

DISASTER AND CONTINGENCY PLANNING

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY,
SAN MARCOS**

**Report Number 03-36
September 9, 2003**

Members, Committee on Audit

Shailesh J. Mehta, Chair
Roberta Achtenberg, Vice Chair
Debra S. Farar William Hauck
Frederick W. Pierce, IV Daniel Weinstein

Staff

University Auditor: Larry Mandel
Senior Director: Janice Mirza
Audit Manager: Jim Usher

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

CONTENTS

Executive Summary	1
Introduction.....	2
Background.....	2
Purpose.....	3
Scope and Methodology	4

OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CAMPUS RESPONSES

Emergency Readiness	6
Plan Updating.....	6
Position Designees	7
Emergency Building Coordinators.....	8
Subordinate Plan Integration.....	8
Constituency Orientation/Plan Communication	9
Mutual Aid Agreements.....	10
Plan Testing	11
Facility Issues.....	12
Business Continuity	13

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A:	Personnel Contacted
APPENDIX B:	Campus Response
APPENDIX C:	Chancellor's Acceptance

ABBREVIATIONS

CSU	California State University
CSUSM	California State University, San Marcos
DCP	Disaster and Contingency Planning
DRII	Disaster Recovery Institute International
EO	Executive Order
EOC	Emergency Operations Center
IITS	Instructional and Information Technology Services
SEMS	Standardized Emergency Management System
SUAM	State University Administrative Manual

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As a result of a systemwide risk assessment conducted by the Office of the University Auditor during the last quarter of 2002, the Board of Trustees, at its January 2003 meeting, directed that *Disaster and Contingency Planning* (DCP) be reviewed. DCP was partially audited in 1997 in a sequence of audits on Seismic Safety and Disaster Readiness.

We visited the California State University, San Marcos (CSUSM) campus from April 1, 2003, through May 9, 2003, and audited the procedures in effect at that time.

In our opinion, the administration and management of DCP activities needed to be significantly improved to ensure reasonable preparation, response, and recovery.

The following summary provides management with an overview of conditions requiring attention. Areas of review not mentioned in this section were found to be satisfactory. Numbers in brackets [] refer to page numbers in the report.

EMERGENCY READINESS [6]

The campus did not have its emergency preparedness plan consolidated in an up-to-date document. Needed improvements included: filling vacant plan positions, providing for concurrent absences, establishing building coordinators, integrating related/subordinate plans with the campus-wide emergency management plan, publicizing the plan and emergency management expectations/responsibilities through such means as better orientation, formalizing reciprocity agreements, and conducting more systematic exercises and tests.

FACILITY ISSUES [12]

Although the campus was planning for a dedicated emergency operations center (EOC), the current EOC was not as well supplied as some of the “go-boxes” in the possession of emergency responders, and inventories of available supplies were infrequently performed.

BUSINESS CONTINUITY [13]

The campus did not have any completed business continuity plans, which could put vital records at risk that the campus would not be able to recreate.

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

Government Code §8680.3 defines **disaster** to mean:

A fire, flood, storm, tidal wave, earthquake, terrorism, epidemic, or other similar public calamity that the governor determines presents a threat to public safety.

In California Code of Regulations, Title 19, §2402, Standardized Emergency Management System Regulations, **emergency** is defined to mean:

A condition of disaster or of extreme peril to the safety of persons and property caused by such conditions as air pollution, fire, flood, hazardous material incident, storm, epidemic, riot, drought, sudden and severe energy shortage, plant or animal infestations or disease, the governor's warning of an earthquake or volcanic prediction, or an earthquake or other conditions, other than conditions resulting from a labor controversy.

Mohammad Qayoumi, Vice President for Administration and Finance and Chief Financial Officer at California State University, Northridge, recently authored a book entitled, *Mission Continuity Planning*, published by the National Association of College and University Business Officers. This publication defines two types of disasters: 1) those that happen suddenly and without notice (e.g., earthquakes), and 2) phased disasters where there can be early warning of eminent danger (e.g., winter storms).

