and help keep it resilient when struck by hazards such as natural disasters, acts of terrorism and pandemics."

Because the federal UASI grant program's objective is to assist "high-threat, high-density Urban Areas in efforts to build, sustain, and deliver the capabilities necessary to prevent, protect against, mitigate, respond to and recover from acts of terrorism" and 25% of the grant funding is to be used for law enforcement, **Urban Shield activities have focused mainly on trainings and exercises for law enforcement but have expanded to include**

TASK FORCE Q2 RESPONSE

first responders and other emergency management personnel. **It has also recently implemented the Grey (and Green) Command to include some activities for community preparedness.**

The **Urban Shield Task Force remains unclear on both the determination and application of the Threat Hazard Identifications and Risk Assessment (THIRA) in drafting exercise scenarios, prioritizing capability targets and gaps, and selecting capabilities to be tested and gaps to be addressed** each year and over multiple years and, for this reason, did not make specific recommendations about these topics.

Some members expressed deep concerns that Bay Area UASI's Risk Relevance Ratings show core capabilities such as "Health and Human

TASK FORCE Q2 RESPONSE

Services", "Economic and Community Recovery", "Long-Term Vulnerability Reduction", "Housing", "Public Health and Medical Services", and "Natural and Cultural Resources", ALL as having low risk relevance, while "Cyber Security", "On-Scene Security and Protection", and "Screening, Search and Detection" are rated as having the highest risk relevance.

TASK FORCE Q2 RECOMMENDATIONS

II. WHOLE COMMUNITY APPROACH

A. Include the “Whole Community” in planning and exercises, e.g., conduct tabletop exercises with the community in the 13 Bay Area UASI counties leading up to a full-scale exercise in September. The example could be 4 tabletop exercises using the UASI Urban Area HUB (East Bay, West Bay, South Bay and North Bay).

B. Report on emergency preparedness activities in publicly available exercise documentation and/or summary reports, if not done already.

C. Train and exercise non-terrorism scenarios that can justifiably support terrorism preparedness, including prevention and recovery, and be in alignment with FEMA’s “Whole Community” approach to emergency management.

IN THE EVENT OF AN EMERGENCY/ATTACK OR NATURAL DISASTER, WILL PUBLIC SAFETY AGENCIES, PUBLIC HEALTH AND OTHER EMERGENCY RESPONSE DEPARTMENTS, BE ADEQUATELY TRAINED AND EQUIPPED TO RESPOND TO SUCH DISASTERS WITHOUT THE TRAINING OFFERED BY URBAN SHIELD?

Question #3 (Q3)

TASK FORCE Q3 RESPONSE

In relationship to public safety, public health and other emergency response departments that have been involved, interagency coordination between them has improved with Urban Shield.

No other significant sources of funding appear to be available for regional large-scale preparedness trainings and full-scale exercises.

TASK FORCE Q3 RECOMMENDATIONS

III. FUNDING

Identify and seek additional grant funding for local regional large full-scale training and exercises for community preparedness and response training activities that is consistent with the Urban Shield Task Force recommendations.

DO THE TERMS, CONDITIONS AND GUIDELINES OF THIS PROGRAM MEET THE DEMAND FOR THE BAY AREA REGION TO BE PREPARED TO RESPOND TO NATURAL DISASTER (FIRE, EARTHQUAKE, ETC.) OR A TERRORIST ACT?

Question #4 (Q4)

TASK FORCE Q4 RESPONSE

The USTF was unable to come to agreement on this question in relationship to Urban Shield. It remains unclear 1) how the assessment of the risk relevance, level of capability, and gap level is determined, and 2) how the Regional Threat Hazard Identifications and Risk Assessment (THIRA) is applied when selecting and drafting exercise scenarios, prioritizing capability targets and gaps, and selecting capabilities to be tested and gaps to be addressed each year and over multiple years.

Bay Area UASI's Risk Relevance ratings show core capabilities such as "Health and Human Services", "Economic and Community Recovery", "Long-Term Vulnerability Reduction", "Housing", "Public Health and Medical Services", and "Natural and Cultural Resources" ALL as having low

TASK FORCE Q4 RESPONSE

risk relevance, while “Cyber Security”, “On-Scene Security and Protection”, and “Screening, Search and Detection” are rated as having the highest risk relevance.[5]

The USTF was in agreement that more could be done to meet the demand for whole community preparedness. Urban Shield has included a component for community preparedness. This component is separate from the full-scale exercise activities with first responders and emergency management personnel.

