

**DISASTER AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS**

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY,  
DOMINGUEZ HILLS**

**Audit Report 06-40  
November 14, 2006**

---

**Members, Committee on Audit**

Raymond W. Holdsworth, Chair  
Debra S. Farar, Vice Chair  
Herbert L. Carter    Carol R. Chandler  
George G. Gowgani    William Hauck  
Glen O. Toney

---

**Staff**

University Auditor: Larry Mandel  
Audit Manager: Michael Zachary  
Internal Auditor: Ann Casey

---

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

---

## CONTENTS

Executive Summary .....	1
Introduction.....	3
Background .....	3
Purpose.....	5
Scope and Methodology .....	6

---

## OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CAMPUS RESPONSES

General Environment .....	7
Emergency Operations Center .....	7
Fiscal Administration .....	7
Emergency Management Plan .....	8
Campus Roster of Emergency Resources .....	8
Emergency Plan Updates and Distribution .....	9
Communications and Training.....	10
Mutual Aid and Assistance Agreements .....	10
Overview Training .....	11
Specialized Emergency Training .....	12
Testing and Drills.....	13
After Action Reports .....	13
Business Continuity Plan Testing .....	14

## **APPENDICES**

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

---

## **ABBREVIATIONS**

CSU	California State University
DEP	Disaster and Emergency Preparedness
DRII	Disaster Recovery Institute International
EHOS	Environmental Health, Occupational Safety
EO	Executive Order
EOC	Emergency Operations Center(s)
GC	Government Code
ICS	Incident Command System
IT	Information Technology
OES	(California) Office of Emergency Services
SEMS	Standardized Emergency Management System
SWEPT	Systemwide Emergency Preparedness Taskforce

---

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

As a result of a systemwide risk assessment conducted by the Office of the University Auditor during the last quarter of 2005, the Board of Trustees, at its January 2006 meeting, directed that *Disaster and Emergency Preparedness* (DEP) be reviewed. Similar audits of Disaster and Contingency Planning were conducted in 2003.

We visited the California State University, Dominguez Hills campus from July 31, 2006, through September 6, 2006, and audited the procedures in effect at that time.

In our opinion, internal administrative and operational controls governing DEP were, for the most part, effective. However, emergency operation center (EOC) procedures, budgeting for disaster and emergency planning activities, campus roster of emergency resources, emergency plan updates and distribution, mutual aid and assistance agreements, overview and specialized emergency training, after action report documentation, and information technology (IT) business continuity plan testing needed improvement.

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.

### **GENERAL ENVIRONMENT [7]**

EOC activation procedures needed revision. Upon inspection, the primary EOC was wired for internet and phone access; however, the lines were not live and the five EOC team members present were unable to locate the switch. Instructions to activate the lines were not defined in the EOC procedures. Additionally, budgets were not prepared by the campus for disaster and emergency planning activities as there was no funding allocated.

### **EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PLAN [8]**

The roster of campus emergency resources was not updated and complete. It did not reflect an “updated as of date” and did not include emergency equipment, locations of supplies and equipment, responsible persons, and expiration dates of food. Further, the campus did not consistently review, update, and communicate its emergency plan annually.

### **COMMUNICATIONS AND TRAINING [10]**

Although the campus had been assisted by local police, sheriffs, and fire departments in emergency situations, campus mutual aid and assistance agreements with these local authorities were not documented. In addition, new hires were not always provided with an overview of emergency/safety training. Furthermore, specialized training for DEP needed to be increased. Two of the five EOC team members interviewed had not been properly trained at the primary and the alternate EOC and a majority of the health center staff had not received specialized training.

## **TESTING AND DRILLS [13]**

Documentation to support evacuation drills at the student residence halls needed improvement. The campus was unable to provide after action report documentation prepared for evacuation drills at the student residence halls. Lastly, a review disclosed that the IT business continuity plan had not been formally tested.

