United States Department of State
and the Broadcasting Board of Governors
Office of Inspector General

# Office of Audits

# Audit of Emergency Preparedness at the Washington Metropolitan Facilities of the Broadcasting Board of Governors

Report Number AUD/SI-06-24, May 2006

~~IMPORTANT NOTICE~~

~~This report is intended solely for the official use of the Department of State or the Broadcasting Board of Governors, or any agency or organization receiving a copy directly from the Office of Inspector General. No secondary distribution may be made, in whole or in part, outside the Department of State or the Broadcasting Board of Governors, by them or by other agencies or organizations, without prior authorization by the Inspector General. Public availability of the document will be determined by the Inspector General under the U.S. Code, 5 U.S.C. 552. Improper disclosure of this report may result in criminal, civil, or administrative penalties.~~

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY . . . . . 1
BACKGROUND . . . . . 5
OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY . . . . . 7
AUDIT RESULTS . . . . . 9
Occupant Emergency Program . . . . . 9
Occupant Emergency Plan . . . . . 11
RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . . 17
ABBREVIATIONS . . . . . 19
APPENDIX A: METHODOLOGY AND RESULTS OF OIG'S EMERGENCY Preparedness Questionnaire . . . . . 21
APPENDIX B: AGENCY COMMENTS . . . . . 27

# SUMMARY

After the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, the federal government refocused its domestic security needs and responsiveness requirements. Clear lines of command and control within an organization are essential to minimize occupant and responder casualties. Effective emergency planning can substantially reduce the loss of life, risk of personal injury, or property damage.

Thus, in accordance with the FY 2005 Audit Plan, the Office of Inspector General (OIG) conducted an audit of the emergency preparedness of the Broadcasting Board of Governors (BBG). The primary objectives were to determine whether BBG had (1) implemented an Occupant Emergency Program[1] in accordance with regulations, and (2) adequately developed and distributed occupant emergency plans.[2] The audit covered BBG facilities (Wilbur J. Cohen and Mary K. Switzer Buildings) located in Washington, DC, and occupant emergency plans for 2005.

BBG's International Broadcasting Bureau (IBB) said it had implemented an Occupant Emergency Program and had included program guidance in its Manual of Operations and Administration (MOA). However, IBB had not revised the guidance since 1999. As of December 2005, BBG also had not complied with Homeland Security Presidential Directive/ HSPD-5, which required agencies to submit a plan to participate in the National Incident Management System by August 2003. IBB officials said they were not aware of this requirement, but during the audit, they initiated an effort to comply.

The IBB occupant emergency plan dated 2005 for the Cohen Building did not address individuals with disabilities. IBB also had not developed and implemented an emergency plan for its occupants of the Switzer Building. Furthermore, BBG employees lacked specific knowledge regarding their roles and responsibilities during an emergency. About 87 percent of BBG employees responding to an OIG

---

[1]An Occupant Emergency Program establishes procedures for safeguarding lives and property in and around the facility during emergencies.
[2]An occupant emergency plan is a facility-specific set of procedures to protect life and property under defined emergency conditions.

questionnaire said that they were not briefed on BBG's emergency plan within their first month of employment. (See Appendix A.) In fact, 52 percent of the employees responded that they were not aware of or had not read the emergency plan for their primary workplace. An IBB official said the current plan has been disseminated to employees through e-mail notices and a posting on the Intranet.

General Services Administration (GSA) guidance provides that an occupant emergency plan should be tested periodically to maintain training proficiency and identify adjustments to the plan. Although BBG had conducted periodic fire drills, requiring building evacuation, it had not conducted shelter-in-place drills.[3] As a result, 52 percent of BBG employees responded that they would not know what to do if management invoked a shelter-in-place, and 51 percent did not know the designated location for a shelter-in-place.

BBG also needs to improve communications with GSA to ensure that critical emergency and safety mechanisms are installed and operational within the BBG facilities. Both buildings either lacked critical equipment such as fire sprinklers, smoke detectors, and alarms, or if installed, such equipment was in several instances inoperable. In fact, the public address system was inoperable in one of the buildings. GSA specifications indicated that renovations were planned to install emergency and safety mechanisms in the Cohen and Switzer Buildings.

The September 11, 2001, and the July 7, 2005, London attacks demonstrate the need for emergency preparedness. Integral to preparedness are such components as effective communication networks and adequate emergency lighting, signage, and plans.

Thus, OIG is recommending that IBB update its MOA, adopt and implement the National Incident Management System, comply with pertinent regulations, and ensure that critical safety mechanisms are installed and operational within its Washington facilities. On December 19, 2005, OIG conducted an exit conference with IBB officials, and discussed its findings. On February 28, 2006, OIG submitted the draft report to BBG for comments.

---

[3]Shelter-in-place means selecting an interior room or rooms within your facility, or ones with no or few windows, and taking refuge there.

BBG concurred, in principle, with the recommendations in the report; however, the agency did not agree with a part of recommendation four, which referred to phone trees, and the wording used in recommendation five. OIG considered the comments received on the draft report from BBG when preparing the final report and incorporated them and made changes as appropriate. The written comments are included in their entirety as Appendix B.