Since the September 11th terrorist attacks, there have been a number of federal initiatives affecting colleges and universities including controls over international students and registration requirements surrounding select agents and toxins. The federal Department of Homeland Security has implemented a new system called Student and Exchange Visitor Information System (SEVIS) to record and monitor information about international students. Other federal agencies including Health and Human Services and the Center for Disease Control have also issued regulations.

Two sources of industry guidance on standards and terminology are *Business Continuity: Best Practices* as defined by the Business Continuity Institute and a *Glossary of Terms* from the Disaster Recovery Institute International (DRII). In *Best Practice*, a disaster recovery plan is "a plan to resume a specific essential operation, function or process of an enterprise." The DRII's *Glossary of Terms* describes disaster recovery as an "approved set of arrangements and procedures that enable an organization to respond to a disaster and resume its critical business functions within a defined time frame."

Disaster recovery/emergency preparedness plans are required of state agencies by Government Code §8607(a), which states:

The Office of Emergency Services, in coordination with all interested state agencies with designated response roles in the state emergency plan and interested local emergency management agencies shall jointly establish by regulation a standardized emergency management system for use by all emergency response agencies.

The Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS) is the system required by Government Code §8607(a) for managing response to multi-agency and multi-jurisdiction emergencies in California. SEMS consists of five organizational levels, which are activated as necessary: field response, local government, operational area, regional, and state. By standardizing key elements of the emergency management system, SEMS is intended to facilitate the flow of information within and between levels of the system and facilitate coordination among all responding agencies. SEMS incorporates the use of five essential Incident Command System functions: command, operations, planning/intelligence, logistics, and finance/administration.

Business/mission continuity is frequently considered a broader term than emergency planning. The goal of emergency planning is to address the immediate impacts of the disaster and to respond as needed to bring the emergency to closure. Business/mission continuity is a continuing cycle of preparation that includes:



PURPOSE

Our overall audit objective was to ascertain the effectiveness of existing policies and procedures related to the administration of *Disaster and Contingency Planning* (DCP) activity and to determine the adequacy of controls over the related processes to ensure compliance with relevant governmental regulations, Trustee policy, Office of the Chancellor directives, and campus procedures.

Within the overall audit objective, specific goals included determining whether:

- ▶ Campuses have developed DCP and other processes that address the most probable incidents that may affect the safety of personnel, damage assets, or cause significant business interruptions and that are also designed to comply with recent terrorism measures.
- ▶ Buildings can be safely secured and evacuated, when appropriate, or configured for sheltering-in-place in response to disasters or emergencies.
- ▶ The DCP plan is adequately tested and maintained.
- ▶ Equipment, information (such as the amount of hazardous materials or number of occupants in a building), supplies, and trained personnel will be available when needed.
- ▶ Campuses have a well-equipped emergency operations center.
- ▶ Buildings have been retrofitted to the extent practical and reasonable facility measures have been taken such as anchoring furniture and other potential falling objects, providing adequate fire suppression measures, and securing building ventilation and air handling systems so potential biological agents cannot be easily introduced to contaminate widespread areas.
- ▶ Campuses have done what they can to reduce the risk of power interruptions.
- ▶ Reasonable business continuity plans have been formulated according to priorities established for critical business applications, processes, and systems.
- ▶ Continuity of operations beyond initial response periods is realistically addressed.

SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

The proposed scope of the audit as presented in Attachment B, Agenda Item 2 of the January 23-24, 2003, meeting of the Committee on Audit, stated that DCP includes program and facility readiness and resource planning for actions related to natural and man-made disasters and the recovery there from. Potential impacts include injury of students, staff, faculty, and visitors; disruption of programs and services; financial exposures; damage claims from injured parties; and property damage.

Our study and evaluation were conducted in accordance with the *Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing* issued by the Institute of Internal Auditors, and included the audit tests we considered necessary in determining that operational and administrative controls are in place and operative. This review emphasized, but was not limited to, compliance with state and federal laws, Board of Trustee policies, and Office of the Chancellor and campus policies, letters, and directives. Industry-wide standards were also considered. The audit review period was July 1, 2001 to date. At CSUSM, the public safety department has overall responsibility for DCP.