---

## INTRODUCTION

### **BACKGROUND**

The National Safety Council ([www.nsc.org](http://www.nsc.org)) has provided guidance showing that disasters and emergencies are inevitable. These events include personal injuries, fires, explosions, chemical spills, toxic gas releases, natural disasters such as earthquakes, tornadoes, floods, and epidemics, and man-made disasters such as terrorist activities and riots. Anticipating emergencies and planning for an appropriate response can greatly lessen the extent of injuries and health concerns. Emergency preparedness can also limit damage to property, equipment, and materials. Experience tells us that when disasters and emergencies occur, the emergency response based on emergency preparedness and crisis training programs, will significantly affect the extent of damages and injuries sustained. The president of each of the 23 California State University (CSU) campuses has been delegated the responsibility for the implementation and maintenance of an emergency management system program.

There is no single definition of what constitutes a disaster. A disaster can develop quickly, hitting full-force, with little or no warning. Other times, a disaster can loom on the horizon for weeks until it becomes large enough to be a threat. Government Code (GC) §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 (SEMS) 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.

Executive Order 921, *California State University Emergency Management Program*, dated November 21, 2004, requires maintenance of an emergency management system on each campus that will be activated when a hazardous condition or natural disaster reaches or has the potential for reaching proportions beyond the capacity of routine operations. The campus shall write each emergency plan in accordance with and as described in SEMS regulations developed by the California Office of Emergency Services (OES). Additionally, the campuses shall support the Systemwide Emergency Preparedness Taskforce (SWEPT) assigned oversight responsibility for CSU systemwide emergency management. SWEPT is a multi-discipline committee charged with improving communication between police chiefs, emergency coordinators, risk managers, and environmental health and occupational safety directors. It proposes and establishes mechanisms/systems for coordinating a response to emergencies; and studies and proposes solutions to systemwide issues such as emergency communications, mutual assistance protocols, and training. Further, business continuity planning is an integral part of a comprehensive emergency management model, and it is recommended that each campus form a Business Continuity Planning Committee.

After the initial emergency response, restoration of business (“business continuity”) is of paramount importance. Two sources of industry guidance on standards and terminology are *Glossary of Terms* from the Disaster Recovery Institute International (DRII), and *Business Continuity: Best Practices* as defined by the Business Continuity Institute. The DRII *Glossary of Terms* describes business continuity as “the ability of an organization to ensure continuity of service and support for its customers and to maintain its viability before, after, and during an event.” In *Best Practices*, a disaster recovery plan is defined as “a plan to resume a specific essential operation, function, or process of an enterprise.”

Business continuity is frequently considered a broader term than emergency preparedness. The goal of emergency preparedness is to address the immediate impacts of the disaster and to respond as needed to bring the emergency to closure. Business continuity is a continuing cycle of preparation that includes the broader perspectives of disaster, response, recovery, mitigation, risk reduction, prevention, and preparedness, as depicted below:



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

The OES, 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 SEMS for use by all emergency response agencies.

SEMS is the system required by GC §8607(a) for managing response to multi-agency and multi-jurisdiction emergencies in California. As a result of the 1991 East Bay Hills fire in Oakland, Senate Bill 1841 was passed and made effective January 1, 1993. The intent of this law is to improve the

coordination of state and local emergency response in California, and it implemented SEMS. SEMS regulations took effect in September 1994. 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 (management), operations, planning/intelligence, logistics, and finance/administration. All CSU campuses are required to formally adopt and implement SEMS.

## **PURPOSE**

Our overall audit objective was to ascertain the effectiveness of existing policies and procedures related to the administration of *Disaster and Emergency Preparedness* (DEP) activity and to determine the adequacy of controls that 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:

- ▶ Administration of DEP incorporates a defined mission, stated goals and objectives, and clear lines of organizational authority and responsibility; and is adequately funded.
- ▶ Plans and procedures address general and campus specific incidents; include recordkeeping systems for effective planning, administration, and reporting; maximize DEP resources; and are adequately communicated to emergency management personnel.
- ▶ An emergency operations center (EOC) provisioned with sufficient equipment, supplies, and other critical resources exists; and a roster of resources for materials and services that may be needed in an emergency situation is maintained.
- ▶ The emergency management plan is compliant with SEMS, including the use of the modular incident command system organization methodology and incident action plans; inclusive of an effective building marshal program for evacuation; and reviewed/updated at a minimum every year.
- ▶ The emergency management plan has been adequately communicated to the campus community, a roster of emergency management personnel is annually communicated to the chancellor's office, and support is provided to the SWEPT.
- ▶ Emergency management activities are effectively coordinated with appropriate city, county, operational area, state, federal, and private agencies; and include adequate mutual aid and assistance agreements.
- ▶ Specialized and/or general training has been provided to the emergency management team, building marshals, and all employees.

- ▶ Emergency plan testing, drills, and/or evacuations are adequately planned, conducted, and documented; and include periodic testing of mutual aid and assistance agreements.
- ▶ Generators, communications devices, and other equipment and supplies are functional, tested currently, and the related responsibility is appropriately assigned.
- ▶ The campus has a business continuity plan and if that plan is tested.

## **SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY**

The proposed scope of the audit, as presented in Attachment B, Audit Item 2 of the January 31 through February 1, 2006, meeting of the Committee on Audit, stated that DEP includes review of compliance with Trustee policy and systemwide directives, contingency and disaster recovery planning, backup communications, building safety and emergency egress including provisions for individuals with disabilities, the extent of plan testing, and relationships with state and federal emergency management agencies. DEP includes program and facility readiness and resource planning for actions related to natural and man-made disasters and the recovery therefrom.

Our study and evaluation were conducted in accordance with the *International 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 Trustees policies, and Office of the Chancellor and campus policies, letters, and directives. The audit review focused on procedures in effect from January 2005 through March 2006. In instances wherein it was necessary to review annualized data, fiscal year 2005/06 was the primary period reviewed.

We focused primarily upon the internal administrative, compliance, and operational controls over the campuswide emergency operations plan and related management activities. Specifically, we reviewed and tested:

- ▶ The emergency management organization.
- ▶ Emergency management and business continuity plans.
- ▶ Emergency management plan guidelines, policies, procedures, and recordkeeping.
- ▶ The building marshal program, emergency action plans, and the campus emergency hotline.
- ▶ The EOC, emergency equipment, and related emergency supplies.
- ▶ Coordination with other agencies and mutual aid and assistance agreements.
- ▶ Funding and budgetary controls for emergency management activities.
- ▶ Communication of the emergency management plan.
- ▶ Training for emergency management activities.
- ▶ Evacuation drills and emergency management and business continuity plan testing.

---

# **OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CAMPUS RESPONSES**

## **GENERAL ENVIRONMENT**

### **EMERGENCY OPERATIONS CENTER**

Campus emergency operations center (EOC) activation procedures needed revision.

Inspection of the primary and alternate EOC disclosed that the primary EOC was wired for internet and phone access; however, the lines were not live and the five EOC team members present were unable to locate the switch. In addition, procedures to activate the lines were not defined in the procedures to activate the EOC.

Executive Order (EO) 921, *California State University Emergency Management Program*, dated November 12, 2004, states that the campus should establish and equip a functional campus EOC consistent with Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS) guidelines. Attachment A provides a list of minimum equipment, power requirements, and supplies.

The manager of environmental health, occupational safety (EHOS) and risk management stated that because the EOC was currently located in a classroom, the phone and internet lines were deactivated to prevent misuse.

Failure to review/update the campus EOC activation procedures and communicate it to the EOC team members limits the campus' ability to effectively respond to emergencies.

#### **Recommendation 1**

We recommend that the campus update EOC internet and phone line activation procedures, and train EOC team members sufficiently to ensure that communications in the primary EOC are immediately available if an emergency occurs.

#### **Campus Response**

We concur. The campus has decided that internet and phone connections in the EOC will be active at all times, rather than being enabled on an as-needed basis via a special procedure. This change has been implemented, and ensures immediate access to all methods of communication in the event that the EOC is activated. This has been completed.