# BACKGROUND

The United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994[4] established IBB and created BBG with oversight authority over all nonmilitary U.S. government international broadcasting. As mandated for all federal departments and agencies, BBG should provide procedures, resources, and support as appropriate and consistent with its responsibilities for protecting lives and ensuring the continuation of its operations.

BBG is located primarily in the Wilbur J. Cohen Building, shown in Figure 1, and has about 40 employees in the Mary E. Switzer Building, shown in Figure 2. Both buildings are in Washington, DC.

**Figure 1: Wilbur J. Cohen Bldg.**

Source: BBG.

**Figure 2: Mary E. Switzer Bldg.**

Source: Elliott, LeBoeuf & Associates.
(Permission granted by Roger LeBoeuf)

According to the MOA, IBB's Office of Administration is responsible for (1) developing, implementing, and maintaining occupant emergency plans; (2) assisting and advising the designated official in establishing an Occupant Emergency Organization and providing guidance in documenting the occupant emergency plans; (3) maintaining liaison with the Federal Protective Service and GSA building managers who advise and assist offices in administering the Occupant Emergency Program;

[4]Pub. L. No. 103-236.

(4) maintaining a copy of the occupant emergency plan established at each location where BBG is the primary occupant agency or where BBG is included in the occupant emergency plan of another primary occupant agency; (5) conducting an annual review of occupant emergency plans and organizations to ensure that they are current and adequate; (6) advising heads of organizational elements in the Washington area about their responsibility for organizing or participating in the Occupant Emergency Program at buildings other than Cohen and Switzer; and (7) providing training and guidance on facility or occupant emergencies to the heads of various establishments.

The MOA further states that: "The Occupant Emergency Program prescribes the scope and method for immediate, positive, and orderly action to safeguard life and property during facility/occupant emergencies." This program is fully implemented through an occupant emergency plan and the establishment of an Occupant Emergency Organization at each location where BBG is the primary tenant. BBG will participate in a similar organization upon the request of another agency having responsibility as primary tenant.

# OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

The primary audit objectives were to determine whether BBG had (1) implemented an Occupant Emergency Program in accordance with federal regulations, and (2) developed and distributed occupant emergency plans to all personnel. The audit scope covered BBG facilities (Cohen and Switzer Buildings) in Washington, DC, and occupant emergency plans for 2005. The scope did not include BBG's alternate site in Maryland or its Washington-based grantees.

To determine whether BBG had implemented an Occupant Emergency Program, OIG interviewed officials from the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), Federal Protective Service, GSA, and IBB officials. OIG also reviewed other audit and inspection reports relating to emergency preparedness and obtained background information on BBG's emergency preparedness.

To determine whether BBG had adequately developed and distributed occupant emergency plans, OIG analyzed the plans for 2005 and 2001; conducted site visits at BBG Washington facilities; held discussions and interviews with key personnel; observed emergency fire drills on October 13 and October 27, 2005, in the Switzer and Cohen Buildings, respectively; reviewed after-action reports from those emergency drills; and obtained and analyzed relevant budgetary documents and other related reports.

Additionally, OIG collected information, through a questionnaire, from BBG employees regarding information they have received about what to do in the event of an emergency. OIG received 324 responses from the 1,649 occupants of the two buildings housing BBG staff, for an overall response rate of 20 percent, with 94 percent of the respondents' primary workplace being the Cohen Building. (See Table 1.) For specific questionnaire responses, see Appendix A.

**Table 1: Sample Size and Response Rate by Stratum**

| Stratum | Universe | Responses | Response Rate |
|---|---|---|---|
| Occupants whose primary workplace is the Cohen Building | 1,605 | 306 | 19% |
| Occupants whose primary workplace is the Switzer Building | 44 | 18 | 41% |
| **Total** | **1,649** | **324** | |

Source: OIG questionnaire and responses (Sept. 13-Oct. 19, 2005).

The criteria used to determine compliance included Titles 29 and 41 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR); GSA Occupant Emergency Program Guide; Department of Homeland Security Directives, and IBB's MOA, Part IV, Section 470.

The audit was performed in accordance with government auditing standards and included such tests and auditing procedures as necessary under the circumstances. OIG's Office of Audits, Security and Intelligence Division, performed this audit from August to November 2005. On December 19, 2005, OIG conducted an exit conference with IBB officials, and their comments are included in the report as applicable.

# AUDIT RESULTS

Although BBG had implemented an Occupant Emergency Program, the guidance was outdated and did not fully comply with federal regulations. BBG's occupant emergency plan also did not comply with federal regulations.

The September 11, 2001, U.S. attacks and the July 7, 2005, London attacks demonstrate the need for emergency preparedness. Integral to preparedness are such components as effective communication networks and adequate emergency lighting, signage, and plans.

## OCCUPANT EMERGENCY PROGRAM

An Occupant Emergency Program establishes procedures for safeguarding lives and property in and around the facility during emergencies. OIG found that BBG had an Occupant Emergency Program. However, BBG's program, a component of IBB's MOA, was last revised in July 1999, despite the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. BBG's program guidance did not reflect any of the federal government post-9/11 changes on emergency preparedness.

