

AGENDA
EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 7, 2014, 9:00 a.m.
Media Center Room, Emergency Operations Center
500 E. Temple Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012

- I. Call to Order, Introductions, Approval of Minutes**
- II. Subcommittee Reports and Planning Teams**
 - Budget – Bruce Aoki
 - Community Preparedness – Larry Meyerhofer
 - Disabilities and Access and Functional Needs – Paul Hernandez
 - Human Resources – Arnie Surmenian
 - Information Technology – Joyce Edson
 - Local Hazard Mitigation Planning – Gabriela Noriega
 - Logistics – Eric Robles
 - Operations – Rob Freeman
 - Planning – Michelle Riebeling
 - Shelter and Welfare – Brian Lam
 - Training / Exercises– Quentin Frazier
 - Others
- III. 2015 Special Olympics – Maria Acosta**
- IV. 2013 Functional Exercise EOC Activation After Action Report – Quentin Frazier**
- V. Old / New Business**
- VI. Adjournment**

EMC meeting information is available on the Emergency Management Department website at <http://emergency.lacity.org/> - Click on Emergency Operations Organization, then EMC. If you would like to be added to the EMC email distribution list, please subscribe via this link <http://emergency.lacity.org/ABOUTEMD/Subscription/index.htm>.

Upon request, sign language interpretation, real-time translation services, agenda materials in alternative formats, and other accommodations are available to the public for City-sponsored meetings and events. All requests for reasonable accommodations must be made at least three working days (72-hours) in advance of the scheduled meeting date. For additional information, contact the Emergency Management Department at (213) 485-2121.

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE



Date: April 30, 2014

To: Rob Freeman, Emergency Management Committee Acting Chair
Emergency Management Committee Members

From: Quentin Frazier, Training and Exercise Officer
Emergency Management Department

Subject: **DECEMBER 4, 2013 ANNUAL EMERGENCY OPERATIONS CENTER
(EOC) FUNCTIONAL EXERCISE AFTER ACTION REPORT -
CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN**

Recommendation

That the Emergency Management Committee (EMC) approve the attached December 4, 2013 Annual Emergency Operations Center (EOC) Functional Exercise After Action Report/Corrective Action Plan (AAR/CAP) and forward to the Emergency Operations Board (EOB) for approval.

Summary

On December 4, 2013, the City's EOC was activated at a Level 3 Alpha (Fire/EMS Lead) for our annual functional exercise. The focus of the exercise was to test communications processes, information flow and situational awareness. The exercise scenario utilized was a catastrophic rain storm/flood. Several Department Operations Centers (DOCs) were also activated and the exercise tested communications between the EOC and these DOCs.

The 2013 annual functional exercise was designed and conducted by an outside contractor (Willdan) using homeland security grant funding. Willdan was supported by a City Exercise Planning Team composed of representatives from the City's major response, support and recovery agencies.

The attached AAR/CAP provides a summary of the exercise, identifies involved departments and agencies, and offers detailed recommendations for corrective actions to improve EOC and DOC operations.

Attachment



City of Los Angeles 2013 Functional Exercise

After-Action Report/Improvement Plan

April 30, 2014

The After-Action Report/Improvement Plan (AAR/IP) aligns exercise objectives with preparedness doctrine to include the National Preparedness Goal and related frameworks and guidance. Exercise information required for preparedness reporting and trend analysis is included; users are encouraged to add additional sections as needed to support their own organizational needs.

This page intentionally left blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| Exercise Overview..... | 1 |
| Analysis of Core Capabilities..... | 4 |
| Appendix A: Improvement Plan..... | A-1 |
| Appendix B: Exercise Participants..... | B-1 |
| Appendix C: Participant Feedback..... | C-1 |
| Appendix D: Acronym List..... | D-1 |

This page intentionally left blank.

EXERCISE OVERVIEW

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Exercise Name | City of Los Angeles 2013 Functional Exercise |
| Exercise Dates | December 4, 2013 |
| Scope | <p>The exercise was a functional exercise planned for 6 – 8 hours at the following Emergency Operations Center (EOC) and Departmental Operations Centers (DOCs):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• City of Los Angeles Emergency Operations Center• American Red Cross West Los Angeles EOC• City of Los Angeles Building and Safety Department• City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering• City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Bureau of Street Services• City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks• City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation• City of Los Angeles Fire Department• City of Los Angeles Housing And Community Investment Department• City of Los Angeles Police Department• Los Angeles World Airports |
| Mission Area(s) | Response |
| Core Capabilities | Core Capabilities include: Operational Coordination, Public and Private Services and Resources, Public Information and Warning, Intelligence and Information Sharing, Situation Assessment, and Mass Care Services. |
| Exercise Objectives | <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Operational Coordination. Evaluate the City of Los Angeles EOC's ability to employ the EOC coordination process in accordance with the City's EOC Policy and Procedures Manual, EOC 301 Course, and in response to a catastrophic flood scenario.2. Public and Private Services and Resources. Evaluate the EOC's ability to provide essential services and resources to response personnel and the affected population in accordance with the City's EOC Policy and Procedures Manual and in response to a catastrophic flood scenario.3. Public Information and Warning: Assess the City's ability to deliver coordinated, prompt, reliable, and management-approved public information in accordance with the City's EOC Policy and Procedures Manual, EOC 301 |

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| | <p>Course, and in response to a catastrophic flood scenario.</p> <p>4. Intelligence and Information Sharing. Evaluate the EOC and DOC’s ability to provide timely, accurate, and actionable information to build situational awareness, establish a common operating picture, and support effective decision making in accordance with the City’s EOC Policy and Procedures Manual, EOC 301 Course, and in response to a catastrophic flood scenario.</p> <p>5. Situational Assessment. Evaluate the EOC’s ability to provide decision makers with decision-relevant information regarding the nature and extent of the hazard, any cascading effects, and the status of the response in accordance with the City’s EOC Policy and Procedures Manual, EOC 301 Course, and in response to a catastrophic flood scenario.</p> <p>6. Mass Care Services. Evaluate the EOC’s ability to provide life-sustaining services to the affected population to include citizens with disabilities and others with access and functional needs with a focus on feeding and sheltering in accordance with the City’s EOC Policy and Procedures Manual, EOC 301 Course, and in response to a catastrophic flood scenario.</p> |
| <p>Threat or Hazard</p> | <p>Flood</p> |
| <p>Scenario</p> | <p>The exercise scenario used during the exercise is a catastrophic flood based on the 100 year flood model. The scenario begins on 11/27 when the National Weather Service (NWS) predicts a deep feed of Pacific moisture will stream into the West Coast within the next 5 – 7 days with the potential to produce up to 5 inches of rain over several days. The storm makes landfall on December 2 and dumps 10 inches of rain over a two day period as predicted. The exercise begins on 12/4 which is 48 hours into the storm. The rain fall, high winds and storm surge unleash a series of cascading sub-scenario events that will require a coordinated response. The sub-scenario events include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rapidly spreading inundation in the San Pedro Area and Port of Los Angeles. 2. Fire in a substation transformer in San Fernando Valley (48,000 customers without power). 3. Rapidly spreading inundation in Venice along canals and low-lying areas. 4. Landslide traps residents near Big Tujunga Canyon Rd. 5. Tractor-trailer accident with HAZMAT release, calcium hypochlorite. 6. Maersk Alabama, in the outer harbor is dragging its anchor and moving toward Terminal Island. 7. Loss of power in central downtown Los Angeles due to downed Antelope-Pardee 500-kV transmission line near Mojave, CA 8. Sepulveda dam flood gate open, spillway overtopped. |

9. Hyperion WWTP reports loss of all power and fire in EDG switchboard.
10. Flooding in South Central Los Angeles.

In addition to the sub-scenario events listed above and the ensuing response requirements, each department will have significant continuity of operations issues to address as the weather is forecasted to worsen over the next 72 hours.

