

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The information for this after action report was gathered through a series of hot wash workshops. The workshops were conducted in individual group settings for Napa County, Solano County, state agencies, and Cal OES. The feedback provided by each group was captured and analyzed. The conclusions of the analysis are stated below.

Description of Event

On Sunday, August 24, 2014, at 0320 hours PST, a magnitude 6.0 earthquake struck five miles northwest of American Canyon, California. The earthquake nucleated at a depth of 10.8km. The shaking intensity in American Canyon and Napa from the Earthquake was a “VII” on the Modified Mercalli Scale, suggesting very strong shaking occurred in the Napa County area. Ground shaking was felt as far south as Salinas, east to Sacramento, and north to Ukiah. The most impacted areas aside from Napa County were Solano County and Sonoma County. This was the most significant earthquake for the region since the 6.9 magnitude Loma Prieta Earthquake that struck in October of 1989. There was significant damage to homes, businesses, and infrastructure. Many injuries were caused by the earthquake most of which were minor to moderate. However, two people did suffer major injuries and one person was killed by falling debris. As of August 30, 2014 at 1400 hours there were 125 aftershocks, four at M3.0 or greater.

Incident Period

August 24, 2014 – September 7, 2014

Declarations and Proclamations

Local Emergency:

Napa County	August 24, 2014
Solano County	August 26, 2014
Sonoma County	August 30, 2014

State of Emergency:

Napa County	August 24, 2014
Solano County	
Sonoma County	

Presidential Declaration:

Major Disaster (FEMA DR-4193)

September 11, 2014

Small Business Administration Declaration:

Napa and Solano Counties

October 27, 2014

AFTER ACTION REPORT
2014-08-24 NAPA EARTHQUAKE

Contiguous Counties: (Economic Injury Loans only)

- Contra Costa
- Lake
- Sacramento
- Sonoma
- Yolo

Statistical Summary

Fatalities:	1
Major Injuries:	2
Minor Injuries:	283
Homes destroyed:	18
Homes with major damage:	113
Homes with minor damage:	1,875
Businesses with major damage:	28
Businesses with minor damage:	337
Preliminary Damage Assessments:	\$87,319,887

Summary of Successes

The following areas list highlights of successful operations in:

- Mitigation measures taken 11 years ago to seismically retrofit historical buildings in the City of Napa were very successful. Those buildings that were retrofitted withstood the impact of the earthquake with little to no damage.
- Staff from both the Napa Operational Area (OA) and the Solano OA reported that the SEMS training they received in the past was a key factor to their successful response to the earthquake.
- Local officials appreciated seeing the Cal OES Director on scene so quickly as a show of his support.
- The coordination efforts made by the California Utilities Emergency Association (CUEA) and Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) resulted in swift restoration of critical infrastructure.

Summary of Areas Needing Improvement

Overall, the management of this disaster was very effective and the needs of the citizens of the impacted counties were met in a timely manner. However, it is important to take advantage of the opportunity to identify areas needing improvement that can enhance California's response to future disasters.

Below are areas identified as needing improvement which can be applicable to all five SEMS levels (Field, Local, Operational Area, Regional and State).

- Some jurisdictions did not properly use SEMS when ordering resources particularly for building inspectors, which in some cases bypassed the OA and Regional levels.

AFTER ACTION REPORT
2014-08-24 NAPA EARTHQUAKE

- Cal OES Region staff needs more training in the area of recovery.
- County emergency managers stated they never received an official notification of the earthquake.
- Conference calls with the region continue to be a hindrance to OAs because they are too long and not enough notice is given before they occur. Also, there was concern that the calls included city jurisdictions as well, thereby not conforming to SEMS.
- For this type of disaster, a Joint Information Center (JIC) needs to be established sooner.
- Much confusion still exists regarding the difference between an Emergency Function (EF) coordinator and an Agency Representative.
- An increased awareness of the needs of people with Access and Functional Needs (AFN) during disasters needs to be prominent in emergency planning.
- Public Information Officers (PIO) and the media need training regarding the rules of accessing shelter sites during disasters.
- One OA identified a lack of staff to operate the OA's EOC. The staffing situation made it difficult to deal with the emergency issues and provide the Regional Emergency Operations Center (REOC) and State Operations Center (SOC) with information.

ORGANIZATIONS CONTRIBUTING TO THIS REPORT

State Agencies and Departments:

California Governor's Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES)
California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
California Highway Patrol (CHP)
California Department of Social Services (CDSS)
California Department of Water Resources (DWR)
California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE)
California National Guard (CNG)
California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal EPA)
Emergency Medical Services Authority (EMSA)
California Energy Commission (CEC)
California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)
California Public Health Department (CDPH)
Department of General Services (DGS)
State Water Resources Board (SWRB)
Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD)

Local Government/Operational Areas/Private/Volunteer Agencies:

Napa County Office of Emergency Services (OES)
Solano County Office of Emergency Services (OES)
California Utilities Emergency Association (CUEA)
American Red Cross (ARC)