Our primary focus involved the internal administrative, compliance, and operational controls over DCP management. Specifically, we reviewed and tested:

- ▶ DCP policies and procedures.
- ▶ DCP plans.
- ▶ Availability of DCP resources including communication systems, equipment, and supplies.
- ▶ Mutual aid agreements.
- ▶ Extent of exercises/tests of DCP capabilities.
- ▶ Training of DCP personnel.
- ▶ Registration and monitoring of visa students.
- ▶ Control of select agents and toxins regulated by the federal government.
- ▶ Preparation of facilities to withstand disasters.
- ▶ Business/mission continuity arrangements for critical processes.

OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CAMPUS RESPONSES

EMERGENCY READINESS

PLAN UPDATING

The campus did not have an up-to-date emergency management plan.

We noted that the campus had several campus-wide emergency management planning documents in various stages of development, including the:

- ▶ Multi-Hazard Emergency Operations Plan, dated January 2001, portions of which had already been superseded.
- ▶ Emergency Management Plan Draft, dated April 21, 2002, that was gradually being updated.
- ▶ Campus Emergency Plan Summary, dated January 2003, which was available electronically on the campus web site.

Executive Order (EO) No. 696, *Implementation of the California State University Emergency Preparedness Program*, dated January 29, 1999, requires the campus president to assure that the emergency management system is maintained and regularly updated.

The chief of police stated that he was the only one on campus who had anything in his position description covering emergency management responsibilities. He further stated that the position description estimated emergency planning as only ten percent of his responsibilities.

The absence of a current, updated emergency plan undermines the ability of the campus to properly respond to disasters.

Recommendation 1

We recommend that the campus complete its emergency management plan consolidation in an up-to-date document and implement planning software as soon as is practical.

Campus Response

We concur. By December 30, 2003, the university will complete the updated and consolidated emergency management plan document. At the time of this audit, the university had recently acquired the Bowmac software to assist with the development of the emergency plan. Upon closer review, it was determined that this software will not be efficient for this purpose. Therefore, the university will not implement and use this software program for its emergency plan review and update.

POSITION DESIGNEES

The roster of designees in key emergency plan positions was incomplete, and procedures for concurrent absences had not been established.

We noted that:

- ▶ The campus emergency management organization was comprised of 68 positions assigned to five Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS) designated functions, including 18 in management, 14 in operations, 12 in planning, 12 in logistics, and 12 in finance. Eight of these positions were unfilled. In addition, two individuals were listed twice, first as a primary and secondarily as an alternate in a different capacity, and one of the primary designees had recently separated employment.
- ▶ Review of absences due to vacation, sick leave, or travel indicated that there were ten instances over approximately the last year when both the primary and alternate in six key plan positions were unavailable with no specific provision for coverage in the event that an emergency had been declared. Only public safety had a procedure for absences of the primary and alternate in designated plan positions.

Title 5 §41302 states that during periods of campus emergency, as determined by the president of the individual campus, the president may, after consultation with the chancellor, place into immediate effect any emergency regulations, procedures, and other measures deemed necessary or appropriate to meet the emergency, safeguard persons and property, and maintain educational activities.

The California Office of Emergency Services' Standardized Emergency Management System Guidelines, Part I.B, dated December 23, 1994, states that the deputy incident commander should have the same qualifications as the incident commander. It further states that optional deputy positions for command, section, and branch levels provide backup support and are also used extensively on an inter-agency basis to improve coordination between multiple agencies or disciplines.

The chief of police stated that the campus had only recently begun appointing position alternates. The vice president for finance and administrative services/chief financial officer stated that it was a goal of the campus to simplify the plan enough so that others could easily substitute for the primary and alternate designees.

The ability of the campus to activate the emergency management plan and effectively respond to emergencies is compromised if personnel that have been trained for key plan positions are unavailable.

Recommendation 2

We recommend that the campus:

- a. Maintain a full complement of designees in key plan positions.

- b. Establish procedures to handle concurrent absences of those with emergency management responsibilities.

