



Headquarters
30628 Detroit Road, No. 222
Westlake, OH 44145

West Coast Office
One Embarcadero Center, Ste. 500
San Francisco, CA 94111

800.598.2102 *tel/fax*
www.putnamcic.com

Northern California Grantmakers Disaster Preparedness and Response Initiative

Needs Assessment Report *April 1, 2007*

Prepared by Putnam Community Investment Consulting, Inc.
Galen El-Askari, MPH, Consultant
Kris Putnam, MSW, President
<http://www.putnamcic.com>

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Executive Summary | 1 |
| Methods | 1 |
| Assessment Findings..... | 1 |
| Recommendations..... | 5 |
| I. Introduction | 9 |
| Methods | 9 |
| Literature scan | 10 |
| Online survey of NCG membership | 10 |
| Key informant interviews..... | 10 |
| NCG Disaster Preparedness and Response Initiative Task Force..... | 11 |
| II. Assessment Findings | 11 |
| Internal preparedness planning in the philanthropic sector..... | 11 |
| Opportunities for building capacity among grantees..... | 17 |
| Assisting grantees to operate in a disaster..... | 19 |
| Disaster preparedness and response grantmaking | 21 |
| Collaboration within the sector and coordination across sectors | 26 |
| Coordination with government..... | 29 |
| Pooling funds..... | 30 |
| Collaboration with corporations..... | 31 |
| NCG's role | 31 |
| III. Recommendations | 31 |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

To assist with disaster management planning among philanthropic organizations, Northern California Grantmakers (NCG) has launched the San Francisco Bay Area Disaster Preparedness and Response Initiative. As the first step of this initiative, NCG engaged Putnam Community Investment Consulting (Putnam) to conduct a needs assessment of NCG and Corporate Contributions Roundtable (CCR) members that identifies their operational and grantmaking resources for disaster management planning, and to determine how NCG can most effectively support its members in meeting those needs.

Methods

In August 2006, NCG engaged Putnam to conduct a four-pronged needs assessment, consisting of a literature scan of best practices, an online survey of NCG membership, a series of key informant interviews, and discussions with NCG's Initiative Task Force. The focal point of the assessment was the online survey. However, in order to design the survey, Putnam conducted four initial exploratory interviews with key informants and held an initial Task Force meeting to receive guidance on content. After designing and administering the survey, 12 additional interviews were conducted to discuss content and gain deeper insights into the survey findings, which would not have been possible in a short online survey. The Task Force met a second time to reflect and provide feedback on the initial findings.

Assessment Findings

The review of data yielded findings that fell naturally into four primary areas:

1. Internal disaster preparedness planning in the philanthropic sector
2. Opportunities for building disaster preparedness and response capacity among grantees
3. Disaster preparedness and response grantmaking
4. Collaboration within the philanthropic sector and coordination across sectors

1. Internal disaster preparedness planning in the philanthropic sector.

Approximately one fifth (19%) of organizations surveyed report that they are very prepared to operate after a major disaster, and one half (51%) are somewhat prepared. However, responses to other questions indicate that far fewer than half of the organizations have more than one or two components¹ of a comprehensive disaster plan in place. On the other hand, a substantial percentage of organizational representatives indicate interest in putting a disaster plan into place. Between 40% and 53% expressed interest in:

¹ For example: an identified person responsible for developing the organization's plan for operating during disasters; a process for testing the plan; a list of staff and board members' home contact information distributed to all employees and board members; hard copies of important legal documents stored at an off-site location; computer files regularly backed up to an off-site location; and others.

- developing an explicit plan for communicating to grantees in the event of a disaster;
- developing an explicit plan for communicating with other organizations in the event of a disaster; and
- a process for testing their disaster plans.

One half of organizations have at least begun many activities to prepare staff for a disaster. They have offered, or begun, to:

- distribute handouts on disaster preparedness and response (49%);
- conduct emergency response drills (41%); and
- post emergency preparedness instructions (49%); and/or
- train staff on personal preparedness and response (47%).

Key informants describe barriers to internal disaster preparedness planning that include:

- lack of support from a champion from high-level leadership;
- a tendency to put disaster preparedness on the “back burner” and develop only cursory policies and procedures;
- competing priorities; and
- lack of information and resources for preparedness.

2. Opportunities for building capacity among grantees. There is more interest in internal preparedness than in preparing grantees for disasters among organizations surveyed. Between one half and two thirds of organizations have not yet and are unlikely to communicate with grantees about disaster preparedness, offer training or assistance on this topic, or offer funds to develop and/or test grantee preparedness plans.