Sponsor

City of Los Angeles Emergency Management Department

Participating Organizations

- Business and Industry Council for Emergency Planning and Preparedness
- City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety
- City of Los Angeles Office of the City Administrative Officer
- City of Los Angeles Emergency Management Department
- City of Los Angeles Fire Department
- City of Los Angeles Department of General Services
- City of Los Angeles Housing and Community Investment Department
- City of Los Angeles Police Department
- City of Los Angeles Public Works Department, Bureaus of Street Services, Sanitation, and Engineering
- City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks
- City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation
- City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power
- City of Los Angeles, Animal Services Department
- Los Angeles World Airports
- Harbor Department

Point of Contact

Rob Freeman
Acting Assistant General Manager
City of Los Angeles Emergency Management Department
rob.freeman@lacity.org
213-359-0836

ANALYSIS OF CORE CAPABILITIES

Aligning exercise objectives and core capabilities provides a consistent taxonomy for evaluation that transcends individual exercises to support preparedness reporting and trend analysis. Table 1 includes the exercise objectives, aligned core capabilities, and performance ratings for each core capability as observed during the exercise and determined by the evaluation team.

| Objective | Core Capability | Performed without Challenges (P) | Performed with Some Challenges (S) | Performed with Major Challenges (M) | Unable to be Performed (U) |
|--|--|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Evaluate the City of Los Angeles EOC's ability to employ the EOC coordination process in accordance with the City's EOC Policy and Procedures Manual, EOC 301 Course, and in response to a catastrophic flood scenario. | Operational Coordination | | | M | |
| 2 Evaluate the EOC's ability to provide essential services and resources to response personnel and the affected population in accordance with the City's EOC Policy and Procedures Manual and in response to a catastrophic flood scenario. | Public and Private Services and Resources | | S | | |
| 3. Assess the City's ability to deliver coordinated, prompt, reliable, and management-approved public information in accordance with the City's EOC Policy and Procedures Manual, EOC 301 Course, and in response to a catastrophic flood scenario. | Public Information and Warning | P | | | |
| 4 Evaluate the EOC and DOC's ability to provide timely, accurate, and actionable information to build situational awareness, establish a common operating picture, and support effective decision making in accordance with the City's EOC Policy and Procedures Manual, EOC 301 Course, and in response to a catastrophic flood scenario. | Intelligence and Information Sharing | | | M | |

| Objective | Core Capability | Performed without Challenges (P) | Performed with Some Challenges (S) | Performed with Major Challenges (M) | Unable to be Performed (U) |
|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 5. Evaluate the EOC's ability to provide decision makers with decision-relevant information regarding the nature and extent of the hazard, any cascading effects, and the status of the response in accordance with the City's EOC Policy and Procedures Manual, EOC 301 Course, and in response to a catastrophic flood scenario. | Situational Assessment | | | M | |
| 6. Evaluate the EOC's ability to provide life-sustaining services to the affected population to include citizens with disabilities and others with access and functional needs with a focus on feeding and sheltering in accordance with the City's EOC Policy and Procedures Manual, EOC 301 Course, and in response to a catastrophic flood scenario. | Mass Care Services | | S | | |
| <p>Ratings Definitions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performed without Challenges (P): The targets and critical tasks associated with the core capability were completed in a manner that achieved the objective(s) and did not negatively impact the performance of other activities. Performance of this activity did not contribute to additional health and/or safety risks for the public or for emergency workers, and it was conducted in accordance with applicable plans, policies, procedures, regulations, and laws. • Performed with Some Challenges (S): The targets and critical tasks associated with the core capability were completed in a manner that achieved the objective(s) and did not negatively impact the performance of other activities. Performance of this activity did not contribute to additional health and/or safety risks for the public or for emergency workers, and it was conducted in accordance with applicable plans, policies, procedures, regulations, and laws. However, opportunities to enhance effectiveness and/or efficiency were identified. • Performed with Major Challenges (M): The targets and critical tasks associated with the core capability were completed in a manner that achieved the objective(s), but some or all of the following were observed: demonstrated performance had a negative impact on the performance of other activities; contributed to additional health and/or safety risks for the public or for emergency workers; and/or was not conducted in accordance with applicable plans, policies, procedures, regulations, and laws. • Unable to be Performed (U): The targets and critical tasks associated with the core capability were not performed in a manner that achieved the objective(s). | | | | | |

The following sections provide an overview of the performance related to each exercise objective and associated core capability, highlighting strengths and areas for improvement.

1. Evaluate the City of Los Angeles EOC's ability to employ the EOC coordination process in accordance with the City's EOC Policy and Procedures Manual, EOC 301 Course, and in response to a catastrophic flood scenario.

The strengths and areas for improvement for each core capability aligned with this objective are described in this section.

Operational Coordination

Strengths

The partial regional Operational Coordination capability level can be attributed to the following strengths:

Strength 1: The City of Los Angeles EOC manual, EOC 301 Course, and the EOC Coordination Process Concept of Operations (ConOp) document developed by the City of Los Angeles Emergency Management Department provide the structure and processes for EOC operations. Evaluators, drawn from several southern California jurisdictions, identified the EOC manual and ConOp as a "best practice."

Strength 2: The EOC Coordination Process ConOp provided the Management Section with a very detailed process-based schedule that described the Management Section's planning, coordination, and decision-making responsibilities for the entire operational period. The ConOp sought to establish a "Battle Rhythm" and provided an excellent road-map for the Management Section and Section Coordinators.

Strength 3: Management Section personnel asked thoughtful and relevant questions during the Report on Current Conditions briefing.

Strength 4: The EOC's standing objectives were an effective tool that streamlined discussions and facilitated the Management Section's ability to rapidly key in on critical and relevant objectives. The standing objectives are a highly effective technique for breaking the initial EOC inertia and jumpstarting support operations.

Strength 6: Information sharing protocols were established between the Operations and Plans and Intelligence Sections per the guidance provided in the EOC ConOp. The Planning and Intelligence Coordinator and Situation Analysis Unit Leader met with the Operations Section and Deputy Operations Section Coordinator to establish information sharing protocols that included identification of the forms that would be used and the schedule under which information would be shared during the operational period.

Areas for Improvement

The following areas require improvement to achieve the full Operational Coordination capability level:

Area for Improvement 1: The City of Los Angeles 2013 Functional Exercise design was not conducted in accordance with the planning timeline recommended by U.S. Department of Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP).

Reference: Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP) Recommended Exercise Planning Timeline Operations-Based Exercises

Analysis: Current HSEEP guidance recommends the planning period for a functional or full-scale exercise be conducted over a 6 – 8 month period. The planning period for the City of Los Angeles 2013 Functional Exercise was 2 months. The compressed nature of the 2013 exercise design did not afford exercise planning team members' sufficient time to review and comment on key exercise documentation among other issues created by the condensed timeline.

Area for Improvement 2: The exercise evaluation was hindered by the participation of untrained EOC responders in the exercise.

Reference: None.

Analysis: Exercise evaluators noted that the majority (>75%) of the EOC responders assigned to the EOC during the December 4th functional exercise had not previously participated in EMD-sponsored EOC training. Further analysis revealed that it is a common practice to assign personnel to the EOC for exercises and real world events without vetting them against any participation standard or requirement (e.g. EOC training, real-world experience, departmental experience, EOC training completed, etc.). Evaluators highlighted several areas where the lack of team cohesion hampered EOC operations. Some EOC responders were reluctant to communicate with other responders because they did not know them, were not aware of the requirement to share information with others, and/or were reluctant to ask for assistance from personnel they did not know. EOC operations would benefit from assigned teams that could train, exercise, and operate together. The importance of EOC team cohesion cannot be overstated.

Area for Improvement 3: The lack of communication between the Management Section and EOC floor hindered operations.

Reference: City of Los Angeles EOC Manual, City of Los Angeles EOC 301 Section Specific Training, and EOC Concept of Operations.

Analysis: Evaluators noted that communications between the Management Section and the EOC floor was hindered for the reasons provided below:

1. The physical separation of the Management Section from the EOC floor does not promote good face-to-face communications.
2. Management personnel appeared reluctant to leave the Management Section room and walk the EOC floor to ascertain how operations were going and to build situational awareness on current operations.
3. Section coordinators appeared to be reluctant to meet face-to-face with the Management Section unless summoned to the Management Section room.
4. Displays inside the Management Section room did not easily convey information to Section personnel.

The lack of communication between the Management Section and the EOC floor occasionally led to the promulgation of guidance and direction from the Management Section that was based on their perception of what was happening in the field vice ground truth. Moreover, the Management Section had little to no real-time situational awareness from which to base their decisions. Key Master Scenario Events List (MSEL) information did trickle back to the EOC Director, but 60-90 minutes after it was injected into the exercise. Evaluators indicated the time delay may have been remedied if the Management Section had identified their information requirements at the outset of the exercise.

Area for Improvement 4: EOC responders relied too heavily on WebEOC as a means for EOC communication and coordination.

Reference: City of Los Angeles EOC Manual, City of Los Angeles EOC 301 Section Specific Training, and EOC Concept of Operations.