Campus Response

We concur with all recommendations. Specifically:

- a. By December 30, 2003, the university will complete the updated emergency management plan document which will assign key plan positions and primary and secondary designees.
- b. By December 30, 2003, the university will develop protocol to manage concurrent absences of key plan positions.

EMERGENCY BUILDING COORDINATORS

The campus did not have a recognized network of trained coordinators to assist in emergencies.

We noted that the library had appointed its own coordinators, and the risk manager had informal arrangements with two individuals in the science building. However, none of these individuals had any specialized emergency training.

EO No. 696, *Implementation of the California State University Emergency Preparedness Program*, dated January 29, 1999, requires that there be adequate training of emergency personnel. The extent of emergency personnel necessary to establish a cadre of trained individuals is assumed.

The chief of police stated that the campus' need for emergency coordinators was a factor of size, and the need was developing as the campus grows.

Emergency responsiveness may be delayed without a trained team of building coordinators to lead emergency evacuations.

Recommendation 3

We recommend that the campus establish a network of emergency coordinators and provide them with the required training.

Campus Response

We concur. By March 9, 2004, the university will adopt the concept of a building coordinator program. Specifically, the existing building evacuation program will be formalized in writing, establishing protocol and procedures for mobilizing building evacuation and providing training to evacuation team members.

SUBORDINATE PLAN INTEGRATION

A number of related/subordinate emergency plans had been independently developed but not centrally reviewed and approved to ensure coordination with the campus-wide emergency management plan.

These plans included:

- ▶ Risk Analysis and Disaster Recovery Plan – Instructional and Information Technology Services (IITS). This plan included the central computer center, the campus network, and other IITS assets. It specifically excluded procedures for any other campus departments.
- ▶ Library Evacuation Procedures.
- ▶ Fiscal Operations Emergency Preparedness.
- ▶ Stage 3 Emergency Energy Procedures.

EO No. 696, *Implementation of the California State University Emergency Preparedness Program*, dated January 29, 1999, requires that there be maintenance and regular updating of the emergency management system.

The chief of police stated that integration of plans was an objective prioritized by the emergency planning advisory committee.

The existence of plans with conflicting provisions will detract from the ability of the campus to effectively respond to emergencies.

Recommendation 4

We recommend that the campus establish a means to ensure that related/subordinate plans receive proper review and approval and synchronize with the campus-wide emergency management plan.

Campus Response

We concur. By March 9, 2004, the university will develop a template to be used for the university's business continuity plan. This template will be used to bring existing department plans into a common format and will include authorization requiring all subordinate plans to go through a centralized point for review.

CONSTITUENCY ORIENTATION/PLAN COMMUNICATION

Faculty and students did not receive the same type of emergency management plan orientation as staff, and the plan was not well communicated.

New staff received some orientation for emergency preparedness through monthly sessions offered by risk management and safety. However, new student orientation conducted by student affairs and new faculty orientation conducted through the faculty center excluded emergency preparedness.

EO No. 696, *Implementation of the California State University Emergency Preparedness Program*, dated January 29, 1999, establishes the responsibilities in support of an effective emergency management system including communication.

The dean of students and the director of the faculty center stated that their orientation agendas were full and that the availability of time to address this subject was a concern.

Constituents that are unfamiliar with emergency procedures could cause unnecessary confusion and denigrate response capabilities.

Recommendation 5

We recommend that the campus include presentations of emergency preparedness during new faculty and new student orientations.

Campus Response

We concur. Specifically:

- a. By March 9, 2004, a campus policy will be established to outline the requirements for campus emergency planning, including the building evacuation program; subordinate plan integration; and communication of emergency preparedness information to new students, staff, and faculty.
- b. By March 9, 2004, we will develop emergency preparedness communications for new students, staff, and faculty.

MUTUAL AID AGREEMENTS

None of the campus mutual aid agreements were in writing.

Campus management indicated that they had reciprocity agreements with the City of San Marcos, San Diego County Sheriff, and San Diego State University; however, the agreements had not been formalized. Campus management also mentioned other discussions with local community colleges in the vicinity.