Along these same lines, approximately one half of organizations have not yet and are unlikely to put into place plans to assist grantees in their response *after* a disaster. The surveyed organizations generally do not have:

- MOUs for quick funding after a disaster;
- discretionary authority to make immediate grants after a disaster; or
- clear communications to grantees describing expense tracking expectations during a disaster (critical for subsequent reimbursement).

However, approximately one third of these organizations are interested such activities that can assist grantees in their response after a disaster.

Several interviewees said that building capacity among local nonprofit organizations (NPO) and faith-based organizations (FBO) needs to be a priority simply because so many become first responders following a disaster. Some interviewees also observed that “philanthropy has a key role in building civic infrastructure” and as such can help to reframe the disaster preparedness discussion. While the absence of preparedness and recovery planning means “that most vulnerable populations and community-based organizations will never be anything but victims,” the philanthropic community has the capacity to create best practices, templates, and models that could empower grantees.

Some people interviewed suggested that philanthropic organizations could require all grantees to take small steps, such as:

- placing disaster information on posters in common areas such as bathrooms;
- requiring meetings sponsored with grantee dollars to include a 30-second safety message in the beginning (e.g., a reminder that should there be an earthquake, the procedure is to drop, cover, and hold);
- placing signage as to where the first aid kit, tool kits, exits, and evacuation routes are located;
- distributing a one-page floor plan marking all things that are safety-related; and
- funding a basic class on nonprofit preparedness.

3. Disaster preparedness and response grantmaking. Very few Bay Area philanthropic organizations are engaged in proactive, predisaster grantmaking, and most of those that provide funds in response to a disaster limit their support to immediate relief. One interviewee stated, “Philanthropic organizations give money away in exactly the opposite way that you need to in an emergency. They can’t make quick, easy decisions. Philanthropic organizations are not set up to deal with this in their usual practice.” Another commented, “Resources are a challenge in an environment [where] resources are limited for current needs. The idea of trying to devote some of those resources to something that hasn’t happened yet is difficult.” One Task Force member offered an explanation as to why foundations are not prepared: “Philanthropic organizations are like penguins. They scoot to the edge, waiting to see if someone else falls in, and if they come up with a fish, then they’ll go in. A lot of philanthropic organizations wait until other organizations are doing something—they don’t want to look foolish.”

Survey respondents were asked how their organizations might prioritize preapproved grants to fund organizations in the event of a disaster. Responses generally fell into five categories:

1. Fund groups providing basic needs and services for the most vulnerable populations.
2. Fund current grantees—service agencies with which the philanthropic organization already has a working relationship and that have already demonstrated capacity to appropriately manage funding.
3. Fund groups according to the decisions of the organization’s Board or the protocol established by some other preapproved agreement, such as a pooled fund.
4. Fund groups in a specific geographic region.
5. Fund grantees based on what group(s) was most ready to respond.

Of the four main stages in disaster preparedness and recovery (preparedness, relief, recovery, and reform), organizations are most likely to fund relief immediately following a disaster (64%) and recovery efforts to return life to normalcy (60%). They are less

likely to fund preparedness planning prior to a disaster (25%) or reform efforts to use the crisis to improve conditions (29%).

4. Collaboration within the sector and coordination across sectors. One quarter (25%) of all respondents and one fifth (21%) of organizations stated that they are aware of disaster preparedness or planning activities in the Bay Area philanthropic community. Seventeen percent (17%) of individuals (and 13% of organizations) stated that their organization was involved with such activities.

More than one quarter (28%) of organizations are absolutely interested or very likely interested in joining with other philanthropic organizations in a coordinated effort to address disaster preparedness and response. However, 28% of organizational representatives do not know the level of interest in their organization for such a partnership. Organizations with budgets between \$5 million and \$25 million are more likely than larger and especially than smaller organizations to be interested in joining a coordinated effort.

Asked about how Bay Area organizations could partner with systems outside of the region or the philanthropic community to effectively respond, interviewees made the following recommendations:

- Have agreements in place so staff can be placed in a geographic area that is not affected.
- Coordinate some level of grantmaking so that if there is agreement about who the first responders are, resources can be focused for those organizations to raise the level of scale of their response.
- Establish agreements with philanthropic organizations outside the area, and give them a list of grantees and the authorization to disburse funds.
- Plan how to quickly get supplies to NPOs and FPOs. Partner with companies that can provide supplies, such as new clothes, prepared meals, diapers, etc.
- Learn the scope and limits of what FEMA, the Red Cross, HUD, Food Stamps, etc. are responsible for so that foundations can fill the gaps.
- If a disaster is of such a scale that donors across the country and the world want to respond, decide in advance on an intermediary that will be ready to swing into action quickly.
- Have an alternate plan if the intermediary suffers a loss of building or infrastructure.
- Coordinate among philanthropic organizations that fund similar population areas to add disaster preparation and response in those areas (e.g., all organizations that focus on the elderly could develop a consistent response for that population).