According to the MOA, IBB's Office of Administration, Management Analysis Division was responsible for developing and updating the emergency preparedness program. OIG determined that BBG's Occupant Emergency Program guidance, as addressed in the MOA, was incomplete and did not include pertinent information. For example, the MOA did not address the National Incident Management System (NIMS). NIMS is required per Homeland Security Presidential Directive/HSPD-5.[5]IBB officials acknowledged to OIG that they knew the MOA was outdated and have hired a contractor to update it in sections. IBB has not yet prioritized the MOA sections, but expects completion within two years.

[5]Subject: Management of Domestic Incidents, Feb. 28, 2003.

HSPD-5 requires the heads of federal departments and agencies to adopt NIMS and to support and assist the DHS Secretary in the development and maintenance of NIMS. All federal departments and agencies are to use NIMS in their domestic incident management and emergency prevention, preparedness, response, recovery, and mitigation activities. The heads of federal departments and agencies are to participate in the National Response Plan (NRP), assist and support the Secretary in the development and maintenance of NRP, and participate in and use domestic incident reporting systems and protocols established by the DHS Secretary.

The head of each federal department and agency was to submit its plan by August 1, 2003, for adopting NIMS to the DHS Secretary and the Assistant to the President for Homeland Security. The latter was to advise the President on whether such plans effectively implement NIMS. As of December 2005, BBG had not submitted a plan. A DHS official responsible for the NRP and HSPD-5 compliance confirmed that BBG had not submitted the required plan. This occurred primarily because IBB was unaware of the requirements. During the audit, OIG provided the related guidance to IBB officials. In December 2005, IBB asked OIG for an agency it could contact that was comparable in size to BBG and had successfully implemented NIMS.

## Conclusions

The terrorist attacks highlight the critical need for an adequate Occupant Emergency Program. Although IBB had program guidance, last updated in 1999, it needs to take further actions to improve emergency preparedness and to comply with federal requirements. Thus, OIG is making the following recommendation.

**Recommendation 1:** OIG recommends that the Broadcasting Board of Governors, International Broadcasting Bureau, Office of Administration revise the Manual of Operations and Administration, Part IV, Section 470 and specifically include the requirements of Homeland Security Presidential Directive/HSPD-5, including the submission of a plan to adopt and implement the National Incident Management System and participate in the National Response Plan.

In its response to the draft report, BBG concurred with the recommendation to update the Manual of Operations and Administration (MOA), Part IV, Section 470.

## Occupant Emergency Plan

An occupant emergency plan is a set of procedures to protect life and property, in federally occupied space under defined emergency conditions. The occupant emergency plan for the Cohen Building covers and provides for major types of emergencies and subsequent actions, such as building evacuation or shelter-in-place.

IBB's Office of Administration is responsible for developing, implementing, and maintaining a current occupant emergency plan for all domestic BBG facilities. IBB officials said they had disseminated the current plan to employees through e-mail notices and Intranet postings, and had handed out copies to each occupant of the Cohen Building.

However as of October 2005, IBB had not developed an emergency plan for the Switzer Building. During the audit, IBB provided OIG with a draft copy of an emergency plan for the Switzer Building.

OIG's analysis of IBB's current 2005 occupant emergency plan, or emergency action plan as it is referred to by BBG, found that it lacked critical elements prescribed by federal regulations and other federal guidelines on occupancy emergency requirements. For example, the plan did not identify the members of the occupant emergency team or include provisions for individuals with disabilities as required by 41 CFR and GSA guidance. IBB officials responded that in order to streamline the document, which was over 20 pages, to make it more reader-friendly, not all the specific regulations and other federal guidelines pertaining to occupancy emergency requirements were included.

### Review of Emergency Plan With Employees

According to 29 CFR §1910.38, under the occupational safety and health standards, an employer must review the emergency action plan with each employee covered by the plan when it is developed or when the employee is assigned initially to a facility. However, the majority of employees responding to OIG's questionnaire generally lacked awareness of emergency preparedness. Specifically, 53 percent indicated that they were not familiar with BBG's Occupant Emergency Program, and 52 percent were not aware of the emergency action plan for their primary workplace. The remaining 48 percent that did profess some knowledge of the plan and received a briefing on it within the first month of employment generally viewed the guidance positively. Specifically, 71 percent rated it as more than

adequate or generally adequate overall. The assessments for specific types of emergencies ranged from 50 percent for biological and chemical incidents to a high of 87 percent for bomb threat and suspicious package, as indicated in Table 2.