Analysis: Exercise evaluators documented repeated events of EOC responders who entered information into WebEOC and took no follow up actions to ensure the recipients, consumers of the information, or those responsible for acting on it, received and understood the information. This action or lack of action is contrary to the instruction provided in the City of Los Angeles EOC 301 Section Specific Training which encourages follow up contact with the recipients of information entered into WebEOC. Too often, EOC and DOC responders considered the entering the information into WebEOC as action complete. For example, MSEL injects #1 and #2 requested evacuation support for the Wilmington area. The same inject was delivered to the LAPD and LAFD DOCs. Transportation and shelter resources were needed to evacuate 24,000 residents. This information was reportedly entered into WebEOC by the DOCs with little to no follow up action within the EOC. The MSEL expected action for LAFD included the following:

- *Fire DOC supports and documents the information in WebEOC. Passes information to Ops- Fire Branch. Ops- Fire Branch notifies Ops Section Chief. Info then shared with Plans, Logistics, Finance, and EOC Director. RAP identifies, opens, and requests resources to open additional shelters. Red Cross supports shelters with staff. DOT closes perimeter streets in the Wilmington area. Metro provides transportation. Animal services support pet sheltering requirements. DOD notified and asked to provide #'s of AFN citizens in area.*

Exercise evaluators noted that the expected actions listed above were not demonstrated during the exercise.

Area for Improvement 5: Face-to-face inter-branch communication was discouraged by some within the Operations Section.

Reference: City of Los Angeles EOC Manual, City of Los Angeles EOC 301 Section Specific Training, and EOC Concept of Operations.

Analysis: Exercise evaluators indicated that the Fire and Law Branch Coordinators were discouraged from communicating with each other outside of WebEOC. Moreover, evaluators noted the strong sentiment that “everything” had to be entered into WebEOC and phone calls and face-to-face meetings were discouraged. EOC responders indicated that they were unsure as to “what” information to enter into WebEOC so they in turn entered everything into the system.

Area for Improvement 6: EOC objectives were not shared with the Planning and Intelligence (P&I) Section and were generally unfamiliar to responders working on the EOC floor.

Reference: City of Los Angeles EOC Manual, City of Los Angeles EOC 301 Section Specific Training, and EOC Concept of Operations.

Analysis: EOC objectives were derived early in the exercise during the Standing Objectives Assignment meeting. As identified in the EOC ConOp, the EOC Coordinator reviewed the EOC Standing Objectives with the Directors to identify which standing objectives applied to the incident. Exercise evaluators noted that EOC responders were generally unfamiliar with which Standing Objectives were selected and the actions they were to take to support objective attainment. In a post-exercise interview, P&I Section personnel indicated their section did not receive the standing objectives to disseminate to the EOC floor. Moreover, they indicated that SMART¹ objective development and dissemination is a common Management Section problem. Evaluators indicated that EOC displays throughout the EOC were the perfect medium for conveying the objectives to EOC personnel.

Area for Improvement 7: Management personnel deviated from the EOC ConOp to conduct a DOC teleconference.

Reference: City of Los Angeles EOC Manual, City of Los Angeles EOC 301 Section Specific Training, and EOC Concept of Operations.

Analysis: The EOC Management Section conducted a teleconference with participating DOCs to determine situational status and current operations. This action is contrary to the reference documents listed above, but within the purview of the Management Section to conduct. Exercise evaluators indicated that each DOC had a representative within the EOC that could have been leveraged in a face-to-face meeting to obtain the information sought during the teleconference. Bypassing the EOC floor to obtain the information from the DOCs in some cases only complicated the information exchange when DOC representatives provided information that conflicted with information provided by their EOC representatives.

¹ SMART is an acronym that stands for simple, measurable, attainable, realistic, and time bound.

2. Evaluate the EOC's ability to provide essential services and resources to response personnel and the affected population in accordance with the City's EOC Policy and Procedures Manual and in response to a catastrophic flood scenario.

The strengths and areas for improvement for each core capability aligned with this objective are described in this section.

Public and Private Services and Resources

Strengths

The partial Public and Private Services and Resources capability level can be attributed to the following strengths:

Strength 1: The Logistic Section staff was friendly, open to helping one another, and to learning.

Strength 2: Personnel from the Operations and Logistics communicated by phone and in person on several occasions during the exercise.

Strength 3: Resource requests were appropriate for the incident, resources were requested in sufficient quantity, and requestors successfully identified where the resource was needed.

Strength 4: Logistics Section personnel had access to a binder containing vendor information that they effectively used to procure goods and services.

Areas for Improvement

The following areas require improvement to achieve the full Public and Private Services and Resources capability level:

Area for Improvement 1: The Logistics Section was requested to assign priorities for incoming resource requests.

Reference: City of Los Angeles EOC Manual (Pg. 44), City of Los Angeles EOC 301 Section Specific Training

Analysis: The City of Los Angeles EOC Manual states the Operations Section will assign a priority to each resource request based on the following criteria:

1. Life Saving
2. Incident Stabilization
3. Property Protection
4. Environmental Protection
5. Infrastructure Support (e.g. responder feeding / housing, fueling, etc.)

Once the resource has been triaged and prioritized, the request is forwarded by the Operations Section to the Logistics Section for acquisition. During the exercise, evaluators noted that the Operations Section did not prioritize the resource requests and instead, asked the Logistics

Section to complete the prioritization process. This request caused confusion within the Logistics Section and resulted in the assignment of “high” priority to nearly all incoming requests.

Area for Improvement 2: The Logistics Section lacked situational awareness pertaining road closures throughout the City.

Reference: City of Los Angeles EOC Manual

Analysis: While resource requests contained information on where the resource was needed, the Logistic Section lacked situational awareness on road closures and was unable to provide recommended routing to simulated vendors delivering resources. Efforts to request a route closure map from the GIS Unit via WebEOC proved ineffective.

Area for Improvement 3: Some resource requests forwarded to the Logistics Section for processing were incomplete.

Reference: City of Los Angeles EOC Manual (Pg. 43), City of Los Angeles EOC 301 Section Specific Training

Analysis: The City of Los Angeles EOC Manual states all incoming resource requests to the EOC should be directed to the Operations Section. The Operations Section is responsible for triaging the resource request to determine:

- What is needed and why (to ensure the right resource for the mission)
- How much is needed – quantity
- Who needs it and contact information
- Where is it needed – specific location(s) and recommended routes
- When is it needed / duration of need (if known)
- Any special resource support requirements (e.g. setup, operators, fuel, housing, feeding, maintenance, etc.)

Several of the resource requests forwarded to the Logistics Section lacked some of the information above. These incomplete resource requests hampered Logistics Section personnel efforts to process the request efficiently and in a timely manner. The City’s EOC Manual and EOC 301 course clearly identify the information required to complete a resource request.

Area for Improvement 4: Logistics Section personnel lacked the situational awareness of current operations to forecast and/or anticipate future resource needs.

Reference: City of Los Angeles EOC Manual (Pg. 31), City of Los Angeles EOC 301 Section Specific Training

Analysis: The City of Los Angeles EOC Manual states the Logistics Section Coordinator is responsible for anticipating supply and equipment procurements and personnel acquisition needs during EOC operations. To do this, the Logistics Section Coordinator needs information pertaining to current resource status, ongoing and future operations. The ability to “forecast” future requirements is one of several positive outcomes of gaining and maintaining situational

awareness. Given the Logistics Section personnel lacked situational awareness of ongoing and future operations, they were not able to anticipate future logistical needs.

Area for Improvement 5: Some resource requests contained terminology unfamiliar to Logistics Section personnel.

Reference: City of Los Angeles EOC Manual, City of Los Angeles EOC 301 Section Specific Training

Analysis: Exercise evaluators indicated that some resource requests contained language and terminology that was not familiar to the personnel assigned to process the request. The lack of terminology familiarity delayed request processing as Logistics personnel sought to clarify the terminology meaning and significance.

Area for Improvement 6: Logistics Section personnel did not demonstrate knowledge of a process to determine resource status.

Reference: City of Los Angeles EOC Manual (Pg. 45), City of Los Angeles EOC 301 Section Specific Training

Analysis: The City of Los Angeles EOC Manual states that the Resource Status Unit in the Planning & Intelligence Section of the EOC is assigned the responsibility for tracking the status of all event resources under the control of the City including those under the command of field Incident Command Posts². This status should include:

- Required resources
- Ordered resources
- En route resources
- Staged resources
- Operational resources
- Demobilized resources

The EOC Operations Section, Logistics Section, and Finance & Administration Section are responsible for closely coordinating with the Resource Status Unit to provide updated resource status information. Incident Command Posts are responsible for ensuring the EOC Operations Section is kept apprised of the status of resources under their command. Exercise evaluators observed no resource status communication between the Logistics Section and the Resource Status Unit. Moreover, there was little to no evidence that the Logistics Section was internally tracking resource status. Further investigation revealed that Logistics Section personnel were not familiar with the Resource Status Unit and the information they were to provide to that Unit. As a result, the EOC lacked situational awareness on resource status.

Area for Improvement 7: Logistics Section personnel did not appear to share cost tracking information with the Finance and Administration Section.

² Subsequent post-exercise interviews with EMD personnel indicated the resource management description provided in the EOC manual on page 45 is no longer valid and should be updated.

