

**RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
DISTRICT SAFETY & SECURITY SUB-COMMITTEE (DSSC)
MEETING MINUTES
Friday, March 7, 2025**

ATTENDEES:	ATTENDEES:	ABSENT:
DiMemmo, Kristie	Arguelles, Rudy	Taube, Rhonda
Mark DiMaggio	Kazsuk, Tracy	MVC Student Body President
Hicks, Marie	Caringella, Graciela	NC Student Body President
Esqueda, Monica	Gonzalez, Evelyn	RCC Student Body President
Tu, Beiwei	Greg Ferrer	Collins, Michael
Brandi Avila	Bolanos, Victor	Martin-Thornton, Renee
Kevin Wurtz	Heim, Stefanie	Thomas Cruz-Soto
Moore, Frankie	Susanne Ma	
Covarrubias, Araceli	DeAnda, Julie	
Blackmore, Chris	Goldware, Rebecca	
Clarke, Chris	Askar, Majd	

Approval of Minutes

The meeting was called to order at 10:01 AM by Beiwei Tu. Marie Hicks moved to approve the minutes from the December meeting, and Stephanie Heim seconded the motion. No revisions were suggested, and the minutes were approved unanimously.

Emergency Operations Plan Review

Beiwei Tu presented the Emergency Operations Plan for a second review. Tu explained that the document establishes the framework for emergency preparedness and response district-wide, with the primary priority being to protect life and property. The plan is based on the hazards overview from the local Hazard Mitigation Plan.

The hazards overview included several key areas of concern. Wildfire smoke was identified as the primary concern during wildfire season, given the district's geographic location. Earthquakes have been experienced frequently but have not caused significant damage. Hazardous materials present a limited risk due to their small quantities on campus, although proximity to railroad tracks was noted as a potential issue. Power failures were identified as having higher potential frequency, but no public safety power shutoffs have been experienced to date. Flooding is a concern, particularly at RCC, which is situated in an area with elevated flood risk. Terrorism and active shooter threats were discussed in the context of the open campus nature creating vulnerability.

The plan is based on several key assumptions. The district must be prepared to survive for a period before county or state assistance arrives. All employees are considered disaster service workers and may be required to respond in emergencies. The Chancellor or designate has the

authority to proclaim a state of emergency. During such declarations, access to district property may be restricted.

For its operational structure, emergency operations adhere to the principles of the National Incident Management System (NIMS), with the Incident Command Structure modeled after the Emergency Operations Center approach. The plan establishes a four-level response approach: Emergency Management Watch (standby/monitoring), Minor Emergency (handled at department level), Moderate Emergency, and Major Emergency. Tu emphasized that these levels could change dynamically as situations evolve.

The plan outlines specific responsibilities for different roles. District leadership is tasked with setting the tone, endorsing the approach, and overseeing recovery. College leadership is responsible for fostering a culture of preparedness, implementing plans, and managing college-level responses. Department administrators must develop department emergency plans and encourage training. Individual employees are expected to participate in preparedness activities, attend training sessions, and assist with restoration efforts as needed.

The Emergency Operations Center (EOC) serves as the central hub for coordinating emergency response. Its functions include information sharing, continuity operations, and resource allocation. Both physical and virtual EOC options are available, with specific procedures detailed in Appendix D for different emergency types.

Communication protocols are a key component of the plan. The RAVE mass notification system serves as the primary tool for rapid information dissemination. Follow-up communications are necessary for obtaining more detailed information beyond the initial alerts. Training encompasses both classroom instruction and hands-on experience, with EOC members receiving additional training on RAVE alerts twice a year.

Additional components of the plan include after-action reporting for continuous improvement (described as developmental rather than judgmental), ADA compliance considerations for individuals requiring additional assistance, preservation of vital records, state of emergency procedures and extension protocols, and a line of succession based on board policy.

During the discussion period, Marie Hicks identified several grammatical corrections needed, including "support" needing to be plural on page 11 and a question about "provide guidance" being struck out on page 7. There was also a discussion about disaster service worker training requirements, with Tu clarifying that the district is moving away from requiring all employees to complete FEMA training and will instead focus on district-specific procedures. Marie Hicks noted that Norco College had previously experienced a credible active shooter threat, and there was reference to the San Bernardino shooting where RCC was potentially targeted. A historical bomb threat incident at UCR during graduation was also mentioned.