There is widespread interest in exploring a pooled fund and NCG's role in convening such a fund. However, there was not clear consensus on decision-making and the scope of such a fund. For example, a fund could be designed to be single or multi-county; it could be dedicated to immediate response only, or include recovery and rebuilding. There was also recognition that philanthropy needs to be at the larger emergency

management table and coordinate more effectively with other efforts in the nonprofit community as well as with government entities.

NCG's role. Survey respondents were provided a list of seven possible roles that NCG could take on to aid in philanthropic-based disaster preparedness and response. They are interested in seeing NCG

- maintain a website/clearinghouse of information before, during, and after a major disaster (64%);
- educate or provide resources for philanthropic sector staff members about disaster preparedness and planning (64%);
- provide sample documents (i.e., disaster plans, MOUs) used by organizations or corporate giving programs (62%);
- develop standards or samples of best practices of disaster preparation for the philanthropic community (60%);
- convene organizations or corporate giving programs to prepare for a major local disaster (53%); and
- develop and maintain a communications system that is likely to function in disaster conditions (51%).

Interviewees were supportive of these roles and functions and were especially interested in the convener role, as well as NCG's role in setting up mechanisms for pooling funds for disaster preparedness.

Recommendations

The following recommendations reflect a broad range of best practices and specific needs within the Bay Area philanthropic community. While these recommendations are derived from the needs assessment data, they may not all necessarily be addressed by the NCG Initiative.

1. **Internal preparedness.** In order to withstand an emergency and to continue their mission to serve their grantees, foundations must take steps to prepare to survive a large-scale disaster. One Task Force member succinctly commented, "In order to achieve our mission, we need to stay in business." After Hurricane Katrina, most foundations had to close their doors. Internal preparedness efforts, including business continuity planning, protect the organization's employees *and* its grantees in the event of an emergency. Those that remain functional after an emergency can help their staff restart operations and can continue to provide financial support to their grantees. There is existing literature that offers guidance on creating internal preparedness plans. (See the Council of Foundations and Northern California Grantmakers websites). Typically, these plans advise foundations to
 - set up phone trees among staff;
 - have a hard copy of all employee, vendor, and grantee information regularly updated and located off-site;

- choose an off-site meeting place for employees;
- pick an out-of-state or out-of-area repository for data and continually update important data;
- create contingency banking plans, which include
 - ✧ obtaining authorization from trustees to make emergency grants in the event that trustee approvals can not be obtained;
 - ✧ designating a person authorized to distribute funds; and
 - ✧ obtaining pre-approved spending amounts for disaster relief;
- minimize paperwork in the event of an emergency for grantees; and
- communicate these systems to grantees, especially those likely to be involved in disaster relief and recovery.

NCG could develop an online toolkit complete with checklists, templates, best practice documents and other resources to support internal preparedness. Additionally, NCG could convene philanthropic staff responsible for internal preparedness planning.

2. Philanthropic organizations can use their leverage to **help their grantees prepare for emergencies**. There is widespread agreement that in a major disaster, people will turn to local service organizations such as faith-based organizations, senior centers, health clinics, and food banks for help. Nonprofits will be pressed into service during an emergency: “Community-based organizations and NGOs with a local presence are the first on the scene when disasters occur... Working with and supporting these organizations allows them to carry out their important role while providing grantmakers with valuable information about the situation on the ground.”²

To assist their grantees to be prepared internally and externally, philanthropic organizations can use their leverage as grantmakers to ask grantees to create emergency preparedness plans. For example, the City of San Leandro asks nonprofits that receive municipal funding to participate in disaster preparedness classes.³ One expert commented, “I’m always pleased when a grantmaker like PG&E requires training in disaster preparedness for their grantees.”

On a smaller scale, funders can require organizations to engage in bite-size steps, such as placing disaster information on posters in bathrooms and making sure employees and clients have flashlights and whistles.