Reference: City of Los Angeles EOC Manual (Pg. 45), City of Los Angeles EOC 301 Section Specific Training

Analysis: The City of Los Angeles EOC Manual states the EOC Cost Unit in the Finance & Administration Section is responsible for documenting the cost of all resources committed to the event. The Cost Unit will coordinate closely with the Operations Section, Planning & Intelligence Section, and Logistics Section to track and document costs. Exercise evaluators did not document the exchange of any resource procurement related cost information during the exercise.

Area for Improvement 8: Logistics Section personnel were generally unfamiliar with EOC processes/functions and WebEOC.

Reference: City of Los Angeles EOC Manual, City of Los Angeles EOC 301 Section Specific Training

Analysis: Exercise evaluators indicated that Logistics Section personnel were generally unfamiliar with EOC processes/functions and WebEOC which reduced their effectiveness and required the Logistics Section Coordinator to provide adhoc EOC/WebEOC training to new personnel during the first hour of the exercise.

3. Assess the City's ability to deliver coordinated, prompt, reliable, and management-approved public information in accordance with the City's EOC Policy and Procedures Manual, EOC 301 Course, and in response to a catastrophic flood scenario.

The strengths and areas for improvement for each core capability aligned with this objective are described in this section.

Public Information and Warning

Strengths

The full regional Public Information and Warning capability level can be attributed to the following strengths:

Strength 1: Assistant PIO, Chris Ipsen, did an excellent job establishing the Joint Information Center (JIC), gathering information from throughout the EOC, sharing that information with JIC personnel, documenting info, and conducting a turnover when the lead PIO arrived³.

Strength 2: Delegation of assignments within the JIC spread the workload, prevented duplication of efforts, and fostered unity of effort.

Strength 3: Good internal information sharing among the PIOs.

Strength 4: PIOs were able to maintain a good level of situational awareness relevant to the information known within other sections.

Strength 5: Effectively developed and obtained permission to release two press releases.

Strength 6: Quickly developed public safety warning material shortly after exercise commencement.

Strength 7: Good documentation of information and actions via the ICS-214 form and room's whiteboard.

³ The lead PIO's participation in the exercise was delayed due to a real world commitment. Following the turnover with the assistant PIO, the lead PIO performed superbly.

4. Evaluate the EOC and DOC's ability to provide timely, accurate, and actionable information to build situational awareness, establish a common operating picture, and support effective decision making in accordance with the City's EOC Policy and Procedures Manual, EOC 301 Course, and in response to a catastrophic flood scenario.

The strengths and areas for improvement for each core capability aligned with this objective are described in this section.

Intelligence and Information Sharing

Strengths

The following strengths associated with the Intelligence and Information Sharing capability are listed below:

Strength 1: The City of Los Angeles EOC Manual thoroughly identifies and describes the internal communications systems available to convey information.

Strength 2: The EOC manual identifies the Section responsibilities that contribute to developing situational awareness.

Strength 3: The EMD understands the importance of and is committed to improving the EOC and DOCs situational awareness and common operating capabilities.

Areas for Improvement

The following areas require improvement to achieve the full capability level:

Area for Improvement 1: An overwhelming number of exercise participants could not effectively use WebEOC during the exercise.

Reference: City of Los Angeles EOC Manual (Pg. 26), City of Los Angeles EOC 301 Section Specific Training

Analysis: The City of Los Angeles EOC Manual states, "*The WebEOC software provides the City of Los Angeles EOC with the ability to exchange data with other WebEOC users such as Department Operations Centers ("DOCs") and the Operational Area EOC. The primary use of WebEOC is to update status boards, situation reports, and resource allocations with other WebEOC users and the OP AREA EOC.*" As evidenced in the statement above, WebEOC is an integral component in the EOC's information management system and a key component in the City's ability to create situational awareness and a common operating picture. Exercise evaluators observed WebEOC challenges on multiple levels throughout the EOC. Moreover, exercise participants indicated they struggled with WebEOC use and in some cases abandoned use of the system in lieu of other non-technological alternatives. While the challenges of using WebEOC cannot completely be attributable to one single cause, it is worth mentioning that prior to the exercise the City's WebEOC platform underwent a major upgrade that required the retraining of all EOC response staff. While exact numbers are not known, it is reasonable to

assume that some exercise participants did not attend the training and therefore performed accordingly.

Area for Improvement 2: Some incident information entered into WebEOC was incomplete, lacked analysis and forecasting information.

Reference: City of Los Angeles EOC Manual, City of Los Angeles EOC 301 Section Specific Training

Analysis: In post exercise interviews, Planning and Intelligence Section personnel expressed displeasure with the lack of incident information entered into WebEOC. One WebEOC example specifically cited was an entry that stated a “Ship adrift in the harbor, possible HAZMAT incident.” No additional information was included. Moreover, the author of the entry did not include any situational information as to response actions underway, assistance required, the nature of the HAZMAT, or any analysis of the information reported. P&I personnel were not sure whether the “lack” of information could be attributed to “exercise apathy” or whether a legitimate training issue is to blame for the deficiency.

Area for Improvement 3: EOC visual displays were underutilized during the exercise.

Reference: City of Los Angeles EOC Manual, City of Los Angeles EOC 301 Section Specific Training

Analysis: Exercise evaluators indicated that the visual display capability within the EOC was underutilized and to some degree forgotten during the exercise. Throughout the exercise, information (e.g. inundation map on large center overhead display) was displayed without update and other information (e.g. EOC objectives) was not displayed at all. Evaluators could not determine if a visual display plan was developed or if guidance as to what to display was given. The City should strive to create an environment within the EOC whereby an observer can stand in one location of the EOC, visually pan the EOC’s displays, and gain a general understanding of status of current and future operations. For example, using one EOC display to inform EOC floor responders of where the EOC is in the EOC Coordination Process would greatly enhance situational awareness of ongoing planning operations. The information displayed should be pertinent, easily assimilated (graphical info preferred), and updated often during the operation.

Area for Improvement 4: No information requirements were levied from the Management Section.

Reference: City of Los Angeles EOC Manual (Pg.25), City of Los Angeles EOC 301 Section Specific Training, and EOC Concept of Operations.

Analysis: As articulated in the City of Los Angeles EOC 301 Section Specific Training Course, the role of the EOC is to:

- Develop a Situation Assessment
- Obtain, prioritize, and allocate resources
- Coordinate with elected officials
- Coordinate with outside agencies

- Manage information
- Work through SEMS levels
- Policy direction to support field response

Information is the currency needed to accomplish the tasks listed above and to support the EOC objectives established by the Management Section during the EOC Coordination Process. The specific information needed by the Management Section to support their decision making was never defined and consequently the EOC sections struggled to provide information they “thought” was important to decision makers. Further analysis yielded that the EOC Manual (Pg. 25) defines the responsibilities of each section in developing or contributing to situational awareness but does not specifically identify which section is responsible for establishing the EOC’s information requirements.

Area for Improvement 5: No documented information collection plan was used during the exercise.

Reference: City of Los Angeles EOC Manual, City of Los Angeles EOC 301 Section Specific Training, and EOC Concept of Operations.

Analysis: The EOC Manual states, “*The EOC Director and Planning & Intelligence Section Coordinator will develop and post procedures for information collection and dissemination for all EOC Staff.*” Exercise evaluators could not find evidence that this action occurred during the exercise. Additionally, post-exercise analysis could not determine if guidance exists that provides the Planning and Intelligence Coordinator with direction as to who defines the information to be gathered, from whom the information is obtained, what format the information is provided (e.g. GIS, narrative report, oral briefing, etc.), how often the information is needed, with whom the information is shared and how sharing is accomplished. Without defining this information, EOC responders are relegated to be “information gatherers” instead of “information hunters” whereby the former looks for information they think they need and might be available; and conversely the latter knows the information they need, where to find it, and with whom to share it.

Area for Improvement 6: WebEOC incident entry information requirements should be further defined.

Reference: City of Los Angeles EOC Manual, City of Los Angeles EOC 301 Section Specific Training, and EOC Concept of Operations.

Analysis: EOC and DOC evaluators cited several examples of participants who entered information into WebEOC without clear knowledge as to why they were entering it. When questioned why they were entering a particular type of information into WebEOC, most participants responded with “I was told to enter everything into WebEOC.” Without a clear definition of what information EOC responders are to enter into WebEOC, the EOC runs the risk of information inundation. DOCs and EOC sections would greatly benefit if WebEOC information entry requirements were defined.

Area for Improvement 7: The LAFD DOC currently lacks a procedure for closing out action items entered into WebEOC.

Reference: City of Los Angeles EOC Manual and City of Los Angeles EOC 301 Section Specific Training.

