

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

ACADEMIC SENATE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - AGENDA

November 2, 1982

FOB 24-B

3:00 PM

Chair, Jim Simmons
Vice Chair, Ron Brown
Secretary, Barbara Weber

- I. Minutes
- II. Announcements
- III. Business Items
 - A. Quality of Committee Recommendations (Hill) (Attachment)
 - B. Disaster Preparedness Plan (Simmons) (Attachment)
 - C. Constitution (Johnson)
- IV. Discussion Items
 - A. University Committee Appointments (Simmons)

MEMORANDUM

To: Executive Committee

Date: October 7, 1982

From: Bob Hill

Subject: Quality of committee recommendations

It happens too often that committee reports brought to the Executive Committee as potential agenda items are simply in no shape to go to the Senate floor. Some of the more obvious deficiencies include:

- (1) WHEREAS clauses do not adequately support the RESOLVED clauses.
- (2) The issues are not clearly stated, i.e., much time is likely to be wasted on the floor simply in finding out what is being proposed.
- (3) The action to be taken as a result of successful Senate passage may be unclear. For most Senate resolutions to be meaningful, some identifiable person must take certain specific action. This needs to be clearly stated.

It is not only inefficient, but potentially dangerous to try to remedy important deficiencies either in the Executive Committee or on the Senate floor. At the same time, it is also unpleasant to return an item to committee for rework. In the hopes that there is some effective structural change available, I propose the following resolution:

RESOLVED: That the Chair appoint an ad hoc committee to investigate the problem of getting satisfactory committee recommendations presented. This committee should consider the preparation of a resolution check list, or such other measures as may lead to more effective presentation of Senate committee recommendations.

[Personal comment: I believe that such a committee should include Ron Brown, Tim Kersten, and Max Riedlsperger if possible; others as interests warrant.]

We, the undersigned, urge that the proposed draft of the Disaster Preparedness Plan for Peacetime Emergencies be tabled until the following questions and criticisms are addressed and met:

I. Procedural Items

- A. We believe that four meetings of the Disaster Preparedness Task Force did not allow for any discussion of many sections of the plan. Each facet of the plan deserves due recognition and discussion.
- B. We question that of the 14 members on the task force, only four representatives, two faculty, two students, represent the majority population affected by any disaster on campus. Therefore, we question the representativeness of the committee.
- C. Frequently the students have not received notification of the time, place and nature of the meetings.

II. Substantive Items

The following comments relate to the three sections that have been studied. Given time, similar comments might be listed on the other sections.

Earthquakes

- A. The plan states that "building assessment surveys will be made by Facilities Planning/Plant Operations in order to identify structural seismic hazards" (emphasis added). When? Hopefully before an earthquake actually occurs.
- B. The plan also states that "shelter facilities will be announced" (emphasis added). Again, this matter needs to be addressed immediately, not during an actual emergency. Shelters should be designated in the plan.
- C. Transportation is called for in order to move car-less staff/students to relocation centers, yet the number of vehicles available for this move is not specified.
- D. Four police officers are not sufficient to handle any type of evacuation, if necessary.
- E. The plan states that handicapped people will receive transportation to staging areas by contacting the Public Safety dispatcher. This does not tell what to do in case the lines are out.

Hazardous Material Incident

- A. The plans for the evacuation of students and staff in the event of a spill on campus, on the railway or roadway, are non-existent.
- B. Since there are only three exits off campus, the greatest danger appears to be a derailment involving a spill, which conceivably cut off both Highland and California, leaving Grand Avenue as the only exit. A careful study of this situation needs to be done.
- C. Except for the chart following the "Hazardous Material Incident" section of the plan, there is no mention of railway or roadway spills.
- D. In the chart referred to above, a staging area is noted. However, there are no particulars given concerning the on-campus staging areas.
- E. Evacuation to a location is also noted on the above mentioned chart. Again, no specifics are addressed.
- F. Under Section V., the plan states that "Only trained personnel shall be allowed to enter, wearing protective clothing and biological respirators". No mention is made as to who these persons are, how many are trained, what training is required, etc.

Nuclear Power Plant Emergency

- A. The plans and discussion of the evacuation of some 10,000 people are inadequate. The proposed use of the three existing exits will not allow for a quick and safe evacuation of students, faculty, and staff.
- B. The proposed shelters are inadequate for a number of reasons. They have not been surveyed for radiation. One such designated shelter is Crandall Gym, one of the oldest structures on the campus. There is one staff bathroom in the building, one women's bathroom and one men's bathroom in the locker rooms in the adjacent building. Neither of these facilities can be reached without going outside. These buildings have not been surveyed to determine how many persons they can accommodate. There are no provisions for food and water. The Kennedy library has no shower facilities, called for in the superficial decontamination process. The building monitors and "designated shelter leaders" are neither appointed nor trained. Further, the plan does not mention the availability of monitors or leaders.

- C. At the October 7 meeting of the Disaster Preparedness Task Force, it was admitted that there are only five docimeter trained persons at Cal Poly. The plan calls out that "Each emergency worker that may be exposed to ionizing radiation must wear a docimeter. Each shelter leader must also wear a docimeter". This statement implies that all emergency workers exposed must be pretrained, these workers have not even been designated, let alone trained. It also states in the plan that every person working for the state of California is designated an emergency worker. Therefore they must all receive the necessary training, unaccomplished to date.
- D. The designated Emergency Operation Centers are inadequate structures. They have not been analyzed for radiation, nor have they been tested for adequacy in the event of an emergency such as in the event of an earthquake.
- E. There is only one radiation treatment center in the city of San Luis Obispo. It is located at French Hospital and has a carrying capacity of nine beds. Furthermore, P.G. and E. has first priority on these beds, rendering the center un-useable to Cal Poly.
- F. There are only four police officials on duty at Cal Poly at any given time. We believe this is inadequate to service the mass evacuation of 6,000 plus vehicles at once.
- G. The plan fails to specify the number of vehicles available to evacuate the 4,000 or so "carless population".
- H. The plan designates numerous University officials to perform additional functions in the event of an emergency. None of these officials have been given the training necessary to perform the additional duties.
- I. All faculty and staff, well over 1,500 people, have been designated "emergency workers". None have been trained, designated or even notified of their duties.
- J. Emergency workers have not been trained to use docimeters, what to do in case of the maximum REM's dose per person, and there are only 15 docimeters available.
- K. Since potassium iodine is a perishable material, it cannot be bought now for the future. There is no mention of the availability, the storage, and the administration of KI other than "an authorization will be given by the county health officer."
- L. There are no adequate provisions for decontamination. Questions about the availability of clothes and methods are raised.

- M. The plan has not been realistically tested, and faculty and students havenot been involved in the to date testing.
- N. There are no provisions guaranteeing that handicapped students will be effectively evacuated.
- O. Students, Faculty and Staff are uneducated on their obligations or where to go.

Ann Morgan, Ph.D.
Name
Faculty Senate Representative
Position

Susan L Figini
Name
ASI Representative
Position

Carl Zutter
Name
Faculty Senate Rep
Position

Hubert "Skip" Moss
Name
ASI Representative
Position

October 21, 1982