[5] See Items 7 and 8 in July 2017 Bay Aare UASI Approval Authority Meeting Master, at http://bauasi.org/sites/default/files/resources/071317%20Approval%20Authority%20July%20Meeting%20Master.pdf.

TASK FORCE Q4 RECOMMENDATIONS

IV. TRAINING AND EXERCISES

A. Training and exercises should also focus emergency preparedness efforts on prevention of and recovery from emergencies in addition to response to such emergencies.
B. Incorporate, where applicable, risks to people especially those who are vulnerable to harm in emergencies in Alameda County.
C. Increase funding for the Urban Shield exercise to incorporate additional preparedness activities to support FEMA's "whole community" inclusion approach. By doing so, the County will be better prepared and more resilient to emergencies.

IV. TRAINING AND EXERCISES

D. Proposal for study: The Obama and Trump administrations sought steep cuts in UASI grant funds for FY 2017 and FY 2018, respectively. The Trump administration has stated that it will cut federal funds to sanctuary jurisdictions, which may include several within BAUSI area. The Alameda County Board of Supervisors shall send a request to jurisdictions within the BAUSI 12-county area to identify non-UASI grants and/or funds from their own resources for disaster preparedness, in order to replace dependence on UASI funds. In addition, the Board will survey the below-named jurisdictions that have not participated in Urban Shield for a number of years, requesting the following information:

IV. TRAINING AND EXERCISES

1. Why have you not participated in Urban Shield? What has the effect been, if any?
2. What programs have been implemented to address preparedness for critical emergencies?
3. How have community-based programs responded or grown since the city stopped participating in Urban Shield?
4. Who participates in them (name departments)? Do community members or civilians participate?
5. What are the contents of the trainings, and who runs them?
6. What do these trainings emphasize? (Ex. natural disaster, mass casualty, terrorist attack, etc.)

IV. TRAINING AND EXERCISES

7. What are the stated objectives of these trainings?
8. How do these trainings facilitate relationships between emergency workers and the community?
9. What is the number of professional development days?
10. Do you receive training in projects for recovery from critical emergencies?
11. How do you meet your budget for these trainings? Through city or county?
12. What is the general procedure for responding to mass casualty events? (Who responds?)

IV. TRAINING AND EXERCISES

13. (For emergency services) Do you have trainings or events coming up that are open to the public?

The Alameda County Sheriff's Office shall verify which law enforcement tactical teams of the following jurisdictions did not participate in Urban Shield for three or more of the last ten years or did not apply to participate in 2016: Menlo Park PD; Palo Alto PD; Mountain View PD; Santa Clara County Sheriff; Vallejo PD; Santa Cruz PD; Watsonville PD; Pacifica PD; Napa County city PDs; Sonoma County city PDs; Marin County city PDs; except Novato.

IV. TRAINING AND EXERCISES

E. Risk Relevance ratings should prioritize risks to people in the Bay Area, especially those who are vulnerable to harm in emergencies, not to non-human assets.

WHAT IS THE IMPACT OF URBAN SHIELD ON THE COMMUNITY'S RELATIONSHIP WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT AND OTHER EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS RESPONDERS SUCH AS THE PUBLIC HEALTH DEPARTMENT; HEALTH CARE AGENCIES; PUBLIC EDUCATION AGENCIES; PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AGENCIES; FIRE DEPARTMENTS; AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES?

Question #5 (Q5)

TASK FORCE Q5 RESPONSE

By majority vote, the USTF suspended its discussion on Question 5 and did <u>not</u> vote on the draft response.

The rationale provided was that because the Urban Shield Task Force does not represent vulnerable communities or those most impacted by Urban Shield, it is not the right body to make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors about the community impact of Urban Shield.

TASK FORCE Q5 RECOMMENDATIONS

IV. IMPACT ON COMMUNITY

By majority vote, the USTF did not vote on the draft recommendations for this question.

THANK YOU. QUESTIONS?