**Table 2: How Respondents Rated the Guidance Provided By the Emergency Action Plan**

| Type of Emergency | Percentage of Respondents | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | More than adequate; generally adequate | Of marginal or borderline adequacy | Inadequate; very inadequate |
| 1. Medical emergency | 81 | 6 | 13 |
| 2. Rescue (mechanical or other entrapment) | 60 | 20 | 20 |
| 3. Fire | 81 | 6 | 13 |
| 4. Bomb threat | 87 | 7 | 7 |
| 5. Bomb explosion | 64 | 29 | 7 |
| 6. Suspicious package | 87 | 7 | 7 |
| 7. Hazardous substance (spill, leak) | 64 | 29 | 7 |
| 8. Chemical incident | 50 | 29 | 21 |
| 9. Biological incident | 50 | 29 | 21 |
| 10. Radiological incident | 54 | 31 | 15 |
| 11. Natural disaster (i.e., hurricane, tornado, flood, earthquake) | 80 | 13 | 7 |
| 12. Terrorist attack | 73 | 13 | 13 |
| 13. Civil disorder (i.e., hostage takeover or physical threat) | 64 | 29 | 7 |
| 14. Armed attack | 67 | 8 | 25 |
| 15. Workplace violence | 69 | 8 | 23 |
| **Overall** | **69** | **17** | **14** |

Source: OIG questionnaire (Sept. 13-Oct. 19, 2005).

## Emergency Drills and Equipment

According to 29 CFR §1910.38, under the occupational safety and health standards, an emergency action plan should contain, at a minimum, procedures for reporting a fire or other emergency and procedures to account for all employees after evacuation. Although IBB has undertaken several approaches to inform its employees of their roles and responsibilities during an emergency, such outreach has been ineffective according to employee responses to the OIG questionnaire. Basically, there were seven drills noted in the questionnaire. Of the seven drills, only the fire drill, which is an evacuation drill, was performed with any degree of regularity (i.e., 3.53 times per year on average); no other drill was reported as occurring more than 0.08 times per year on average.

In addition, when queried about specific guidance related to an emergency, the majority of respondents indicated that they were unaware of the guidance. More specifically, 52 percent responded that they did not know what to do when a shelter-in-place is invoked, and 51 percent did not know the designated location for a shelter-in-place. Moreover, BBG employees reported via the OIG questionnaire rarely participating in a shelter-in-place exercise for their primary workplace-the average number of times per year was 0.03. Yet drills and exercises play a valuable role in preparing for and assessing emergency readiness.

Both the Cohen and Switzer Buildings still lacked critical equipment, such as fire sprinklers, smoke detectors, and alarms, or if installed, such equipment was in several instances inoperable. Specifically, OIG found the following in the Cohen and Switzer Buildings, as shown in Table 3.

**Table 3: Emergency Preparedness Weaknesses Noted at BBG's Washington Facilities**

| COHEN BUILDING | SWITZER BUILDING |
|---|---|
| • Inoperable public address system with an intercom hanging from the wall.<br>• Inoperable escalator blocked off. Officials explained that parts for the escalator were no longer available.<br>• Fire sprinklers and smoke detectors were not throughout the building (i.e. majority of main floor and major corridors)<br>• No emergency evacuation routes or signs posted. | • No public address system.<br>• An outdated fire alarm system that failed during an OIG observed drill on October 13, 2005.<br>• No marked evacuation routes.<br>• In operable fire sprinklers and smoke detectors. |

Source: OIG analysis.

BBG facilities located in Washington, DC, are buildings of historical significance. GSA building management said that because of the age of the facilities, the buildings are not required to have sprinklers, but if renovated, sprinkler systems have to be included in the renovations. When discussing the emergency preparedness issues of the buildings, such as fire sprinklers and smoke alarms, IBB officials responded that these issues belong with GSA. GSA officials noted that they were responsible for the building, but the BBG officials were responsible for the Occupant Emergency Program and plans for these buildings.

GSA plans to install new fire sprinklers, smoke detectors, and public address systems in both the Cohen and Switzer Buildings. These improvements should take about four years to complete. Thus, in the interim, BBG should consider other

measures used by another federal agency to assist during an emergency evacuation. For example, placing signs at doors at the floor level to denote exits, placing fluorescent tape and arrows to walls at a level six inches from the floor will guide victims in smoked-filled halls to safety. According to 62 percent of the employees responding to OIG's questionnaire, evacuation routes were not clearly marked. OIG suggests that implementing these measures would assist BBG occupants during an emergency.

### Phone Tree

An employee phone tree is a listing of phone numbers with instructions for who will call whom in the event of an emergency. It can also be used as a tool to account for all employees after an evacuation. However, 55 percent of BBG employees responding to the questionnaire indicated that their division did not have an up-to-date emergency phone tree. Moreover, 64 percent responded that they did not know how to use an emergency phone tree.

### Buddy System

Only two percent of the respondents indicated that they were individuals with special needs,[6] and the majority of them reported apprising their supervisor of this fact. However, none of them indicated any knowledge of arrangements, such as the establishment of a buddy system, to assist them in an emergency. Every agency's occupant emergency plan should have a component that addresses the concerns of employees who may need assistance during an emergency. One practical step to assist individuals with disabilities is to establish a buddy system, which should be fully integrated into the agency occupant emergency plan.

---

[6] Executive Order 13347 - Individuals with Disabilities in Emergency Preparedness, July 22, 2004.

## Conclusions

BBG's occupant emergency plan did not include all critical elements or comply with federal regulations. In fact, BBG did not have an emergency plan for the Switzer Building. The current plan for the Cohen Building did not identify the members of the occupant emergency team or include provisions for individuals with disabilities. BBG also did not routinely discuss the emergency plans with new employees. These problems were borne out by the results of the questionnaire. The majority of BBG employees self-reported that they were unaware of the proper procedures to employ in the event of an emergency.