EO No. 696, *Implementation of the California State University Emergency Preparedness Program*, dated January 29, 1999, requires the campus residents to assure that there is periodic testing of mutual aid agreements.

The chief of police stated that the campus had identified the need to update plans as their first priority and other activities would follow.

The absence of written agreements increases the potential for confusion and the inability of the campus to effectively respond to emergencies.

Recommendation 6

We recommend that the campus formalize emergency management mutual aid arrangements with other entities.

Campus Response

We concur. By June 30, 2004, the university will formalize agreements with its vendors and other organizations for assistance or support in an emergency.

PLAN TESTING

The campus emergency management plan had not been extensively tested.

Specifically, testing was limited as follows:

- ▶ Two randomly occurring emergency situations presented opportunities to test the plan, a blasting incident on July 30, 2001, and a water main break on March 8, 2003.
- ▶ A pre-planned fire drill at the Rancheros Drive leased facility on January 25, 2002.
- ▶ A simulated earthquake exercise with the emergency management plan finance designated function on January 27, 2003.
- ▶ No campus-wide exercises or tests either on the campus or in any of the other leased facilities.

EO No. 696, *Implementation of the California State University Emergency Preparedness Program*, dated January 29, 1999, requires the campus president to assure that there is periodic testing of simulated emergency incidents.

The chief of police stated that it was premature to test the plan before the revisions were complete.

Inadequate testing of the emergency management plan increases the possibility that it will not work when needed.

Recommendation 7

We recommend that the campus periodically test simulated emergency situations across a broader section of the campus.

Campus Response

We concur. By December 30, 2003, the university will establish and implement a schedule to conduct tabletop exercises and drills on a regular basis.

FACILITY ISSUES

Although the campus was planning for a dedicated emergency operations center (EOC), the current EOC was not as well supplied as some of the “go-boxes” in the possession of emergency responders, and inventories of available supplies were infrequently performed.

We noted that:

- ▶ The existing EOC was a conference room in the university services building with a locked storage closet used for EOC purposes. Within this locked closet were several small containers labeled for each of the five SEMS designated functions. We also found emergency supplies in a locked storage bin near the visual and performing arts annex, which is adjacent to the current EOC location.
- ▶ Several designated function coordinators had their own go-boxes with supplies that were more current and comprehensive than what was available in the EOC.
- ▶ The only inventories of emergency supplies in a storage shed, which had been dedicated for this purpose, were from January 1998 and five years later in March 2003.
- ▶ Procurement Services had an extensive go-box at the Rancheros Drive office that was significantly better than the supplies maintained in the EOC.

EO No. 696, *Implementation of the California State University Emergency Preparedness Program*, dated January 29, 1999, requires the campus president to determine, acquire, and maintain facilities, equipment and related supplies for emergency preparedness.

The vice president for finance and administrative services/chief financial officer stated that the campus was seeking a donation for the permanent EOC.

Inadequate facilities, equipment, and related supplies denigrate the ability of the campus to properly respond to emergencies.

Recommendation 8

We recommend that the campus establish supplies in multiple locations and maintain a current inventory of all available items that is regularly updated and screened for obsolescence.

Campus Response

We concur. By March 9, 2004, the university will establish duplicate emergency supplies in multiple campus locations, and develop a procedure for inventorying supplies on a regular basis and replacing obsolete items as needed.

BUSINESS CONTINUITY

The campus did not have any completed business continuity plans, putting vital records at risk that the campus would not be able to recreate.

We noted that the campus had started business continuity planning through recent activities in information technology, and campus departments were being informed with respect to how long they would have to operate without automated tools and system technology. In addition, departments were starting to draft workaround systems and procedures. However, the campus had not identified vital records that would be considered irreplaceable.

State Administrative Manual §4843.1 requires each state agency to establish and maintain both an operational recovery plan and a plan to resume operations following a disaster.

The CSUSM January 2001 *Multi-Hazard Emergency Management Plan* addresses vital records protection.

The director of systems development and software engineering stated that the campus was still in the process of establishing disaster response plans for automated applications and systems before broader business recovery plans could be completed.

Without a business continuity plan, disaster recovery would be more difficult.