3. Philanthropic organizations can be good disaster preparedness and response **grantmakers**. To do so, they must create nimble emergency grantmaking processes to get funds out the door quickly in an emergency. “Foundations give money away in exactly the opposite way that you need to in an emergency,” explained one Task Force member.

² *Disaster Grantmaking: A Practical Guide for Foundations and Corporations*, Council on Foundations and the European Foundation Centre, 2001.

³ *Disaster Preparedness: A Guide to Planning for California Community Foundations*, League of California Community Foundations, 2001.

Philanthropic organizations can focus particular attention on bolstering capacity to grantees that serve those with special needs, such as low-income, disabled, non-English speaking, elderly, and homeless populations.

NCG could be a clearinghouse for best practices in disaster grantmaking. In addition the NCG Disaster Preparedness and Response Task Force could sponsor training sessions and briefings on this topic to the larger Bay Area philanthropic community.

4. Philanthropy can play a large role in **reframing** the disaster preparedness discussion. Disaster relief is traditionally thought of as the exclusive province of the government and such organizations as the Red Cross. That paradigm must shift if the philanthropic community is going to be an active participant in relief and recovery. “We have trained the nation that there [is] a narrow group of people who are the responders... We have branded nonprofits and businesses as *not* responders,” says Ana Marie Jones. “Funders are in the best position to make things happen in the community,” she adds. The lack of widespread preparedness and recovery planning means “that most vulnerable populations and community-based organizations will never be anything but victims.”
5. The philanthropic community can play a **role in the overall emergency management system**:
 - Designate an intermediary organization to connect grantmakers in the region at all levels of disaster preparedness.
 - Inventory local, state, and federal resources for disaster relief and recovery. (*Disaster Preparedness: A Guide to Planning for California Community Foundations*, League of California Community Foundations, 2001, is an excellent resource).
 - Consult and coordinate with existing disaster relief agencies and collaboratives, including Voluntary Organizations Active in Disaster (VOAD)⁴ and the Coordinated Assistance Network (CAN)⁵, to identify gaps in services.
 - Coordinate with Office (s) of Emergency Services in local jurisdictions to identify gaps in services and to communicate disaster relief plans. Ask to be part of the region’s disaster relief and recovery system.
6. The **corporate sector** is generally further ahead of the philanthropic community in terms of disaster planning. Many have whole infrastructures in place for disaster preparedness (e.g., PG&E and Kaiser Permanente). In addition, such funders as PG&E require disaster planning of their grantees. Foundations should explore opportunities for leveraging resources, building a learning community, and enhancing coordination with this sector. One Task Force member commented, “The voice of corporate philanthropy is really important. We may be surprised at how much it would mean to businesses for communities to be ready.”

⁴ VOAD coordinates planning efforts by many voluntary organizations responding to disaster.

⁵ CAN supports coalitions of non-profit disaster agencies, including the development of shared databases of survivors and clients. (See www.can.org.)

7. Interviewees suggested that a critical role for NCG is **information dissemination**, as complex issues (e.g., race, economics, neighborhoods) arise. “Thinking through all these dynamics is an ongoing process. NCG should really take this and put it on a three-to-five-year trajectory so that people are educated on salient issues—whether they are best practices, new technologies, or experiences from other places—and develop capacity to coordinate testing the level of readiness of first responders.”
8. Another key opportunity for collaboration is the development of **regional planning and pooled funding**. This can encompass coordinating with other existing efforts, developing educational campaigns, coordinating advocacy efforts on behalf of the philanthropic community within the government sector, and/or pooling funds for relief, recovery, and/or rebuilding that would be activated in case of disaster. While controversial, these are areas that need to be explored fully. (At a minimum, NCG can convene discussions in this regard.)

I. INTRODUCTION

Hurricane Katrina shuttered most New Orleans-based philanthropic organizations. Yet one key lesson learned following the hurricane's devastation was that in a large-scale natural disaster, communities need philanthropy more than ever. As the federal response to the flooding came up tragically short, local government, nonprofits, and faith-based organization stepped up to alleviate the human suffering and to help the region move forward. Bay Area grantmakers can heed the lessons of Katrina and other recent disasters to help their community prepare for and recover from catastrophe.

Clearly, not all philanthropic organizations support nonprofits that will clothe or shelter people in the first days or weeks after a disaster. But neither is any Bay Area grantmaker likely to remain untouched by a major natural disaster such as a powerful earthquake. All foundations can educate themselves now in the four stages of disaster recuperation—relief, recovery, reconstruction, and transformation—and prepare to promote one or more phases of community healing and renewal in the wake of disaster.