Furthermore, the inoperable public address system and an outdated fire alarm system that failed during an observed drill, along with the resultant lack of timely and orderly evacuation, demonstrate the importance of effective and clear communication networks to notify employees of the extent and magnitude of an emergency. The ultimate measure of BBG's readiness in an emergency is the manner in which it responds to an actual event. Thus, OIG is making the following recommendations.

**Recommendation 2:** OIG recommends that the Broadcasting Board of Governors, International Broadcasting Bureau immediately develop, implement, and maintain an emergency action plan for the occupants of the Switzer Building.

In its comments on the draft report, BBG responded that it has put in place an Emergency Action Plan for employees of the Switzer Building. In addition, BBG has created a Command Center within the building and equipped it with radios, emergency kits, assigned corridor monitors, and auxiliary lighting.

**Recommendation 3:** OIG recommends that the Broadcasting Board of Governors, International Broadcasting Bureau update its emergency action plan to include pertinent elements as outlined in Titles 29 and 41 of the Code of Federal Regulations and General Services Administration guidelines for occupant emergency plans.

BBG officials stated that they will update their emergency action plan to conform with the original template for Occupant Emergency Plans, as outlined in 29 and 41 CFR and GSA guidelines.

**Recommendation 4:** OIG recommends that the Broadcasting Board of Governors, International Broadcasting Bureau review the emergency action plan, phone trees, and the buddy system with each employee covered by the plan when the plan is developed or when the employee is assigned initially to a facility and conduct periodic drills, including sheltering-in-place, as required under federal guidance.

BBG concurred with recommendation 4, with the exception of the reference to "phone trees." BBG officials indicated in their response to the draft that "phone trees" is a Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) requirement and does not apply in this instance.

OIG acknowledges BBG's response and that it is an essential COOP requirement. However, 29 CFR § 1910.38(c) requires that an accounting of employees be performed after an evacuation. Therefore, OIG continues to believe in the utility of recommendation 4 in its entirety.

**Recommendation 5:** OIG recommends that the Broadcasting Board of Governors, International Broadcasting Bureau continue to communicate with the General Services Administration regarding GSA's installation and maintenance of critical safety mechanisms, such as public address systems, sprinklers, and alarms with distinctive signal for either a building evacuation or shelter-in-place.

In their response to the draft report, BBG officials suggested modifying the wording of this recommendation to reflect the GSA's, rather than the BBG's authority to install critical safety mechanisms and the ongoing, positive communications between BBG and GSA regarding those mechanisms. In addition, BBG noted that exit signage installed within the building meets current building standards for fire stairwell and exit signage. In preparing this final report, OIG reexamined the wording of this recommendation, as suggested, and made adjustments accordingly.

# RECOMMENDATIONS

**Recommendation 1**: OIG recommends that the Broadcasting Board of Governors, International Broadcasting Bureau, Office of Administration revise the Manual of Operations and Administration Part IV, Section 470 and specifically include the requirements of Homeland Security Presidential Directive/HSPD-5, including the submission of a plan to adopt and implement the National Incident Management System and participate in the National Response Plan.

**Recommendation 2:** OIG recommends that the Broadcasting Board of Governors, International Broadcasting Bureau immediately develop, implement, and maintain an emergency action plan for the occupants of the Switzer Building.

**Recommendation 3:** OIG recommends that the Broadcasting Board of Governors, International Broadcasting Bureau update its emergency action plan to include pertinent elements as outlined in Titles 29 and 41 of the Code of Federal Regulations and General Services Administration guidelines for occupant emergency plans.

**Recommendation 4:** OIG recommends that the Broadcasting Board of Governors, International Broadcasting Bureau review the emergency action plan, phone trees, and the buddy system with each employee covered by the plan when the plan is developed or when the employee is assigned initially to a facility and conduct periodic drills, including sheltering-in-place, as required under federal guidance.

**Recommendation 5:** OIG recommends that the Broadcasting Board of Governors, International Broadcasting Bureau continue to communicate with the General Services Administration regarding GSA's installation and maintenance of critical safety mechanisms, such as public address systems, sprinklers, and alarms with distinctive signal for either a building evacuation or shelter-in-place.

# ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|---|---|
| BBG | Broadcasting Board of Governors |
| DHS | Department of Homeland Security |
| GSA | General Services Administration |
| HSPD | Homeland Security Presidential Directive |
| IBB | International Broadcasting Bureau |
| MOA | Manual of Operations and Administration |
| NRP | National Response Plan |
| NIMS | National Incident Management System |
| OIG | Office of Inspector General |

# APPENDIX A

## Methodology and Results of OIG Emergency Preparedness Questionnaire

### Methodology

On the basis of information OIG obtained from BBG officials, a review of BBG guidance, and federal guidelines on emergency preparedness, OIG developed a questionnaire to be completed by occupants of the Cohen and Switzer Buildings only. OIG collected information on BBG personnel and contractors' opinions regarding the information they have received about what to do in an emergency.