After discussion, Marie Hicks moved to accept the plan as written with the noted corrections. Dr. DiMemmo seconded the motion. With no abstentions or objections, the motion carried unanimously.

Crisis Communications Guidelines

Chris Clarke presented the Crisis Communications Guidelines, explaining that they are part of a broader set of guidelines being developed for external relations and strategic communications. He noted that while these do not rise to the level of board policy, they provide district-wide guidance. After review by this committee, the guidelines will be presented to the DSPC.

The guidelines are built around several guiding principles, including clarity, accuracy, consistency, and timeliness in all crisis communications. Three categories of critical incidents are defined: law enforcement-related incidents, facility-related incidents (such as plumbing, HVAC, and gas leaks), and other critical incidents (including earthquakes, fires, floods, and storms).

Clarke outlined the roles and structure for crisis communications. The Incident Commander (IC) could be the Chancellor, a college president, the Chief of police, or a designee. The Public Information Officer (PIO) role would primarily be filled by Clarke himself, with VC Goldware as a backup or a college PAO if needed. The Crisis Communications Team (CCT) comprises the Vice Chancellor, Public Information Officer (PIO), public affairs officers, Director of Government Relations, and Information Architect. In cases requiring multi-agency coordination, a Joint Information Center (JIC) would be established.

For communication channels, the RAVE Alert system serves as the primary tool for urgent communications. This system incorporates text messaging, voice messages, email, RSS feed to websites, social media alerts, desktop messaging, digital signage, and the Guardian app. For non-crisis situations, alternative communication tools are available, including the Canvas network, WebAdvisor, public address systems, blue phones, media releases, press conferences, and RCCD email and Listserv.

Regarding media relations, Clarke explained that the PIO serves as the designated spokesperson, with all media inquiries directed to the PIO during emergencies. The guidelines emphasize maintaining transparency while observing FERPA and confidentiality requirements. News and social media will be closely monitored to correct any misinformation that may emerge.

Training and review processes include communications training conducted twice a year and RAVE alert system training twice a year for 26 designated personnel. The guidelines will be reviewed every two years.

During the discussion, Marie Hicks asked for clarification on what constitutes a crisis versus a localized emergency. Clarke confirmed that individual medical emergencies typically wouldn't activate the EOC or trigger a RAVE alert unless there was a need to keep people away from a specific area. Frankie Moore expressed concern about blue emergency phones on campuses and requested the prioritization of making all blue phones operational. Tu noted that this issue would be addressed in the discussion of the Security Assessment Report.

Academic Continuity Planning

Beiwei Tu proposed forming a task force to develop plans for continuing teaching during emergencies. The purpose would be to develop comprehensive plans for maintaining educational continuity, create templates and standards for academic continuity, and learn from the pandemic experience to avoid disorganized modality changes in future emergencies.

For implementation, Tu suggested meetings every other month, with a focus on creating templates and using the task force as a sounding board. The task force would address issues such as modality changes during emergencies, grade policy adjustments, and drop deadlines during mid-semester emergencies.

In the discussion, Araceli Covarrubias asked about the time commitment required. There were also concerns raised about the varying types of emergencies that require different responses. Tu emphasized the need for a more organized approach than what occurred during the pandemic, noting that the rapid shift to online learning was not as smooth as it could have been with better planning and coordination.

Regarding task force composition, Tu noted the need for input from faculty on academic policies. Marie Hicks volunteered to represent associate faculty if permitted. Dr. DiMemmo suggested involving Academic Senate Presidents in the process. Araceli Covarrubias recommended including the Faculty Association due to the implications for working conditions.

Marie Hicks moved to form the task force, and Dr. DiMemmo seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. Tu agreed to send a follow-up email to the committee for volunteer recruitment.

District Safety and Security Assessment Report

Beiwei Tu presented highlights from the 433-page District Safety and Security Assessment Report. The report included a CAP Analysis examining neighborhood crime statistics. The District and COIL locations showed a 500+ score, which Tu explained was influenced by the nearby detention center. RCC received a score of 229, while Moreno Valley and Norco scored in the 200+ range. Tu noted that the national average is 100, and scores in the 200 range are consistent with Riverside County averages.

The assessment included input from 60 key stakeholders, including faculty, staff, and administrators who were interviewed. Tu mentioned that student leaders were not interviewed due to a lack of response to outreach efforts. Key stakeholder concerns included the need for increased campus security presence, improved community and physical security infrastructure, enhanced emergency preparedness, and improved student mental health services. Stakeholder recommendations included mandating safety training, with a particular concern about low participation rates; increasing police and public safety patrols; improving communication protocols; updating security infrastructure, including cameras; and expanding mental health services.

