

**Emergency Services Council Meeting
Minutes October 1, 2021**

The Emergency Services Council was called to order by Chairperson Canepa at 5:30p.m.
Roll Call was taken.

Members Present:

Karen Cunningham	Brisbane
Ann Keighran	Burlingame
Diana Colvin	Colma
Glen Sylvester	Daly City
Lisa Gauthier	East Palo Alto
Richa Awasthi	Foster City
Deborah Penrose	Half Moon Bay
Marie Chuang	Hillsborough
Cecilia Taylor	Menlo Park
Ann Schneider	Millbrae
Sue Vaterlauss	Pacifica
Janet Borgens	Redwood City
Rico Medina	San Bruno
Adam Rak	San Carlos
Joe Goethals	San Mateo
David Canepa	County of San Mateo

Members Not Present:

Cary Wiest	Atherton
Davina Hurt	Belmont
John Richards	Portola Valley
Richard Garbarino	South San Francisco
Chris Shaw	Woodside

Approval of Minutes

Motion to approve minutes from June 18, 2020 Meeting

Motion to approve- Hillsborough

2nd Motion to approve- San Bruno

Ayes- 14

Not present- 7

County Update-Mike Callegy -County Manager- Discussed the Office of Emergency Services transition from the Sheriff’s Office to the County Manager’s Office. Since the County Manager is the Director of Emergency Services and the EOC it made more sense to move the Office of Emergency Services to the County Manager’s Office. Because the Sheriff’s Office shifts Captains around every three years or so it is important to have consistency in leadership, with one manager who has the background in Emergency Management and will

be there for a while. The Sheriff and I talked about this and were in agreement. The Sheriff will still be there to support OES. Dan Belville who has experience and expertise will be the new manager in OES. He has been in the EOC for the last 7 months.

Burlingame: Do we need to change the JPA Bi-Laws?

County Manager: I believe that is the case. We have County Counsel looking at that now.

San Bruno: What might we see different?

County Manager: We will report back at the next meeting if there is any needed amendments to the JPA Agreement.

I believe there will be more stability in leadership with a manager who does not move every two to three years. There will be a more streamlined decision process in the EOC with the Office reporting to the County Manager's office.

Homeland Security will remain under the Sheriff but will be in the EOC to support Dan Belville.

Update CZU Fire- Jonathan Cox- Gave a power point presentation on the CZU Fire. The CZU fire is now 100% contained. On August 15th and 16th we had numerous lightening strikes. There were over 300 strikes in San Mateo and Santa Cruz Counties. There were 27 confirmed fires within both Counties within 12 hours. We have 13 wildfire engines but were outnumbered by the fires. The dry conditions, extreme heat, and no fog helped to fuel the fires.

On August 16th at 3:30 AM we implemented the local lightening plan.

We received hundreds of calls on the fires. At this time, we called in our Volunteer Fire departments. There were 5 fires in the Watershed. We called in Mutual Aid from Central County Fire and Woodside. They were able to put these fires out.

La Honda, Kings Mountain, and Loma Mar Volunteer Fire Departments were very instrumental in fighting the fires.

August 17th there were 5 major fires burning in heavy terrain that were inaccessible. We had limited resources. This was just one of many major fires burning throughout the state. We continued to put in requests for resources. The Napa and Santa Clara fires were exploding at this time and resources were being allocated to areas that threatened the public.

We had five potential fires that could turn into major incidents. On August 18th, the fire activity was increasing, with multiple spot fires, with limited access. It was now at 5500 acres. The fires continued to push south. We started to get multiple spot fires. By the

evening we were up to 5500 acres. We ordered a type one incident management team to take command of the incident.

On the 19th the fire had burned 45,000 acres within 24 hours. We were in constant communication with the EOC, the County Manager, and the Sheriff's Office. We made some significant decisions to evacuate a large area in the county. The evacuation was one of the smoothest ones I have ever seen. Evacuation orders also went out in Santa Cruz. On August 20th we had over 77,000 people evacuated between the two counties. Santa Mateo had 7700 people evacuated. The fire continued to grow. But more slowly than the initial fire.

At its peak we had 10,000 structures threatened with only 600 firefighters. This County took aggressive measures over the last 18 months to institute an evacuation management system. We were about 6 weeks away from releasing this to the public. We reached out to Zone Haven and asked if we could go with it. They stepped up to the plate for us. This was a great toll for us as well as the public to get information.

We got up to 2300 firefighters near the end of the incident. We had crucial support from Coast side Cert, Volunteer Fire Brigades, Ham Radio Operators, Puente, Red Cross, any many others.

Summary:

We sent out 112 information Releases,
Final acreage, 86, 509 acres – 22,755 acres in San Mateo County
1490 structures were destroyed- 59 in San Mateo County/14 single homes
2300 Fire Fighters
Will remain on the incident for months
Unified Command
\$60 million to fight the fire
Multiple request for resources locally

San Mateo County decided about 18 months ago to invest heavily in the County Fire Department and Cal Fire. Their dedication to a six-year fire risk reduction plan laid the framework for the last 12 months for the wildfire risk reduction plan which we have been working on.