## **FISCAL ADMINISTRATION**

Budgets were not prepared by the campus for disaster and emergency planning activities.

The campus did not allocate funding to disaster and emergency planning activities. Therefore, budgets were not prepared and a line item was not included in the overall campus budget.

SEMS Guidelines Part I, §4, *Resources Management*, dated December 23, 1994, states, in part, that at all SEMS levels, there will be some functional activity related to managing resources in terms of directing and controlling, coordination, and resource inventorying.

*Federal Emergency Management Agency, Emergency Management Guide for Business and Industry*, §1, step one on establishing a planning team, recommends developing an initial budget for expenses that may be necessary during the development of an emergency management plan.

EO 921, *California State University Emergency Management Program*, dated November 12, 2004, states that each president shall ensure determination, acquisition, and maintenance of facilities, equipment, and related supplies required for emergency management activities.

The director of business process management stated that due to funding limitations, the campus had attempted to manage its disaster and emergency preparedness (DEP) activities using the financial and personnel resources of the departments that collaborate on those activities.

Failure to prepare adequate budget documentation critical to DEP increases the risk that emergency management activities will not be adequately funded.

## **Recommendation 2**

We recommend that the campus require the emergency planning team to prepare a request for emergency management activities needs and submit the information to the vice president of administration and finance annually.

## **Campus Response**

We concur. The campus emergency preparedness committee will prepare on an annual basis and submit to the vice president of administration and finance a detailed, prioritized list of items that are needed to ensure the campus' readiness to respond to emergencies. The estimated cost of each item will be included in the list. The first such list will be prepared and presented by January 31, 2007.

## **EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PLAN**

### **CAMPUS ROSTER OF EMERGENCY RESOURCES**

The roster of campus resources was not updated and complete.

The campus roster of resources had not been updated to include emergency equipment, locations of the supplies and equipment, responsible persons, and expiration dates of food. In addition, the roster of campus resources did not reflect the "updated as of date."

EO 921, *California State University Emergency Management Program*, dated November 12, 2004, states that the campus should develop a roster of campus resources and memoranda of understanding for materials and services that may be needed in an emergency situation, including equipment, emergency power, communications, food and water, and update at least annually. The “updated as of date” should appear on each roster.

The manager of EHOS and risk management stated that the roster and list of campus resources and inventory had not been updated due to oversight.

Failure to complete and update the campus roster of emergency resources annually increases the risk that delays in locating critical resources could occur during an emergency.

### **Recommendation 3**

We recommend that the campus update and complete its roster of resources to include emergency equipment, locations of the supplies and equipment, responsible persons, food expiration dates, and the last date that the roster was reviewed and updated.

### **Campus Response**

We concur. The campus has updated its roster of campus emergency resources to include responsible persons, last date of update for each resource, locations of resources, an organization chart for the campus emergency management team, and documentation regarding EOC setup and maintenance. The roster will be reviewed and updated on an annual basis in coordination with the updating of the list of items needed to ensure campus readiness to respond to emergencies. This has been completed.

## **EMERGENCY PLAN UPDATES AND DISTRIBUTION**

The campus did not consistently review, update, and communicate its emergency plan annually.

Our review of the campus emergency plan disclosed that formal reviews and updates of the plan had not occurred in 2005. The emergency plan was reviewed and updated in June 2006; however, the prior versions were not dated to evidence the timeliness of the review.

EO 921, *California State University Emergency Management Program*, dated November 12, 2004, states, in part, that each campus president is delegated the responsibility for the implementation and maintenance of an emergency management system on the campus. The campus should develop an emergency management plan and review/update it at a minimum of every year. Further, the campus should communicate the emergency plan to the campus community in a variety of methods and on a continuous basis through public education such as web posting of the plan or through other mechanisms for regular dissemination of hazard planning.

Government Code (GC) §13402 states that management is responsible for establishing and maintaining a system of internal administrative controls, which includes documenting the system, communicating system requirements to employees, and assuring that the system is functioning as prescribed and is modified, as appropriate, for changes in conditions.