OIG received 324 responses from the 1,649 occupants, for an overall response rate of 20 percent, with 94 percent of the respondents' primary workplace being the Cohen Building. The majority of the respondents were government employees (90%) who have worked in either the Cohen or Switzer Buildings for over 12 years.

Table 1 shows the details of the survey procedure:

**Table 1: Sample Size and Response Rate by Stratum**

| Stratum | Universe | Responses | Response Rate |
|---|---|---|---|
| Occupants whose primary workplace is the Cohen building | 1,605 | 306 | 19% |
| Occupants whose primary workplace is the Switzer building | 44 | 18 | 41% |
| **Total** | **1,649** | **324** | |

Source: OIG (Sept.13-Oct. 19, 2005).

Notes: (1) Responses to the questions are expressed in percentages unless indicated otherwise.
(2) Percentages may not add to 100 owing to rounding; additionally, the number of responses to each question was not identical because respondents did not always answer all questions.
(3) An asterisk (*) indicates that responses such as "Don't know" were filtered from the data for clarity of the analysis and presentation. By eliminating these responses from the analysis of question 11, for example, only respondents actually providing assessments of the guidance provided by the emergency action plan were included in the evaluation of the plan.

**Results of OIG's Questionnaire**

**Q1** Please provide your Division/Office symbol.

**95% responded to this question.**

**Q2** Please provide your primary workplace. (Check one.)

**[ 94%]** *Wilbur J. Cohen Building*
**[ 6%]** *Mary E. Switzer Building*
**[ 0%]** *Other* **(Please Specify.)** _____

**Q**3 About how many years has this building been your primary workplace? **(Round your answer up to the nearest whole year; enter zero if less than six months.)**

**Responses averaged 12.16 years**

**Q4** Please provide your employment status within the BBG organization. **(Check one.)**

**[ 90%]** *Government Employee*
**[ 7%]** *Contractor*
**[ 3%]** *Purchase Order Vendor (POV)*
**[ 0%]** *Personal Services Contract/Agreement (PSC/PSA)*
**[ 0%]** *Other* **(Please Specify.)** _____

**Q5** Are there other tenants in your building besides BBG?

**[ 98%]** *Yes*
**[ 3%]** *No*
**[ * ]** *Don't know*

**Q6** Are you aware of the BBG's Occupant Emergency Program?

**[ 47%]** *Yes* ----------> **Continue**
**[ 53%]** *No* ----------> **Go to Q8**

**Q7** How would you rate the BBG's Occupant Emergency Program? **(Check one; select "Don't know" only if you are not familiar enough with the Program to render a judgment.)**

**[ 5%]** *More than adequate*
**[ 63%]** *Generally adequate*
**[ 22%]** *Of marginal or borderline adequacy*
**[ 6%]** *Inadequate*
**[ 5%]** *Very Inadequate*
**[ * ]** *Don't know*

**Q8** Are you aware of or have you read the Emergency Action Plan for you primary workplace?

**[ 48%]** *Yes* ----------> **Continue**
**[ 52%]** *No* ----------> **Go to Q12**

**Q9** Within the first month of your employment at your primary workplace, were you briefed on the Emergency Action Plan?

**[ 13%]** *Yes* ----------> **Continue**
**[ 87%]** *No* ----------> **Go to Q12**
**[ * ]** *Don't know/can't recall* ----------> **Go to Q12**

**Q10** How would you rate the briefing you received on the Emergency Action Plan for your primary workplace? **(Check one.)**

**[ 21%]** *More than adequate*
**[ 50%]** *Generally adequate*
**[ 29%]** *Of marginal or borderline adequacy*
**[ 0%]** *Inadequate*
**[ 0%]** *Very Inadequate*
**[ * ]** *Don't know/can't recall*

**Q11** For your primary workplace, how would you rate the guidance provided by the Emergency Action Plan for a ... **(Check one box in each row; select "Don't know" only if you are not familiar enough to render a judgment.)**

| | *More than adequate* | *Generally adequate* | *Of marginal or borderline adequacy* | *Inadequate* | *Very inadequate* | *Don't know* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| medical emergency? | **6%** | **75%** | **6%** | **6%** | **6%** | * |
| Rescue (mechanical or other entrapment)? | **7%** | **53%** | **20%** | **7%** | **13%** | * |
| fire? | **25%** | **56%** | **6%** | **6%** | **6%** | * |
| bomb threat? | **20%** | **67%** | **7%** | **7%** | **0%** | * |
| bomb explosion? | **21%** | **43%** | **29%** | **7%** | **0%** | * |
| suspicious package? | **13%** | **73%** | **7%** | **7%** | **0%** | * |
| hazardous substance (spill, leak)? | **14%** | **50%** | **29%** | **7%** | **0%** | * |
| chemical incident? | **14%** | **36%** | **29%** | **21%** | **0%** | * |
| biological incident? | **14%** | **36%** | **29%** | **21%** | **0%** | * |
| radiological incident? | **15%** | **39%** | **31%** | **15%** | **0%** | * |
| natural disaster (i.e., hurricane, tornado, flood, earthquake)? | **13%** | **67%** | **13%** | **7%** | **0%** | * |
| terrorist attack? | **13%** | **60%** | **13%** | **13%** | **0%** | * |
| civil disorder (i.e., hostage takeover or physical threat)? | **7%** | **57%** | **29%** | **7%** | **0%** | * |
| armed attack? | **17%** | **50%** | **8%** | **25%** | **0%** | * |
| workplace violence? | **15%** | **54%** | **8%** | **23%** | **0%** | * |
| other? **(Please specify.)** _____ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | * |

**Q12** Do you have a specific role or duties to perform (such as, Floor Monitor/ Warden, Handicapped Monitor, etc.) in the event of an emergency?

