



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.