The manager of EHOS and risk management stated that the lack of review, update, distribution, and dating of the current emergency plan was due to a change in personnel, which resulted in oversight.

Failure to timely review/update the campus emergency plan, communicate it to the campus community, and ensure its availability to emergency team members limits the campus' ability to effectively respond to emergencies.

#### **Recommendation 4**

We recommend that the campus establish procedures to ensure that the campus emergency plan is reviewed and updated annually and distributed campuswide.

#### **Campus Response**

We concur. The campus has completed the review and update of its emergency plan for 2006, including the annotation of the date of last review and update, and will do so on an annual basis in conjunction with its review and update of its roster of emergency resources and its list of items needed to ensure readiness to respond to emergencies. This has been completed.

## **COMMUNICATIONS AND TRAINING**

### **MUTUAL AID AND ASSISTANCE AGREEMENTS**

Campus mutual aid and assistance agreements with local authorities were not documented.

Although the campus had been assisted by the local police, sheriffs, and fire departments in emergency situations, mutual aid and assistance agreements between the campus and the agencies had not been documented.

EO 921, *California State University Emergency Management Program*, dated November 12, 2004, states, in part, that the campus shall interact and coordinate comprehensive emergency management activities, on a regular basis, with appropriate city, county, operations area, state, federal government, and private agencies to increase the readiness of the university. Evidence of this fact is represented by a current signed mutual aid agreement.

The director of business process management stated that the campus traditionally had relied on its ongoing working relationships with, and close proximity to, municipal authorities rather than completing written agreements with those entities.

Failure to document mutual aid and assistance agreements increases the risk that essential aid and services will not be defined or provided.

### **Recommendation 5**

We recommend that the campus document its mutual aid and assistance agreements, and develop and exercise test plans to ensure the effectiveness of those agreements, including a review and documentation of test results and lessons learned.

### **Campus Response**

We concur. The campus has participated in the development of systemwide intercampus written mutual aid and assistance agreements, and is in the process of establishing such agreements with local, regional, and statewide governmental and administrative agencies. A statewide test of mutual aid and assistance, in which the campus is a participant, is scheduled for March 2007. Completion of all necessary written mutual aid and assistance agreements is expected by April 30, 2007.

## **OVERVIEW TRAINING**

New hires were not always provided with emergency management plan overview training.

Based on our sample of 33 fiscal year 2005/06 new hires tested, 16 did not receive emergency management plan overview training.

EO 921, *California State University Emergency Management Program*, dated November 12, 2004, states that the campus community is to be trained on the SEMS compliant plan to include, at a minimum, overview training of every employee within one year of employment.

GC §13401 states that each state agency must maintain effective systems of administrative control as an integral part of its management practices.

The manager of EHOS and risk management stated that the campus provided emergency training to all new hires through the new employee orientation; however, the new hires did not always attend and management had no specific follow-up to enforce their attendance.

Failure to provide emergency management plan overview training for new hires increases the likelihood that emergency response would be inadequate.

### **Recommendation 6**

We recommend the campus ensure that emergency management plan overview training be timely provided to all new hires.

### **Campus Response**

We concur. The campus has developed and implemented procedures for following up on a timely basis with those newly hired employees who do not attend new employee orientation promptly after hire to ensure that they are made aware of the campus' emergency management program. This has been completed.

### **SPECIALIZED EMERGENCY TRAINING**

Specialized training for DEP needed to be increased.

We found that:

- ▶ Two of the five EOC team members interviewed had not been properly trained at the primary and the alternate EOC.
- ▶ The majority of the health center staff had not received any specialized training for DEP.

SEMS Guidelines, *Planning and Developing SEMS, Operational Area*, dated December 23, 1994, advises that all personnel who will be staffing positions in the operational area EOC must maintain minimum training competencies pursuant to the approved course of instruction. The training should be provided to primary and alternate EOC staff. Training should be initiated as soon as feasible after EOC staff are designated. Provisions should be made for an ongoing training program to accommodate personnel changes.