Recommendation 9

We recommend that the campus establish a comprehensive business continuity plan including the protection of vital records.

Campus Response

We concur. By March 9, 2004, the university will accomplish the following:

- a. Perform a risk assessment to determine the types of emergency events that pose the greatest threat to the university and what impact these events would have on key university operations.
- b. Prioritize key university operations essential for recovery after an event.

- c. Develop a template to be used for the consistent development of the university's business continuity plan which will also be used to transfer existing university department plans into a common format that aligns with the emergency management plan and includes protection of vital records.

APPENDIX A: PERSONNEL CONTACTED

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>
Alexander Gonzalez	President (at time of review)
Roy McTarnaghan	Interim President
Shirley Brady	Interim Controller
George Cagala	Publications Manager
Carla Charlow	Accounts Payable Lead, Direct Pay/Travel
Russ Decker	Director, Planning, Design and Construction
Barbara Dovenbarger	Director of Internal Audit
Charles Evans	Deputy Building Official and Campus Fire Marshall
Regina Frasca	Director, Risk Management and Safety
Steve Garcia	Vice President, Finance and Administrative Services/Chief Financial Officer
Vicki Golich	Director, Faculty Center and Interim Chair, Political Science
Suzanne Green	Associate Vice President, Finance and Business Services
Deborah High	Safety Officer
Irene LaPolice	Deputy Controller, Payroll Services
Linda Leiter	Associate Vice President, Human Relations and Campus Enterprises
Dean Manship	Special Assistant
Danielle McMartin	International Student and Scholar Advisor
Gil Oswald	Drafting Technician, Facility Services
Jonathan Poullard	Dean of Students
Marion Reid	Dean, Library and Information Services
Jeri Richards	Technical Specialist, Enrollment Services
Richard Riehl	Executive Director, Enrollment Services
Tom Schultheis	Chief of Police
Deborah Smith	Risk Manager
Abigail Stone	Resource and Special Projects Manager
Art Torres	Director, Procurement and Support Services
Wayne Veres	Director, Systems Development and Software Engineering
Chuck Walden	Interim Director, Facility Services
Bill Ward	Director, Telecommunications and Network Operations
Peter Zwick	Director, University Global Affairs



Office of the CFO and Vice President, Finance and Administrative Services
California State University San Marcos San Marcos, California 92096-0001 USA
Tel: 760 750-4950; Fax: 760 750-4949
www.csusm.edu

MEMORANDUM



DATE: October 1, 2003

TO: Larry Mandel
University Auditor
The California State University

FROM: Stephen G. Garcia
Chief Financial Officer and Vice President
Finance and Administrative Services
California State University San Marcos

SUBJECT: Campus Responses to Audit Report
Disaster and Contingency Planning 03-36

Attached for your consideration and acceptance are campus responses to the recommendations of Disaster and Contingency Planning Audit 03-36 dated September 9, 2003 for California State University San Marcos.

Please contact Barbara Dovenbarger, Director of Internal Audit, if we can be of further assistance. She may be reached by email at dove@csusm.edu or by phone at (760) 750-4955.

SGG:kjh

cc: President McTarnaghan

DISASTER AND CONTINGENCY PLANNING

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY,
SAN MARCOS**

REPORT NO. 03-36

EMERGENCY READINESS

PLAN UPDATING

Recommendation 1

We recommend that the campus complete its emergency management plan consolidation in an up-to-date document and implement planning software as soon as is practical.

Campus Response

We concur. By December 30, 2003, the University will complete the updated and consolidated emergency management plan document. At the time of this audit, the University had recently acquired the Bowmac software to assist with the development of the emergency plan. Upon closer review, it was determined that this software will not be efficient for this purpose. Therefore, the University will not implement and use this software program for its emergency plan review and update.

POSITION DESIGNEES

Recommendation 2

We recommend that the campus:

- a. Maintain a full complement of designees in key plan positions.
- b. Establish procedures to handle concurrent absences of those with emergency management responsibilities.