Analysis: DOC evaluators cited several examples of participants who entered information into WebEOC without clear knowledge of any follow up actions required or how the entered action item would be closed out when completed. For example, MSEL Inject #1 was a request from the South Area Command for logistical assistance to evacuate the Wilmington area due to excessive flooding. This request was received in the Fire DOC and entered into WebEOC. Evaluators indicated that they observed no additional player follow up to the WebEOC entry. No phone calls to the EOC Fire Branch alerting them to the situation and no follow up requests for assistance. Face-to-face meetings between the DOC and the Fire Branch personnel did not happen until late in the exercise. Moreover, evaluators indicated that the EOC Fire Branch did not provide the Fire DOC with feedback on any of the items entered into WebEOC. Fire DOC participants were questioned as to whether they understood the action item process close out and they replied, “No.” Additional analysis revealed the following:

- The Fire DOC was unaware of the EOC’s objectives
- No EOC organizational chart was available in the DOC and DOC participants were unaware of which EOC sections, branches, and positions were staffed
- The specific information required from the Fire DOC was not identified nor understood by DOC personnel
- The Fire DOC lacks position checklists, job action sheets, and an SOP

While the issues listed above may be unique to the Fire DOC, it is worth additional investigation as to whether these issues plague most or all DOCs. Collectively, the issues listed above significantly contribute to the lack of situational awareness and common operating picture within the EOC.

Area for Improvement 8: Defining the 5-layers of Situational Awareness and Common Operating Picture will improve the use of WebEOC within the EOC and DOCs.

Reference: None.

Analysis: Exercise participants in the EOC and DOCs over relied on WebEOC to provide them with SA/COP. In several post-exercise interviews, exercise evaluators highlighted the exercise participant expectation that they and others would enter information into WebEOC and overtime the system would produce situational awareness and a common operating picture. This over reliance on technology is common among EOCs that use WebEOC and other emergency information management solutions. In order for the technology tool to effectively perform its function within the EOC, four requirements or layers have to be defined. The five requirements or layers are listed and defined below:

1. Information Requirements. Information needed to support decision making, situational awareness, and the establishment of a common operating picture must be defined- ideally during deliberate planning prior to the exercise or EOC activation.

2. Information Gathering. Defines “where” to find the information required. Moreover, it also defines the information format in which the information is needed and how often the information is needed.
3. Information Processing. This layer identifies who within the EOC is responsible for analyzing, processing and disseminating the intelligence derived.
4. Communications Architecture. Identifies the agencies that have an operational information exchange relationship (Information producers and consumers). Moreover, this layer defines the physical communications means (phone, fax, radio, WebEOC, etc.) and the types of information exchanged and/or required to support an operation.
5. Technology Enabler. This layer identifies how technology (e.g. WebEOC) will be used to enhance the EOCs business processes and information sharing.

Without defining the “how” of the layers above, a technology enabler (e.g. WebEOC) has no chance of supporting the development of situational awareness or a common operating picture.

Area for Improvement 9: Exercise participants lacked a collective vision of the enormity of the exercise scenario unfolding around them.

Reference: City of Los Angeles EOC Manual, City of Los Angeles EOC 301 Section Specific Training, and EOC Concept of Operations.

Analysis: Exercise evaluators noted most exercise participants were unable to grasp the enormity of the exercise scenario and the cascading effects that were resulting from it. Perhaps this effect is best exemplified by the statement made by the Operations Section Coordinator who said at 0947 that “we have no situational awareness...we haven’t been able to meet yet and much of the staff are unaware of their duties.” This lack of situational awareness and collective vision can be attributed, in part, to the following reasons:

1. Most Sections spent the first hour training their staff on how to use WebEOC rather than building situational awareness.
2. EOC Standing Objectives were not known to most EOC responders (See EOC ConOp, Implement Standing Objectives).
3. The detailed information and intelligence contained in the Report on Current Conditions (ROCC) was not widely distributed or known.
4. Situational information obtained from the field (simulated) and relayed through the DOC’s was entered into WebEOC without follow up notification to the EOC recipient/s or action taken by the EOC.

LAFD exercise participants added that in this type of scenario the use of visual, audible and other forms of updating staff is essential. Coordinators should be encouraged to hold periodic meetings with staff when major milestones are met within an operational period, at timed intervals, meal breaks, and at shift or operational period changes.

5. Evaluate the EOC’s ability to provide decision makers with decision-relevant information regarding the nature and extent of the hazard, any cascading effects, and the status of the response in accordance with the City’s EOC Policy and Procedures Manual, EOC 301 Course, and in response to a catastrophic flood scenario.

The strengths and areas for improvement for each core capability aligned with this objective are described in this section.

Situational Assessment

The Strengths and Areas for Improvement identified in exercise objectives 1, 2, 4, and 6 apply to this exercise objective as well. They were omitted from this section to avoid redundancy. Following the corrective actions identified in the Improvement Plan will ensure full Situational Assessment capability level attainment.

6. Evaluate the EOC's ability to provide life-sustaining services to the affected population to include citizens with disabilities and others with access and functional needs with a focus on feeding and sheltering in accordance with the City's EOC Policy and Procedures Manual, EOC 301 Course, and in response to a catastrophic flood scenario.

The strengths and areas for improvement for each core capability aligned to this objective are described in this section.

Mass Care Services

Strengths

The partial Mass Care Services capability level can be attributed to the following strengths:

Strength 1: The junior personnel from the Department of Recreation and Parks (RAP) that staffed the DOC demonstrated a willingness to serve, were eager to learn, and maintained a can-do attitude throughout the exercise.

Strength 2: The Park Ranger Headquarters location has very robust communications that enabled communications with the EOC and Department locations throughout the City.

Strength 3: The Department of Recreation and Parks have sufficient numbers of trained personnel to staff the EOC and DOC for multiple operational periods during a real-world event.

Strength 4: The Department of Recreation and Parks views the working relationship with American Red Cross as excellent and values the shelter management partnership with ARC.

Strength 5: Based on current and forecasted weather conditions, Park Rangers proactively planned for future shelter openings and shelter relocations.

Strength 6: The Red Cross EOC demonstrated good internal communication throughout the exercise. Available information was readily shared with DOC staff through meetings and informational updates.

Strength 7: The Red Cross EOC staffing included a Mass Care Subject Matter Expert that provided invaluable counsel on mass care operations throughout the exercise.

Areas for Improvement

The following areas require improvement to achieve the full capability level:

Area for Improvement 1: The current Department of Recreation and Parks Operations Center is too small to accommodate RAP staff.

Reference: None.

Analysis: Exercise evaluators indicated that the workspace with the RAP DOC is insufficient to accommodate a full DOC activation.

Area for Improvement 2: The current Department of Recreation and Parks Department Operations Center (DOC) lacked resources needed to successfully conduct emergency operations.

Reference: None.

Analysis: With the exception of the communications capability provided by the Park Rangers, the DOC lacked critical operational resources. For example, there were no ICS forms on which to document or log actions or information, no maps, and no whiteboard. Exercise evaluators noted that these deficiencies hamstrung the DOC staff and while the exercise activity was light in the beginning of the exercise they could keep up with the pace of the exercise, but when the pace increased, their ability to perform their duties suffered.

Area for Improvement 3: The current Department of Recreation and Parks DOC lacks WebEOC.

Reference: None.

Analysis: Exercise evaluators noted that situational awareness within the DOC was hampered by the lack of WebEOC. Some participants likened the WebEOC absence akin to operating “blind.” Moreover, the lack of situational awareness hampered the RAP staff’s ability to forecast future shelter needs. The absence of WebEOC was likely amplified because of the junior personnel participating in the exercise. For example, the RAP DOC could have asked the EOC to extract information from WebEOC and send it to them. Evaluators indicated information requests were levied on the EOC but primarily from an information deconfliction perspective (e.g. numbers of shelters opened, closed, relocated, etc.).

Area for Improvement 4: The current RAP DOC does not have a DOC SOP or any documentation to guide their operations.

Reference: None.

Analysis: Exercise evaluators indicated that the DOC lacks a standard operating procedure. The absence of guidance, understandably, affected their ability to effectively operate the DOC. For example, exercise participants struggled with information exchange requirements. What should the EOC provide the DOC and conversely, what information should the DOC provide to the EOC were not clear. Moreover, position specific responsibilities (e.g. checklists, job aids, etc.) were not identified and clear. As a result, DOC personnel worked together as a team to solve the issues resulting from the absence of clearly identified instructions.

Area for Improvement 5: Shelter information reporting channels are not understood by all mass care participating organizations.

Reference: City of Los Angeles Mass Care and Sheltering Annex (Version 3, Page 14) and Traditional Sheltering Appendix (Version 4 Draft, Page 21)

Analysis: Red Cross exercise evaluators indicated that some exercise injects developed by the RAP contained subject matter that would not or should not be reported to the RAP DOC. Information pertaining to shelter status or operations should be reported by shelter management personnel to the Red Cross EOC who would then, in turn, report the information to the EOC.