EO 921, *California State University Emergency Management Program*, dated November 12, 2004, states that the campus community is to be trained on the SEMS compliant plan to include, at a minimum, specialized training for employees who will operate as building marshals and for those designated as members of the campus emergency management team. Training attendance records shall be kept for a minimum of seven years.

EO 943, *Policy on University Health Services*, dated April 28, 2005, states that the president or designee shall be responsible for ensuring that campus emergency plans include provision for the training and assignment of student health center staff in disasters that may require emergency medical services.

The director of business process management stated that, although one or more of the current members of the EOC team had attended SEMS/Incident Command System (ICS) training in the past, such training had not been made mandatory for all team members, and several had not attended the training due to its location and related financial and time commitments.

Absence of specialized emergency training in critical emergency management skills increases the likelihood that an emergency response would be inadequate.

### **Recommendation 7**

We recommend that the campus:

- a. Ensure that all EOC team members are properly trained at the primary and the alternate EOC.
- b. Ensure that adequate specialized training is provided for the health center staff.

### **Campus Response**

We concur. The campus provided training during October and November 2006 in SEMS/ICS and National Incident Management System procedures to all primary and alternate members of the campus emergency management team. In October 2006, area-specific emergency operations training was provided to staff of the campus health center. In March 2007, the primary campus and alternate EOC facilities will be activated in order to participate in a statewide emergency management exercise, and an assessment will be prepared of the results of that exercise.

## **TESTING AND DRILLS**

### **AFTER ACTION REPORTS**

Documentation to support evacuation drill after action reports needed improvement.

We found that the campus was unable to provide after action report documentation prepared for evacuation drills at the student residence halls.

EO 921, *California State University Emergency Management Program*, dated November 12, 2004, states, in part, that at the completion of each exercise, full documentation of test results and lessons learned shall be reviewed with the campus emergency planning team and maintained by the emergency planner for a period of no less than five years.

The associate director of university housing services stated that she was unaware of the requirement to maintain the after action reports for a period of no less than five years.

Failure to maintain and evaluate after action reports increases the risk that the same or similar errors will be made in response to an actual emergency.

### **Recommendation 8**

We recommend that the campus maintain evacuation drill after action reports for a period of no less than five years, and use them to evaluate test results and lessons learned.

### **Campus Response**

We concur. The campus has begun to prepare formal after action reports for evacuation drills at the student residence halls. The reports will be presented at meetings of the campus emergency preparedness committee, in addition to the reports prepared of evacuation drills conducted of the remainder of the campus. All such reports will be retained in electronic form for a period of no less than five years. This has been completed.

### **BUSINESS CONTINUITY PLAN TESTING**

The information technology (IT) business continuity plan had not been formally tested.

Our review disclosed that the servers at the disaster recovery site (California State University (CSU), Bakersfield) were tested on a monthly basis and tapes were often restored on demand; however, the IT business continuity plan had not been formally tested. Additionally, evidence of data restore tests was not always maintained.

EO 921, *California State University Emergency Management Program*, dated November 12, 2004, states that each campus shall develop a business continuity plan. Further, almost all business continuity plans contain certain common elements including testing and auditing the plans to determine the effectiveness of the overall business continuity and incident recovery program. This includes a review and documentation of test results and lessons learned. The review should occur annually, with testing occurring every two years at a minimum.

The associate vice president of IT stated that CSU, Dominguez Hills had not been able to schedule with CSU, Bakersfield a full-scale test of the business continuity plan for IT as specified in the IT disaster and recovery plan.

Inadequate testing of business continuity plans increases the risk of ineffective preparedness and unavailability of essential services.

### **Recommendation 9**

We recommend that the campus develop and exercise test plans sufficient to ensure the effectiveness of campus business continuity activities, including a review and documentation of test results and lessons learned.

### **Campus Response**

We concur. The campus conducted a successful test of its information technology disaster recovery plan in October 2006. A document was prepared that described the steps involved in that test and the results thereof. Additional tests of the plan will be conducted periodically in the future. This has been completed.