Two surveys were conducted as part of the assessment. The student survey received 236 responses, comprising 151 from RCC, 27 from Moreno Valley, 28 from Norco, and 30 from COIL. The primary student concerns included the open campus nature, police presence, lighting, security technology, communication during emergencies, interactions with transient individuals, and access to mental health resources. The employee survey had 249 respondents, comprising 119 faculty members, 95 classified staff members, and 32 administrators. Employee concerns mirrored those of students but also highlighted communication delays due to outside dispatch, classroom security issues, inconsistent emergency procedures, and low participation in training.

The physical site assessment revealed several key findings. Regarding key management, there is no centralized system; instead, each campus manages keys differently and has inconsistent door hardware across locations. Perimeter security issues included inconsistent window film application, a lack of a standard approach to security bumpers, non-standard fencing requirements, and the ECE fence being noted as too low. Signage and wayfinding concerns included faded signage, with Tu explaining that appearance impacts crime prevention through environmental design principles.

Security technology assessments revealed that access control is not centrally managed, with four different accounts across the district. Additionally, multiple intrusion detection systems are in use, an inconsistent approach to car access exists, and no standard guidelines exist for security camera types or placement. Emergency communication systems were evaluated, noting that visitor management is only implemented at ECE and the district office. Multiple types of emergency phones are available (blue phones and wall phones with blue lights), but some units have functionality issues. PA systems vary, with Norco using a dedicated PA system, Moreno Valley using blue phones, and RCC in the process of sourcing a siren system.

The exterior lighting assessment included a night evaluation that found lighting to be generally adequate but identified some low-light areas. Some parking areas and walkways were identified as needing enhancement, and maintenance issues were observed, including light poles with one bulb functioning and one not working.

For the next steps, Tu explained that she is working with Hussain on Facilities Planning and Development to create an action plan. They are evaluating which improvements require bond money versus operational funding. The action plan will be presented at next month's meeting.

During the discussion, Marie Hicks noted that Norco College's proximity to a prison may affect its crime statistics. Victor Bolanos asked about access to the full report. Rudy, joining by phone, asked about faculty input opportunities, and Tu confirmed that the action plan would be brought back to this committee for input before advancing through shared governance channels.

Police Department Updates

Chief DiMaggio provided brief updates on department activities. Regarding police officer candidates, one candidate withdrew from the process, and another candidate failed the background check. As a result, the position is being advertised through the end of the month. DiMaggio also mentioned that a Public Safety Advisory Committee is being formed with VC

Brown. The committee will include representatives from all constituency groups, and its formation will be formally approved by DSSC.

Workplace Violence Prevention Program

Monica Esqueda presented information on the Workplace Violence Prevention Program, which is now available on three website locations: the Police website, Risk Management (under Safety and Injury/Illness Prevention Program), and the HR website, serving as the primary location. The program components include information on various types of workplace violence, board policies related to workplace violence, access to training through the Vision Resource Center, a reporting form submitted to Human Resources, and comprehensive plan documentation. Esqueda noted that the program was launched on July 1, 2024.

Training Platform Migration

Monica Esqueda presented on the migration to the Vision Resource Center training platform. She explained that this is the State Chancellor's Office learning management platform, offering single sign-on access through RCCD. Dr. Lorraine Jones has created a customized homepage for RCCD users. All Cal/OSHA training sessions are now available on the platform, with a total training time of 1 hour and 28 minutes, divided into short, targeted modules.

The benefits of the new platform include manager reporting capabilities, certificates available for telework verification, flex credit available for training completion, and training applicable to both work and home situations. Regarding the timeline and requirements, Esqueda noted that the best practice is to complete within 90 days, although the technical deadline extends to the end of the year. A flyer has been created showing access instructions for users.

During the discussion, Araceli Covarrubias asked about associate faculty compensation for training. There was clarification provided on the difference between flex credit and professional development credit, as well as the distinction between HR training requirements and risk management training.

Next Meeting

The next meeting was scheduled for the first Friday of April (April 4, 2025) at the same time. The upcoming agenda will include a discussion on traffic control and the security assessment action plan.

The meeting concluded at approximately 11:30 AM.