This reporting relationship is documented in the City of Los Angeles Mass Care Annex and RAP personnel did not appear to be familiar with the reference.

Area for Improvement 6: Non-traditional shelter plans do not appear to contain information that delineates when a non-traditional shelter opening should be considered.

Reference: City of Los Angeles Mass Care Annex, Non-Traditional Sheltering Appendix Draft

Analysis: Red Cross exercise evaluators indicated that Red Cross EOC exercise participants recommended the opening of a non-traditional shelter to support the Wilmington evacuation operations. Although recommended early in the exercise, the decision to open or not open the non-traditional shelter was not conveyed to the Red Cross EOC. Moreover, further analysis revealed that the “triggers” to open a non-traditional vs. traditional shelter are not documented. Documenting the “triggers” or reasons to open a non-traditional shelter will assist the LA City EOC decision makers in their evaluation of traditional or non-traditional shelter courses of action.

APPENDIX A: IMPROVEMENT PLAN

This IP has been developed specifically for the City of Los Angeles as a result of City of Los Angeles 2013 Functional Exercise conducted on December 4, 2013.

Improvement Planning Items

| Core Capability | Issue/Area for Improvement | Corrective Actions/ Recommendations | Capability Element | Primary Responsible Organization | Organization POC | Start Date | Completion Date |
|----------------------------|---|---|--------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|------------|-----------------|
| 1.Operational Coordination | 1.1 The City of Los Angeles 2013 Functional Exercise design was not conducted in accordance with the planning timeline recommended by U.S. Department of Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP). | 1.1.1 Begin planning for the 2014 City of Los Angeles Functional Exercise no later than June 1, 2014. | 1.1.1 Planning | EMD | Rob Freeman | 2/6/14 | 6/1/14 |
| | 1.2 The exercise evaluation was hindered by the participation of untrained EOC responders in the exercise. | 1.2.1 Refer the recommendation to establish an EOC credentialing program to the Emergency Operations Board for consideration. | 1.2.1 Training | EMD | Rob Freeman | 2/6/14 | 4/1/14 |

| Core Capability | Issue/Area for Improvement | Corrective Actions/ Recommendations | Capability Element | Primary Responsible Organization | Organization POC | Start Date | Completion Date |
|-----------------|---|---|--------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| | | 1.2.2 Refer the recommendation to establish EOC teams with assigned, credentialed personnel to each team to the Emergency Operations Board for consideration. | 1.2.2 Organization | EMD | Rob Freeman | 2/6/14 | 4/1/14 |
| | 1.3 The lack of communication between the Management Section and EOC floor hindered operations. | 1.3.1 Develop a Management Section specific training course that addresses Management Section roles, responsibilities, and communications strategies. | 1.3.1 Training | EMD | Rob Freeman | Under Development | 4/30/14 |
| | | 1.3.2 Analyze the Management Section information display needs to determine what information needs to be displayed and in what format. | 1.3.2 Planning | EMD | Rob Freeman | 2/6/14 | 12/1/14 |

| Core Capability | Issue/Area for Improvement | Corrective Actions/ Recommendations | Capability Element | Primary Responsible Organization | Organization POC | Start Date | Completion Date |
|-----------------|--|--|--------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|------------|-----------------|
| | 1.4 EOC responders relied too heavily on WebEOC as a means for EOC communication and coordination. | 1.4.1 Develop an information exchange protocol that defines “what” information is to be entered into WebEOC, the follow up steps required for entries that require EOC/DOC action, and how actions items are closed out within WebEOC. | 1.4.1 Planning | EMD | Rob Freeman | 2/6/14 | 12/1/14 |
| | | 1.4.2 Modify the EOC 301 course and future WebEOC training sessions to include the updated protocol. | 1.4.2 Training | EMD | Rob Freeman | 2/6/14 | 12/1/14 |
| | | 1.4.3 Provide WebEOC Training modules in an e-learning platform. Ensure personnel assigned to the EOC or DOC’s with WebEOC complete on an annual basis. | 1.4.3 Training | EMD | Rob Freeman | 2/6/14 | 12/1/14 |

| Core Capability | Issue/Area for Improvement | Corrective Actions/ Recommendations | Capability Element | Primary Responsible Organization | Organization POC | Start Date | Completion Date |
|-----------------|--|--|--------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| | 1.5 Face-to-face inter-branch communication was discouraged by some within the Operations Section. | 1.5.1 Ensure the EOC 301 course instruction emphasizes and reinforces the need for face-to-face communication at all levels. | 1.5.1 Training | EMD | Rob Freeman | 2/6/14 | Ongoing |
| | | 1.5.2 Consider face-to-face communication as one of the steps to be included in the protocol referenced in recommendation 1.4.1. | 1.5.2 Planning | EMD | Rob Freeman | 2/6/14 | 12/1/14 |
| | 1.6. EOC objectives were not shared with the Planning and Intelligence (P&I) Section and were generally unfamiliar to responders working on the EOC floor. | 1.6.1 Ensure the new Advanced Management Section Training Course emphasizes the need for the Management Section to develop and disseminate SMART objectives. | 1.6.1 Training | EMD | Rob Freeman | Under Development | 4/30/14 |
| | | 1.6.2 Use the visual displays throughout the EOC and DOCs to convey the objectives. | 1.6.2 Planning | EMD | Rob Freeman | 2/6/14 | 12/1/14 |

| Core Capability | Issue/Area for Improvement | Corrective Actions/ Recommendations | Capability Element | Primary Responsible Organization | Organization POC | Start Date | Completion Date |
|---|--|---|--------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| | 1.7 Management personnel deviated from the EOC ConOp to conduct a DOC teleconference. | 1.7.1 See recommendation 1.3.1. | 1.7.1 Training | EMD | Rob Freeman | Under Development | 4/30/14 |
| 2.Public and Private Services and Resources | 2.1 The Logistics Section was requested to assign priorities for incoming resource requests. | 2.1.1 Provide EOC personnel with remedial training on the EOC's resource request procedure as outlined in the EOC manual. | 2.1.1 Training | EMD and GSD | Rob Freeman | 2/6/14 | 12/1/14 |
| | | 2.1.2 The General Services Department should require their personnel to attend EOC training as a precursor to serving within the EOC's Logistics Section. | 2.1.2 Training | GSD | Rob Freeman | 2/6/14 | Ongoing |
| | 2.2 The Logistics Section lacked situational awareness pertaining road closures throughout the City. | 2.2.1 Develop an information collection plan that identifies the specific information needs of all EOC sections. | 2.2.1 Planning | EMD | Rob Freeman | 2/6/14 | 12/1/14 |

| Core Capability | Issue/Area for Improvement | Corrective Actions/ Recommendations | Capability Element | Primary Responsible Organization | Organization POC | Start Date | Completion Date |
|-----------------|---|---|--------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|------------|-----------------|
| | | 2.2.2 Incorporate information collection plan instruction into the EOC 301 course. | 2.2.2 Training | EMD | Rob Freeman | 2/6/14 | 12/1/14 |
| | 2.3 Some resource requests forwarded to the Logistics Section by the Operations Section for processing were incomplete. | 2.3.1 See recommendation 2.1.1. | 2.3.1 Training | EMD | Rob Freeman | 2/6/14 | 12/1/14 |
| | | 2.3.2 The Operations Section Coordinator should be staffed by EMD. An EMD staff member can oversee the EOC's "processes" within the Operations Section and ensure the processes identified in the EOC manual and taught in the EOC 301 course are adhered to. | 2.3.2 Organization | EMD | Rob Freeman | 2/6/14 | 12/1/14 |

| Core Capability | Issue/Area for Improvement | Corrective Actions/ Recommendations | Capability Element | Primary Responsible Organization | Organization POC | Start Date | Completion Date |
|-----------------|---|---|--------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|------------|-----------------|
| | 2.4 Logistics Section personnel lacked the situational awareness of current operations to forecast and/or anticipate future resource needs. | 2.4.1 See recommendation 2.2.1. | 2.4.1 Planning | EMD | Rob Freeman | 2/6/14 | 12/1/14 |
| | 2.5 Some resource requests contained terminology unfamiliar to Logistics Section personnel. | 2.5.1 Refer to recommendation 2.1.1. Ensure the EOC 301 course adequately stresses the need to use common terminology when requesting resources AND that Logistics personnel understand they can follow up with the requesting agency to clarify resource requests. | 2.5.1 Training | EMD | Rob Freeman | 2/6/14 | 12/1/14 |
| | 2.6 Logistics Section personnel did not demonstrate a process to determine resource status. | 2.6.1 See recommendations 2.1.1 and 2.1.2. | 2.6.1 Training | EMD and GSD | Rob Freeman | 2/6/14 | 12/1/14 |