---

## APPENDIX A: PERSONNEL CONTACTED

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>
James E. Lyons, Sr.	President
Brian Dahm	Director of Business Process Management (At time of review)
Irina Gaal	Chief of Medical Services, Student Health and Psychological Services
Robert Gill	Manager, Environmental Health, Occupational Safety and Risk Management
Russell Hudson	Media Relations and Public Affairs Coordinator, University Communications and Public Affairs Office
David McCulloch	Assistant Director, Non-Resident Alien Tax Compliance Coordinator, Business Process Management
Mary Ann Rodriguez	Vice President, Administration and Finance
Randy Sharp	Director, Physical Plant
Susan Sloan	Chief of Police
Lynn Weddington	Associate Director, University Housing Services
Emmit Williams	Director/Contracts Administrator, Procurement, Contracts, Logistical and Support Services
Min Yao	Associate Vice President, Information Technology



California State University  
**Dominguez Hills**

---

Office of the Vice President of Administration and Finance  
Carson, CA 90747 (310) 243-3750 FAX: (310) 243-3869

December 12, 2006

RECEIVED  
UNIVERSITY AUDITOR

DEC 14 2006

THE CALIFORNIA STATE  
UNIVERSITY

Mr. Larry Mandel  
University Auditor  
The California State University  
401 Golden Shore  
Long Beach, CA 90802

Dear Mr. Mandel:

Enclosed please find California State University, Dominguez Hills' response to the Disaster and Emergency Preparedness Audit 06-40. The campus is committed to addressing and resolving the issues identified in the audit report.

If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact me.

Sincerely,

*M. Rodriguez*

Mary Ann Rodriguez  
Vice President of Administration and Finance

cc: James E. Lyons, Sr., President  
Boice Bowman, Vice President, Student Affairs  
Allen Mori, Provost and Vice President, Academic Affairs  
Brian Dahm, Director, Business Process Management

## DISASTER AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

### CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, DOMINGUEZ HILLS

Report Number 06-40  
November 14, 2006

## GENERAL ENVIRONMENT

### EMERGENCY OPERATIONS CENTER

#### Recommendation 1

We recommend that the campus update EOC internet and phone line activation procedures, and train EOC team members sufficiently to ensure that communications in the primary EOC are immediately available if an emergency occurs.

#### Campus Response

We concur. The campus has decided that internet and phone connections in the EOC will be active at all times, rather than being enabled on an as-needed basis via a special procedure. This change has been implemented, and ensures immediate access to all methods of communication in the event that the EOC is activated. COMPLETED.

### FISCAL ADMINISTRATION

#### Recommendation 2

We recommend that the campus require the emergency planning team to prepare a request for emergency management activities needs and submit the information to the vice president of administration and finance annually.

#### Campus Response

We concur. The campus Emergency Preparedness Committee will prepare on an annual basis and submit to the Vice President, Administration and Finance a detailed, prioritized list of items that are needed to ensure the campus' readiness to respond to emergencies. The estimated cost of each item will be included in the list. The first such list will be prepared and presented by January 31, 2007.

## EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PLAN

### CAMPUS ROSTER OF EMERGENCY RESOURCES

#### Recommendation 3

We recommend that the campus update and complete its roster of resources to include emergency equipment, locations of the supplies and equipment, responsible persons, food expiration dates, and the last date that the roster was reviewed and updated.

#### Campus Response

We concur. The campus has updated its roster of campus emergency resources to include responsible persons, last date of update for each resource, locations of resources, an organization chart for the campus emergency management team, and documentation regarding EOC setup and maintenance. The roster will be reviewed and updated on an annual basis in coordination with the updating of the list of items needed to ensure campus readiness to respond to emergencies. COMPLETED.

### EMERGENCY PLAN UPDATES AND DISTRIBUTION

#### Recommendation 4

We recommend that the campus establish procedures to ensure that the campus emergency plan is reviewed and updated annually and distributed campuswide.

#### Campus Response

We concur. The campus has completed the review and update of its emergency plan for 2006, including the annotation of the date of last review and update, and will do so on an annual basis in conjunction with its review and update of its roster of emergency resources and its list of items needed to ensure readiness to respond to emergencies. COMPLETED.