Millbrae- We need to think about fire warning systems and were do we place them.

East Palo Alto- How do we get good information out about air quality out to the public.

Supervisor Canepa- We need to work on this. Dealing with the Air quality is a serious issue. That we need to continue to address.

Grand Jury Report SMC Alert- Kevin Rose- On August 24th the San Mateo County Grant

Jury released their report on how SMC alert, They tackled the question of how does SMC compare to other counties and what other methods can be used to promote more participation in the system. We have one of the highest participations on the system compared to other counties in the region which is a good thing. We have twenty cities that use the system as well as special districts.

There were four recommendations by the Grand Jury:

- 1.) By December 31, 2020 OES should publish SMC Alert enrollment data by city/won on its website with at least yearly but preferably quarterly updates.
OES Respond: OES partially agreed. We will publish a quarterly report and share with the Council and the Cities
- 2.) OES should investigate the option of accessing mobile phone carrier data to augment the SMC alert database and present a recommendation to the Emergency Services Council by December 31, 2020.
OES Response: OES partially agrees. We will reach out to the mobile carriers to obtain the data. This will occur in 2021 as provisions of AS2213 -expansion and clarification of 2018's SB831 will take effect providing legislative support for this effort.
- 3.) OES should translate the enrollment materials and then provide alerts and messages in all languages spoken by more than 5% of the County's population including without limitations both Chinese and Tagalog in addition to the current languages of Spanish and English by March 31, 2021.
OES Response: OES partially agrees. We have made advances in Spanish translation to accompany English messaging. The difficulty is that the County is not the only sender of SMC alert messages. The 20 cities and a handful of special districts also send out messages where they do not have the ability to translate in a timely manner.
- 4.) OES staff should work with the member cities and the County to determine the viability of translating SMC alert enrollment materials, alerts, messages into other languages even if the prevalence of such languages does not meet the 4% threshold of the Dymally-Alatorre Bilingual Services Act and publicly present a recommendation to the ESC Council by December 31, 2020.
OES Response: OES disagrees. With all 20 cities, the County and some special districts as Alert senders, it would be impossible to achieve this in a timely manner. The intended goal of messaging is to get alerts out quickly to the vast majority of individuals. With more than 30 languages spoken in San Mateo County, life safety messages could be greatly delayed with serious consequences.

The Grand Jury reached out to Woodside and Half Moon Bay for input on the SMC alert system. They also reached out to Sonoma and Santa Clara County and shared their recommendations and see what they are doing to promote participation. They also shared information with Cal OES.

Supervisor Canepa- I looked at some of the cities data. Some are not doing that well with participation in SMC alert. Do you think we will ever get to opt out, given the heavy lift that is required?

OES- We presently have two opt-out systems available to use- FEMA's WEA system (Emergency Alert Notification) similar to the AMBER Alert and the reverse 911 system for land wireline phones. With some of the new bills being signed their has been some clarification on using utility bills.

Burlingame: I see that Sonoma was going to use water bills to gather the data. This does not seem reliable given that many renters do not get water bills or utility bills. Can we use the Voter registration system or the DMV for data information?

OES – Right now neither SB 821 or AB 2213 mention either the use of the DMV or Voter Registration. Maybe that can be looked later.

San Carlos- Can we get some updated data for the cities with regards to number of people on the system? San Carlos sends out postcards to get people to sign up for SMC alert. This costs money put it is one way to get the message out.

Public Safety Power Shutoff (PSPS) Update- Kevin Rose- Last year we were lucky to have a de-energization plan in place even though we were not on PG and E's radar regarding power shut offs. We sill had three public safety shutoffs in October of 2019. After that we had numerous meetings with PG and E as well as workshops. In July they developed a draft policy and procedure plan for their response. In August after a review we did our final draft with input from County Department heads, the cities Emergency Managers. This or next month PG and E will be finalizing their plan. If there are any changes need to be made to our plan will be shared with the city Emergency Managers and the Council.

Some of PG and E's changes are:

- 1.) All plans need to be COIVD proof for Community Resource Centers
- 2.) Lessen impact to customers with the Shut offs; Doing more re-routing (Shrink area impacted, more structural hardening
- 3.) Increase restoration time; Equipment that can-do work at night; more crews to help
- 4.) More accurate and timely communications; using more weather sites
- 5.) More social media presence
- 6.) More Resources in Multiple languages
- 7.) Customized alerts to the area that is going to be impacted. More information out and more precise.
- 8.) More outreach to communities beforehand as well as doing and after an event
- 9.) Transportation for those who might need to get to a resource center.

PG and E has their own EOC and will allow a representative from the Operational Area to go there. PG and E is going to give the operational area a GIS specialist to work out of the operational EOC if needed.

We will keep the Emergency Managers in the cities and the Council up to date on any changes that might occur regarding the plan.

Announcements: None

Public Comment- None

The next Emergency Services Council is January 21, 2020

Meeting was adjourned at 6:45 P.M.