**[ 4%]** *Yes* ----------> **Continue**
**[ 96%]** *No* ----------> **Go to Q15**

**Q13** Please provide in the space below your specific role, duties, title, etc. with respect to an emergency.

**All persons answering yes to Q12 responded to this question.**

**Q14** Did you receive any training to prepare you for your role, duties, etc., with respect to an emergency?

**[ 60%]** *Yes*
**[ 40%]** *No*

**Q15** Are the evacuation routes clearly posted on the walls of your workplace?

**[ 38%]** *Yes*
**[ 62%]** *No*
**[ * ]** *Don't know*

**Q16** Do you know what to do when a shelter-in-place is invoked?

**[ 48%]** *Yes*
**[ 52%]** *No*

**Q17** Do you know the designated location for shelter-in-place in your primary workplace?

**[ 49%]** *Yes*
**[ 51%]** *No*

**Q18** During the time that this building has been your primary workplace, about how many times per year have you participated in ... **(Fill in each box; place a zero in the box if you have never participated in that type of drill).**

| | |
|---|---|
| fire drills? | **[Avg 3.53]** |
| shelter-in-place drills? | **[Avg 0.03]** |
| chemical or biological exposure drills? | **[Avg 0.01]** |
| hostage takeover drills? | **[Avg 0.00]** |
| physical threats drills? | **[Avg 0.07]** |
| natural disaster drills? | **[Avg 0.02]** |
| terrorist drills? | **[Avg 0.08]** |
| other? **(Please specify type of drill.)**_____ | **[Avg 0.03]** |

**Q19** Does your Division/Office have an up-to-date emergency phone tree?

**[ 45%]** *Yes*
**[ 55%]** *No*
**[ * ]** *Don't know/can't recall*

**Q20** Do you know how to use an emergency phone tree?

**[ 36%]** *Yes*
**[ 64%]** *No*

**Q21** Do you know who the Handicapped Monitor is for your primary workplace?

**[ 4%]** *Yes*
**[ 96%]** *No*

**Q22** Are you a person with special needs?

**[ 2%]** *Yes* ----------> **Continue**
**[ 98%]** *No* ----------> **Go to Q25**

**Q23** Have you notified your supervisor/manager of your special needs?

**[ 71%]** *Yes* ----------> **Continue**
**[ 29%]** *No* ----------> **Go to Q24**

**Q24** Have arrangements been established to assist you in the event of an emergency (i.e., Buddy System)?

**[ 0%]** *Yes* ----------> **Go to Q26**
**[ 100%]** *No* ----------> **Go to Q26**

**Q25** Although you are not a person with special needs, are you nonetheless aware of ...

| | *Yes* | *No* |
|---|---|---|
| people with special needs in your office? | **[ ~ ]** | **[ ~ ]** |
| procedures in place for people with special needs? | **[ ~ ]** | **[ ~ ]** |

Note: A tilde (~) indicates that this question was answered very infrequently; therefore, the results expressed in percentages or otherwise were not sufficiently meaningful to be reported.

**Q26** Please use the space below to continue or elaborate on any answer or to provide any additional information that you think is important or pertinent.

**21% of the respondents provided comments.**

# APPENDIX B

BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

March 28, 2006

The Honorable Howard J. Krongard
Inspector General
U.S. Department of State

Dear Mr. Krongard:

This is in response to your letter dated February 27, 2006, regarding the Office of Inspector General (OIG) draft inspection report titled "Audit of Emergency Preparedness at the Washington Metropolitan Facilities of the Broadcasting Board of Governors," Report No. AUD/SI-06-XX, dated February 2006.

The Broadcasting Board of Governors (BBG) has reviewed the above listed OIG report and provides its comments to address Recommendations 1 through 5 as noted on the enclosure.

We thank you for the opportunity to respond to the report. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Ms. Carol F. Baker, Director, Office of Administration, or Mr. Stephen S. Smith, Associate Director for Management at (202) 203-4588.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Y. Tomlinson
Chairman

Enclosure: As Stated

330 INDEPENDENCE AVENUE, SW ROOM 3360 COHEN BUILDING WASHINGTON, DC 20237 (202) 203-4545 FAX (202) 203-4568

Enclosure

**BBG Response to the OIG Draft Report**
**"Audit of Emergency Preparedness at the Washington Metropolitan Facilities of the Broadcasting Board of Governors"**
**Report Number AUD/SI-06-XX**
**February 2006**

**OIG Recommendation 1: OIG recommends that the Broadcasting Board of Governors, International Broadcasting Bureau, Office of Administration revise the Manual of Operations and Administration, Part IV, Section 470, and specifically include the requirements of Homeland Security Presidential Directive/HSPD-5, including the submission of a plan to adopt and implement the National Incident Management System and participate in the National Response Plan.**

**BBG Response**: The Broadcasting Board of Governors (BBG) concurs with Recommendation 1 regarding the update of the Manual of Operations and Administration (MOA), Part IV, Section 470. The MOA is being updated as time permits, and will include the requirements of Homeland Security Presidential Directive/HSPD-5, including the submission of a plan to adopt and implement the National Incident Management System and participate in the National Response Plan.