## COMMUNICATIONS AND TRAINING

### MUTUAL AID AND ASSISTANCE AGREEMENTS

#### Recommendation 5

We recommend that the campus document its mutual aid and assistance agreements, and develop and exercise test plans to ensure the effectiveness of those agreements, including a review and documentation of test results and lessons learned.

#### Campus Response

We concur. The campus has participated in the development of systemwide intercampus written mutual aid and assistance agreements, and is in the process of establishing such agreements with local, regional and statewide governmental and administrative agencies. A statewide test of mutual

aid and assistance, in which the campus is a participant, is scheduled for March 2007. Completion of all necessary written mutual aid and assistance agreements is expected by April 30, 2007.

## **OVERVIEW TRAINING**

### **Recommendation 6**

We recommend the campus ensure that emergency management plan overview training be timely provided to all new hires.

### **Campus Response**

We concur. The campus has developed and implemented procedures for following up on a timely basis with those newly hired employees who do not attend new employee orientation promptly after hire to ensure that they are made aware of the campus' emergency management program. COMPLETED.

## **SPECIALIZED EMERGENCY TRAINING**

### **Recommendation 7**

We recommend that the campus:

- a. Ensure that all EOC team members are properly trained at the primary and the alternate EOC.
- b. Ensure that adequate specialized training is provided for the health center staff.

### **Campus Response**

We concur. The campus provided training during October and November 2006 in SEMS/ICS and NIMS procedures to all primary and alternate members of the campus emergency management team. In October 2006, area-specific emergency operations training was provided to staff of the campus health center. In March 2007, the primary campus and alternate EOC facilities will be activated in order to participate in a statewide emergency management exercise, and an assessment will be prepared of the results of that exercise.

## **TESTING AND DRILLS**

### **AFTER ACTION REPORTS**

#### **Recommendation 8**

We recommend that the campus maintain evacuation drill after action reports for a period of no less than five years, and use them to evaluate test results and lessons learned.

#### **Campus Response**

We concur. The campus has begun to prepare formal after action reports for evacuation drills at the student residence halls. The reports will be presented at meetings of the campus Emergency

Preparedness Committee, in addition to the reports prepared of evacuation drills conducted of the remainder of the campus. All such reports will be retained in electronic form for a period of no less than five years. COMPLETED.

## **BUSINESS CONTINUITY PLAN TESTING**

### **Recommendation 9**

We recommend that the campus develop and exercise test plans sufficient to ensure the effectiveness of campus business continuity activities, including a review and documentation of test results and lessons learned.

### **Campus Response**

We concur. The campus conducted a successful test of its information technology disaster recovery plan in October 2006. A document was prepared that described the steps involved in that test and the results thereof. Additional tests of the plan will be conducted periodically in the future. COMPLETED.



THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY  
OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR

BAKERSFIELD

January 17, 2007

CHANNEL ISLANDS

CHICO

**MEMORANDUM**

DOMINGUEZ HILLS


EAST BAY

TO: Mr. Larry Mandel  
University Auditor

FRESNO

FULLERTON

FROM: Charles B. Reed  
Chancellor



HUMBOLDT

LONG BEACH

SUBJECT: Draft Final Audit Report 06-40 on *Disaster and Emergency Preparedness*, California State University, Dominguez Hills

LOS ANGELES

MARITIME ACADEMY

In response to your memorandum of January 17, 2007, I accept the response as submitted with the draft final report on *Disaster and Emergency Preparedness*, California State University, Dominguez Hills.

MONTEREY BAY

NORTHRIDGE

CBR/jt

POMONA

Enclosure

SACRAMENTO

cc: Dr. James E. Lyons, Sr., President  
Ms. Mary Ann Rodriguez, Vice President, Administration and Finance

SAN BERNARDINO

SAN DIEGO

SAN FRANCISCO

SAN JOSÉ

SAN LUIS OBISPO

SAN MARCOS

SONOMA

STANISLAUS