| Core Capability | Issue/Area for Improvement | Corrective Actions/ Recommendations | Capability Element | Primary Responsible Organization | Organization POC | Start Date | Completion Date |
|-----------------|--|--|--------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|------------|-----------------|
| | 2.7 Logistics Section personnel did not appear to share cost tracking information with the Finance and Administration Section. | 2.7.1 Provide Logistics and Finance and Administration Section personnel with remedial instruction on the information exchange requirements of both sections to effectively track costs. | 2.7.1 Training | EMD and GSD | Rob Freeman | 2/6/14 | 12/1/14 |
| | | 2.7.2 Continue to update the EOC manual to ensure the information contained in the manual reflects the information taught in the EOC 301 course. | 2.7.2 Planning | EMD and GSD | Rob Freeman | 2/6/14 | 12/1/14 |
| | 2.8 Logistics Section personnel were generally unfamiliar with EOC processes/functions and WebEOC. | 2.8.1 Logistics Section personnel that participated in the exercise should attend the next delivery of the EOC course series. | 2.8.1 Training | GSD | Eric Robles | 2/6/14 | Ongoing |

| Core Capability | Issue/Area for Improvement | Corrective Actions/ Recommendations | Capability Element | Primary Responsible Organization | Organization POC | Start Date | Completion Date |
|----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|------------|-----------------|
| 3.Public Information and Warning | 3.1 No areas for improvement were identified by the exercise evaluator during the exercise. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| Core Capability | Issue/Area for Improvement | Corrective Actions/ Recommendations | Capability Element | Primary Responsible Organization | Organization POC | Start Date | Completion Date |
|---|---|--|--------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|------------|-----------------|
| 4. Intelligence and Information Sharing | 4.1 An overwhelming number of exercise participants could not effectively use WebEOC during the exercise. | 4.1.1 Develop a WebEOC concept of operations. Ensure the ConOp details how the system will be used with specific emphasis on where information is posted and where information can be retrieved. | 4.1.1 Planning | EMD | Rob Freeman | 2/6/14 | 12/1/14 |
| | | 4.1.2 Review WebEOC training to ensure the training provides EOC responders with the skills they need to effectively navigate the system. | 4.1.2 Training | EMD | Rob Freeman | 2/6/14 | 6/30/14 |
| | | 4.1.3 Ensure WebEOC training and proficiency is a key component of EOC personnel accreditation. | 4.1.3 Training | EMD | Rob Freeman | 2/6/14 | 12/1/14 |
| | | 4.1.4 Conduct low-level WebEOC-centric proficiency drills. | 4.1.4 Exercises | EMD | Rob Freeman | 2/6/14 | 12/1/14 |

| Core Capability | Issue/Area for Improvement | Corrective Actions/ Recommendations | Capability Element | Primary Responsible Organization | Organization POC | Start Date | Completion Date |
|-----------------|--|--|--------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|------------|-----------------|
| | | 4.1.5 Create an e-learning course with emphasis on WebEOC. Require LAFD Officers who are members of FIMT, IMT or critical positions complete the e-learning class. Attach completion of the course to the performance bonus members receive. | 4.1.5 Training | EMD and LAFD | Rob Freeman, EMD | 2/6/14 | 12/1/14 |
| | 4.2 Some incident information entered into WebEOC was incomplete, lacked analysis and forecasting information. | 4. 2.1 Ensure EOC responders understand the level of incident information required when entering information in WebEOC. | 4.2.1 Training | EMD | Rob Freeman | 2/6/14 | 12/1/14 |
| | 4.3 EOC visual displays were underutilized during the exercise. | 4.3.1 During the information collection plan development, ensure visual displays are considered as a "means" to convey information. The information displayed on every EOC and DOC display should be | 4.3.1 Planning | EMD | Rob Freeman | 2/6/14 | 12/1/14 |

| Core Capability | Issue/Area for Improvement | Corrective Actions/ Recommendations | Capability Element | Primary Responsible Organization | Organization POC | Start Date | Completion Date |
|-----------------|---|--|--------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| | | carefully thought out. | | | | | |
| | 4.4 No information requirements were levied from the Management Section. | 4.4.1 See recommendation 1.3.1. | 4.4.1 Training | EMD | Rob Freeman | Under Development | 4/30/14 |
| | 4.5 No documented information collection plan was used during the exercise. | 4.5.1 See recommendation 2.2.1. | 4.5.1 Planning | EMD | Rob Freeman | 2/6/14 | 12/1/14 |
| | 4.6 WebEOC incident entry information requirements should be further defined. | 4.6.1 See recommendation 1.4.1. | 4.6.1 Planning | EMD | Rob Freeman | 2/6/14 | 12/1/14 |
| | | 4.6.2 Ensure that one component of the e-learning course includes incident entry requirements. | 4.6.2 Training | EMD | Rob Freeman | 2/6/14 | 12/1/14 |

| Core Capability | Issue/Area for Improvement | Corrective Actions/ Recommendations | Capability Element | Primary Responsible Organization | Organization POC | Start Date | Completion Date |
|-----------------|---|--|--------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|------------|-----------------|
| | 4.7 The LAFD DOC currently lacks a procedure for closing out action items entered into WebEOC. | 4.7.1 See recommendation 1.4.1. | 4.7.1 Planning | EMD and LAFD | Rob Freeman, EMD | 2/6/14 | 12/1/14 |
| | | 4.7.2 Ensure that one component of the e-learning course includes a SMART method to close out items entered into WebEOC. | 4.7.2 Training | EMD | Rob Freeman | 2/6/14 | 12/1/14 |
| | 4.8 Defining the 5-layers of Situational Awareness and Common Operating Picture will improve the use of WebEOC within the EOC and DOCs. | 4.8.1 Continue development of SA/COP tools to include synchronization and knowledge maps; collection plans, and playbooks. | 4.8.1 Planning | EMD | Rob Freeman | 2/6/14 | 12/1/14 |
| | 4.9 Exercise participants lacked a collective vision of the enormity of the exercise scenario unfolding | 4.9.1 Continue development of SA/COP tools to include synchronization and knowledge maps; collection plans, and playbooks. | 4.9.1 Planning | EMD | Rob Freeman | 2/6/14 | 12/1/14 |

| Core Capability | Issue/Area for Improvement | Corrective Actions/ Recommendations | Capability Element | Primary Responsible Organization | Organization POC | Start Date | Completion Date |
|---------------------------|--|--|--------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|------------|-----------------|
| | around them. | | | | | | |
| 5. Situational Assessment | 5.1 Sections 1, 2, 4 and 6 provide the corrective actions for this exercise objective. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 6. Mass Care Services | 6.1 The current Department of Recreation and Parks Operations Center is too small to accommodate RAP staff. | 6.1.1 Evaluate alternative spaces from which to operate the RAP DOC. | 6.1.1 Equipment | RAP | Brian Lam | 2/6/14 | |
| | 6.2 The current Department of Recreation and Parks Operations Center lacked resources needed to successfully conduct emergency operations. | 6.2.1 Consider the purchase of the materials necessary to outfit the RAP DOC for operations. | 6.2.1 Equipment | RAP | Brian Lam | 2/6/14 | |
| | 6.3 The current Department of Recreation and Parks | 6.3.1 Consider the purchase of WebEOC for the RAP DOC in order | 6.3.1 Equipment | EMD | Rob Freeman | 2/6/14 | 12/1/14 |

| Core Capability | Issue/Area for Improvement | Corrective Actions/ Recommendations | Capability Element | Primary Responsible Organization | Organization POC | Start Date | Completion Date |
|-----------------|--|---|--------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|------------|-----------------|
| | Operations Center lacks WebEOC. | to enhance the DOC's situational awareness. | | | | | |
| | 6.4 The current Department of Recreation and Parks Operations Center does not have a DOC SOP or any documentation to guide their operations. | 6.4.1 Consider the development of DOC SOPs for RAP and other DOCs that lack standard operating procedures. | 6.4.1 Planning | EMD and RAP | Rob Freeman | 2/6/14 | 12/1/14 |
| | 6.5 Shelter information reporting channels are not understood by all mass care participating organizations. | 6.5 Consider the conduct of a mass care discussion-based exercise to clarify departmental and organizational roles and responsibilities associated with mass care operations. | 6.5.1 Exercises | RAP and ARC | Brian Lam | 2/6/14 | |

| Core Capability | Issue/Area for Improvement | Corrective Actions/ Recommendations | Capability Element | Primary Responsible Organization | Organization POC | Start Date | Completion Date |
|-----------------|---|---|--------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|------------|-----------------|
| | 6.6 Non-traditional shelter plans do not appear to contain information that delineates when a non-traditional shelter opening should be considered. | 6.6.1 Amend current shelter plans to include the operational factors that may drive the City EOC to activate a non-traditional shelter. | 6.6.1 Planning | RAP and EMD | Rob Freeman | 2/6/14 | 12/1/14 |