**OIG Recommendation 2: OIG recommends that the Broadcasting Board of Governors, International Broadcasting Bureau immediately develop, implement, and maintain an emergency action plan for the occupants of the Switzer Building.**

**BBG Response:** To safeguard our personnel, BBG put in place an Emergency Action Plan for our employees and workspace several months ago, and the employees have copies of this plan. We created our own Command Center for our employees in the Switzer Building, with radios, emergency kits, assigned corridor monitors, and auxiliary lighting.

**OIG Recommendation 3: OIG recommends that the Broadcasting Board of Governors, International Broadcasting Bureau update its emergency action plan to include pertinent elements as outlined in Titles 29 and 41 of the Code of Federal Regulations and General Services Administration guidelines for occupant emergency plans.**

**BBG Response:** The BBG will update the emergency action plan to conform to the original template for Occupant Emergency Plans (OEPs), as outlined in Title 29 and 41 of the Code of Federal Regulations and General Services Administration (GSA).

**OIG Recommendation 4: OIG recommends that the Broadcasting Board of Governors, International Broadcasting Bureau review the emergency action plan, phone trees, and the buddy system with each employee covered by the plan when the plan is developed or when the employee is assigned initially to a facility and conduct periodic drills, including sheltering-in-place, as required under federal guidance.**

**BBG Response:** The BBG concurs with this requirement with one exception; the reference to "phone trees" is a Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) requirement (not OEP), and does not apply in this instance. With regard to the OEP, it has been disseminated widely and is on the BBG website. When the new OEP is completed, the BBG will ensure all employees are familiar with it.

Also, the BBG has conducted at least one planned fire drill per year, and we conducted our first Sheltering-In-Place (SIP) drill earlier this year. Our plans are to conduct evacuation and SIP drills quarterly.

**OIG Recommendation 5: OIG recommends that the Broadcasting Board of Governors, International Broadcasting Bureau, continue to work with the General Services Administration to ensure that the critical safety mechanisms, such as public address systems, sprinklers, and alarms with distinctive signal for either a building evacuation or shelter-in-place, are installed and operational. Additionally, evacuations signage should be posted to assist occupants during an evacuation when corridors are filled with smoke.**

**BBG Response:** The BBG suggests modifying the wording in this recommendation to reflect the GSA's , rather than the BBG's authority to ensure the installation and operation of critical safety mechanisms, and the ongoing, positive communications between the BBG and the GSA regarding those mechanisms. As discussed in the Emergency Preparedness exit conference, BBG suggests that the recommendation address the need for continuing those communications, and not imply that BBG has the authority or the responsibility to "ensure" the desired result. We therefore suggest that the wording of the recommendation be modified to recommend that the BBG/IBB continue to communicate with the General Services Administration regarding GSA's installation and maintenance of critical safety mechanisms, such as public address systems, and alarms with a distinctive signal for either a building evacuation or shelter-in-place. Sprinkler and voice systems are now being installed within the Cohen Building under a GSA contract.

In addition, regarding the wording in this recommendation, the BBG suggests removing the requirement to post exit signage, as it is not our responsibility to do so. Even so, exit signage that has been installed within the building, meets current building standards for fire stairwell and exit signage.

The BBG would like to point out that contrary to the comment in Table 3 of the OIG report, the Switzer Building fire alarm system (which remains the responsibility of GSA) did not fail during the observed drill. As was explained to the auditors at the time, a GSA technician inadvertently shut off the alarms in that portion of the building when initiating the drill. The system was subsequently checked and another fire drill was successfully accomplished two weeks later.

Although the Switzer Building does not have a public address system, this is being installed as a part of GSA's renovation project now underway. Evacuation routes are marked within the Switzer Building, per the National Fire Code (NFC), with the appropriately installed EXIT signage, including emergency power backup. Smoke detectors are installed and working within the elevators and other strategic places within the Switzer Building. The renovation project underway includes the installation of smoke detection systems as well as sprinklers throughout the entire building.

**FRAUD, WASTE, ABUSE, OR MISMANAGEMENT**
of Federal programs
and resources hurts everyone.

Call the Office of Inspector General
**HOTLINE**
**202-647-3320**
**or 1-800-409-9926**
**or e-mail oighotline@state.gov**
to report illegal or wasteful activities.

You may also write to
Office of Inspector General
U.S. Department of State
Post Office Box 9778
Arlington, VA 22219
Please visit our Web site at:
http://oig.state.gov

Cables to the Inspector General
should be slugged "OIG Channel"
to ensure confidentiality.