Campus Response

We concur with all recommendations. Specifically:

- a) By December 30, 2003, the University will complete the updated emergency management plan document which will assign key plan positions and primary and secondary designees.
- b) By December 30, 2003, the University will develop protocol to manage concurrent absences of key plan positions.

EMERGENCY BUILDING COORDINATORS

Recommendation 3

We recommend that the campus establish a network of emergency coordinators and provide them with the required training.

Campus Response

We concur. By March 9, 2004, the University will adopt the concept of a Building Coordinator Program. Specifically:

The existing Building Evacuation Program will be formalized in writing, establishing protocol and procedures for mobilizing building evacuation and providing training to evacuation team members.

SUBORDINATE PLAN INTEGRATION

Recommendation 4

We recommend that the campus establish a means to ensure that related/subordinate plans receive proper review and approval and synchronize with the campus-wide emergency management plan.

Campus Response

We concur. By March 9, 2004, the University will develop a template to be used for the University's Business Continuity Plan. This template will be used to bring existing department plans into a common format and will include authorization requiring all subordinate plans to go through a centralized point for review.

CONSTITUENCY ORIENTATION/PLAN COMMUNICATION

Recommendation 5

We recommend that the campus include presentations of emergency preparedness during new faculty and new student orientations.

Campus Response

We concur. Specifically:

- a) By March 9, 2004, a campus policy will be established to outline the requirements for campus emergency planning, including the Building Evacuation Program; subordinate plan integration; and communication of emergency preparedness information to new students, staff, and faculty.
- b) By March 9, 2004, we will develop emergency preparedness communications for new students, staff, and faculty.

MUTUAL AID AGREEMENTS

Recommendation 6

We recommend that the campus formalize emergency management mutual aid arrangements with other entities.

Campus Response

We concur. By June 30, 2004, the University will formalize agreements with its vendors and other organizations for assistance or support in an emergency.

PLAN TESTING

Recommendation 7

We recommend that the campus periodically test simulated emergency situations across a broader section of the campus.

Campus Response

We concur. By December 30, 2003, the University will establish and implement a schedule to conduct tabletop exercises and drills on a regular basis.

FACILITY ISSUES

Recommendation 8

We recommend that the campus establish supplies in multiple locations and maintain a current inventory of all available items that is regularly updated and screened for obsolescence.

Campus Response

We concur. By March 9, 2004, the University will establish duplicate emergency supplies in multiple campus locations, and develop a procedure for inventorying supplies on a regular basis and replacing obsolete items as needed.

BUSINESS CONTINUITY

Recommendation 9

We recommend that the campus establish a comprehensive business continuity plan including the protection of vital records.

Campus Response

We concur. By March 9, 2004, the University will accomplish the following:

1. Perform a risk assessment to determine the types of emergency events that pose the greatest threat to the University and what impact these events would have on key University operations.
2. Prioritize key University operations essential for recovery after an event.
3. Develop a template to be used for the consistent development of the University's Business Continuity Plan which will also be used to transfer existing University department plans into a common format that aligns with the emergency management plan and includes protection of vital records.

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR

BAKERSFIELD

October 21, 2003

CHANNEL ISLANDS

CHICO

MEMORANDUM

DOMINGUEZ HILLS

FRESNO

TO: Mr. Larry Mandel
University Auditor

FULLERTON

HAYWARD

FROM: Charles B. Reed
Chancellor

HUMBOLDT

LONG BEACH

SUBJECT: Draft Final Report Number 03-36 on *Disaster and Contingency Planning*, California State University, San Marcos

LOS ANGELES

MARITIME ACADEMY

In response to your memorandum of October 21, 2003, I accept the response as submitted with the draft final report on *Disaster and Contingency Planning*, California State University, San Marcos.

MONTEREY BAY

NORTHRIDGE

POMONA

CBR/bth

SACRAMENTO

Enclosure

SAN BERNARDINO

SAN DIEGO

cc: Mr. Stephen G. Garcia, Vice President, Finance and Administrative Services
Dr. Roy McTarnaghan, Interim President

SAN FRANCISCO

SAN JOSE

SAN LUIS OBISPO

SAN MARCOS

SONOMA

STANISLAUS