APPENDIX B: EXERCISE PARTICIPANTS

| Participating Organizations |
|---|
| State |
| California Governor's Office of Emergency Services, Southern Region |
| County |
| Los Angeles County Office of Emergency Management |
| Los Angeles County Public Works Department |
| Los Angeles County Medical Alert Center |
| Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health |
| Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts |
| City |
| City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety |
| City of Los Angeles Department of General Services |
| City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Bureau of Street Services |
| City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks |
| City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation |
| City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power |
| City of Los Angeles Department on Disability |
| City of Los Angeles Fire Department |
| City of Los Angeles Harbor Department |
| City of Los Angeles Housing And Community Investment Department |
| City of Los Angeles Information Technology Agency |
| City of Los Angeles Office of the Chief Legislative Analyst |
| City of Los Angeles Office of the City Administrative Officer |
| City of Los Angeles Personnel Department |
| City of Los Angeles Police Department |
| Los Angeles Animal Services Department |
| Los Angeles City Attorney's Office |
| Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering |
| Los Angeles World Airports |
| Special Districts |
| Los Angeles Unified School District |
| Non-Governmental Organizations |
| American Red Cross West Los Angeles |

| |
|---|
| Private Sector |
| Business and Industry Council for Emergency Planning and Preparedness |

APPENDIX C: PARTICIPANT FEEDBACK

Please enter your responses in the form field or checkbox after the appropriate selection.

Part I: Recommendations and Corrective Actions

1. Based on the exercise today and the tasks identified, list the top three strengths and/or areas that need improvement.

- SIC worked well to centralize info.
- Asst. did provide useful updates to staff.
- PIO team provided info to internal and external stakeholders using various outlets.
- Great communication (5)
- Great teamwork. (5)
- Need more messages from EOC.
- Exercise needs to be warm start as this was an ongoing rain event.
- Triage was not done when I checked in.
- Good team disseminating info.
- Sharing info among sections could be improved.
- Require training on WebEOC.
- Make sure printers do not default to public info.
- Coordination of Mass Care.
- Great team communication.
- Advance familiarity with exercise scenario.
- Many participants were familiar with EOC operations.
- Pre-exercise meetings helpful.
- Communication between management was excellent.
- Doc was lacking in information.
- EMD personnel were very helpful.
- Situational Awareness of the needs of the field.
- Ability in Web EOC to be notified when Mass Care needs to open shelters.
- Most responders didn't know where we were in the "P".
- More drills to gain experience with equipment.
- Ability to pass messages.
- Equipment tests.
- Good encouragement of working together.
- Good update.
- Have all work stations operational. We were a little short in DOC.
- Need to have updated software.
- Have all the players participate in drill.
- Have resource material at desk.
- Docs need to be better prompted to ensure info is sent up properly to EOC.
- Use if Forms and adherence to protocols by planning section and others.
- Section meetings.
- Software needs enhancement.

- DOC not answering phone 213-576-8984.
 - Web EOC needs improvement.
 - Communication lacked between DOC and EOC.
 - WebEOC couldn't find incidents easily.
 - Information overload-management.
 - Lack of regular briefings.
 - Wonderful attitudes among participants.
 - Web EOC needs to operate correctly.
 - More training/better understanding of my duties.
 - Glitch in WebEOC Logistics Resource Request hang-up.
 - Having the ability to “ earmark ” incidents that pertain to you and list those separately.
 - Addition of building and safety related incident types.
 - Have Web EOC installed onto law Brach.
2. Is there anything you saw in the exercise that the evaluator(s) might not have been able to experience, observe, and record?
- Not all exercise was smooth for the most part.
 - No Access to RCS forms on computer.
 - Ability to be notified when logistic request has been fulfilled.
 - How shooting and amount of messages were sent through LAFD Metro to the valley.
 - Call taker was manually trying to hand write all “injects”, there should be a better way to possibly use a 214 on computer and be “live time” to share with me.
 - Not sure if simulations went back and forced issues to be acted upon.
 - Did not share opportunity to study web EOC. However I know it needed improvement.
 - Have a greeter at front door to direct people to check-in.
 - We could not verify a lot of the injects because the injects did not close the scenarios. It was hard to determine whether or not our injects led to a successful/non-successful end.
 - Interaction between EOC/doc transportation was strong.
 - Outside business partners supported exercise.
3. Identify corrective actions that should be taken to address the issues identified above. For each corrective action, indicate if it is a high, medium, or low priority.
- Provide more details on 214 for individuals.
 - Ensure exercises participants have all the focus.
 - The phonebook was missing from the JIC.
 - Fix WebEOC.
 - WebEOC needs updating. In a real life scenario the logistics resource request procedure could experience problems.
 - Advanced functionality of the WebEOC.
 - Need more copiers in MCR.
 - More training.
 - Better equipment.
 - Simulations need to flu on injects to ensure timely response.

- Resource tracking database and protocols.
- Helpful to see when someone inputs.
- Inset drop down for evacuations needed.
- Train tech support on web EOC functionality.
- Continue ongoing training.
- Have a manual work-around in case of a computer glitch.

Part II: Assessment of Exercise Design and Conduct

Please rate, on a scale of 1 to 5, your overall assessment of the exercise relative to the statements provided below, with 1 indicating strong disagreement with the statement and 5 indicating strong agreement.

| Assessment Factor | Strongly Disagree | | | | | Strongly Agree | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|----------------|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| The exercise was well structured and organized. | 2% | 0% | 17% | 48% | 33% | | | | | |
| The exercise scenario was plausible and realistic. | 2% | 4% | 13% | 35% | 46% | | | | | |
| The controller(s) was knowledgeable about the area of play and kept the exercise on target. | 0% | 2% | 12% | 40% | 46% | | | | | |
| The exercise documentation provided to assist in preparing for and participating in the exercise was useful. | 0% | 12% | 19% | 37% | 33% | | | | | |
| Participation in the exercise was appropriate for someone in my position. | 2% | 0% | 13% | 31% | 54% | | | | | |
| The participants included the right people in terms of level and mix of disciplines. | 4% | 0% | 8% | 48% | 40% | | | | | |
| I generally understood what information was needed to perform my job, where to obtain that information, and with whom to share it. | 2% | 8% | 15% | 40% | 35% | | | | | |
| Information sharing within my operations center* and with response partners was effective and efficient. | 2% | 6% | 21% | 37% | 35% | | | | | |
| My operations' center information systems and procedures helped me gain and maintain situational awareness. | 2% | 8% | 23% | 35% | 33% | | | | | |
| Information management within my operations center helped facilitate a common operating picture that was available to all operations center responders. | 2% | 13% | 15% | 38% | 31% | | | | | |

* The term operations center applies to both emergency and department operations centers.

Part III: Participant Feedback

Please provide any recommendations on how this exercise or future exercises could be improved or enhanced.

- Although this was a warm start event there was confusion to when it actually started in the EOC.
- Perhaps the exercise could be started at 1300.
- Schedule exercises more often and train dept. staff.
- It would be great if one of the wall monitors showed where we are in the "Planning P".

- More amateur radio exercises.
- I need more training and branch situation reports need to be more detailed.
- Damage assessments GeoTech position best served by representative from DBS.
- Good exercise.
- Shorten—demobilization should be expedited.
- Web EOC was no help.
- Better training. Due to lack of training and information from my DOC, I do not know my role or expectations.

APPENDIX D: ACRONYM LIST

| | |
|--------|---|
| AAR/IP | After-Action Report/Improvement Plan |
| AFN | Access and Functional Needs |
| ARC | American Red Cross |
| DOC | Department Operations Center |
| DOD | Department on Disability |
| DOT | Department of Transportation |
| EMD | Emergency Management Department |
| EOC | Emergency Operations Center |
| FE | Functional Exercise |
| GIS | Geographic Information System |
| HAZMAT | Hazardous Materials |
| ICS | Incident Command System |
| JIC | Joint Information Center |
| LAFD | City of Los Angeles Fire Department |
| LAPD | City of Los Angeles Police Department |
| MSEL | Master Scenario Events List |
| OA | Operational Area |
| NWS | National Weather Service |
| P&I | Planning and Intelligence |
| PIO | Public Information Officer |
| RAP | City of Los Angeles, Department of Recreation and Parks |
| ROCC | Report on Current Conditions |
| SA/COP | Situational Awareness/Common Operating Picture |
| SEMS | Standardized Emergency Management System |
| SOPs | Standard Operating Procedures |

This page intentionally left blank.