

**CITY COUNCIL’S AND CITY MANAGER’S  
JOINT RESPONSES TO FINDINGS (F)**

**A Disaster Waiting to Happen!**

**City Manager – F3, F4, F9, F10, F13**

**City Council – F10, R3, R5**

- F3. Written plans and checklists are not consistent among county, cities, agencies and departments, and in some cases are non-existent.**

Response: Agrees

The City of Santa Rosa plan was recognized and commended by the Grand Jury as a “well structured but dated plan”. The City appreciates the recognition of the work that has gone into the plan and further notes that the plan is scheduled to be reviewed and updated this year.

- F4. Where plans and checklists do exist, they are not always stored in multiple safe places for guaranteed access in the event of a disaster. The most common place is “the office,” not-withstanding that a disaster does not limit itself to regular work hours, and office buildings may not be accessible!**

Response: Disagrees as to the City of Santa Rosa

Santa Rosa plans and checklists are stored in multiple locations and available at the City’s EOC location.

- F9. All county employees are listed as disaster recovery resources, as indeed are members of the grand jury, but there is no clear plan on how they will report in for duty, or how they will be used.**

Response: Disagrees as to City employees

The City of Santa Rosa plan provides employee reporting locations and 3 alternative reporting locations. This information is currently being updated and will be reviewed with all affected employees.

- F10. The city plans are not consistent in scope and detail. The City of Santa Rosa has a well-structured but dated plan, Cotati’s plan is literally a copy of the county plan, Cloverdale is still using the 1989 two volume *door-stopper* plan that existed before the adoption of SEMS, and Healdsburg’s plan is dated 1987. See Exhibit D for a table comparing the format and date of the county and city plans.**

Response: Agrees

The Santa Rosa City Council appreciates the acknowledgement of the “well-structured” city plan finding and commits to the updating of the plan. In addition the City Council will further review the recommendations in sections R3 and R5 of the Grand Jury Report

at a future study session to develop formal Council recommendations to City Management and a formal adoption of those recommendations.

- F13. There is an agreement dated 1997, between the cities and the county, promising help from the county for the construction of, training in, and testing of city-based disaster plans. This assistance is not provided, nor sought on a continually consistent basis, despite the payment of a \$2000 annual fee by the cities.**

Response: Disagrees in part.

Sonoma County has worked in cooperation with the City of Santa Rosa. There is a County representative sitting on the City Emergency Preparedness committee. In June 2005 a Joint City/County EOC workshop was held at the City EOC site.

The City is currently working with ABAG and other local agencies on a Bay Area Hazard Mitigation Plan to meet the FEMA Mitigation Plan Requirements.

<b>Exhibit D – A Table of County/City Plan Comparisons</b>					
<b>Plan Owner</b>	<b>Date of Plan</b>	<b>Relationship To County Plan</b>	<b>Commitment to SEMS in plan</b>	<b>Calls for Checklists</b>	<b>Actual Checklists</b>
County	Nov-00	Full	Total	Yes	Yes
Santa Rosa	Some 99	Separate Plan	Strong	Yes	Yes
Sonoma	Nov-01	Clone of SR	Strong	Yes	Some
Petaluma	Nov-00	Clone of County	Strong	Some	Some
Cotati	Nov-00	Literally a copy of County Plan	Strong	Some	Some, dated 2-01
Windsor	Draft Xmas 2002	Makes some reference to County Plan, not in same format	Some	Some	No
Healdsburg	1987	Separate Plan	None	Some	Some
Cloverdale	89-92	None	None	No	No
Sebastopol	1996	Clone of a South Bay County!	None	Yes	Yes-1995

## CITY COUNCIL'S RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS (R)

### A Disaster Waiting to Happen!

**R3. Each city council should:**

- **Initiate an annual review of its disaster plan, coincident with the budget cycle, starting with the 2006-2007 cycle. These reviews should include the following tasks as a minimum:**
  - **Examine status of the actions from the previous year's review.**
  - **Review any tests during the year and any plan changes required as a result of the tests ("no change" is an unlikely outcome).**
  - **Request detail of any changes to the plan occasioned by known state, national or world emergencies that occurred in the review year.**
  - **Request detail of any changes to the plan required by directives from the Department of Homeland Security (with due regard to any security and secrecy requirements).**
  - **Concur, by vote, that review has been completed successfully**

**R5. Implement training for existing employees in SEMS and the Emergency Recovery Plan and complete training by year-end 2005; document reporting steps employees must take as support individuals in the event of a disaster; and endorse that the most effective use of most employees is to focus on business resumption.**

Response to R3 and R5: The recommendations require further study with implementation to follow.

Within 120 days, the City Council, as noted in the Responses to F10, will review the recommendations contained in sections R3 and R5 of the Grand Jury Report after receiving a full analysis from staff. The Council will consider whether to adopt any or all of the recommendations in those sections.