To assist with disaster management planning among philanthropic organizations, Northern California Grantmakers (NCG) has launched the San Francisco Bay Area Disaster Preparedness and Response Initiative. As the first step of this initiative, NCG engaged Putnam Community Investment Consulting (Putnam) to conduct a needs assessment of NCG and Corporate Contributions Roundtable (CCR) members, which identifies their operational and grantmaking resources for disaster management planning and determines how NCG can most effectively support its members in meeting those needs.

The following report describes the needs assessment's findings, which fall under the following categories:

- Internal preparedness planning in the philanthropic sector
- Opportunities for building capacity among grantees
- Grantmaking
- Collaboration within the sector and coordination across sectors

Putnam makes eight recommendations based on the needs assessment findings. These recommendations, while broader than the purview of the NCG initiative, will inform the subsequent development of a strategic plan, beginning in early 2007.

Methods

In August 2006, NCG engaged Putnam Community Investment Consulting (Putnam) to conduct a four-pronged needs assessment, consisting of a literature scan of best practices, an online survey of NCG membership, a series of key informant interviews, and discussions with the Task Force. The focal point of the assessment was the online survey. However, in order to design the survey, Putnam conducted four initial exploratory interviews with key informants and held an initial Task Force meeting to receive guidance on content. After designing and administering the survey, additional interviews were conducted to gain deeper insights into the survey findings and discuss content that would have been prohibitive in a short online survey. The Task Force met a second time

to reflect and provide feedback on the initial findings. This section describes these four components in more detail.

Literature scan

Putnam reviewed various documents already collected by NCG or referred by Task Force members and key informants, and it conducted its own Internet research on disaster preparedness. Specifically, documents that focused on disaster preparedness and response in the philanthropic and nonprofit sectors, as well as some key literature on business resumption (or continuity) planning were gathered. These were reviewed for their relevance to the Initiative and passed on to NCG for their website. Many of those are cited throughout this report.

Online survey of NCG membership

The online needs assessment survey was launched on Monday, October 16, 2006, and responses were collected through Tuesday, November 7, 2006. Respondents completed the survey using the professional version of Survey Monkey. During those three weeks, three reminder emails were sent to nonrespondents to stress the importance of completing the survey. In addition, Putnam staff telephoned all NCG-member nonresponding organizations at the end of the second week to encourage survey completion.

The survey was sent to a total of 528 persons from 143 foundations and corporate giving programs, and to 28 individuals from 21 non-NCG corporate giving programs. A total of 96 persons from 69 organizations completed the survey. For many questions, the responses of only one designated representative from the organization were analyzed so that the report can relate key findings by organization, rather than by individual.

One or more persons responded from 68 of the 143 NCG-member organizations—a 48% response rate. Further, from the non-NCG-member list, one person responded, for a 5% response rate. Of those who began the survey, 15 (22%) did not complete it, and for the majority of questions there are responses from 53–55 organizations. Results were transferred to the statistical software program SPSS for analysis.

Key informant interviews

A total of 17 interviews were conducted in the months of September through November of 2006. About half were conducted with Task Force members and the remaining with experts in the field.

A first round was exploratory, meant to gain insights into the field of good disaster planning, examples of philanthropic response in recent national disasters, and an initial sense of what kinds of questions to include in the online survey. Putnam spoke to two Task Force members who were well-informed and actively engaged in disaster preparedness, including one family foundation and one corporate foundation. In addition, interviews were conducted with the Louisiana Disaster Recovery Foundation and the New York Regional Association of Grantmakers to ensure that lessons learned from recent disasters were incorporated into the needs assessment. Collaborating Agencies Responding to Disasters (CARD) was consulted specifically on the content of the survey and was engaged in reviewing the survey before it was launched.

Once the online survey closed and preliminary findings were produced, Putnam conducted seven additional interviews with Task Force members. They were queried on their organizations' internal preparedness, response plans, grantmaking, and their perceptions regarding collaboration and coordination.

Five additional experts were contacted to gain insights into specific areas of the needs assessment. Putnam interviewed security and operations experts, informants from Louisiana and the faith-based community, and representatives from the American Red Cross and other Bay Area efforts for assessing preparedness.

NCG Disaster Preparedness and Response Initiative Task Force

NCG held two Task Force meetings to gain guidance in the development of the needs assessment. An initial meeting in September was aimed at getting input on the survey content. The group provided extensive input on the types of questions they felt should be either in the survey or answered in the key informant interviews. Once the survey was drafted, a subgroup of the Task Force and NCG staff reviewed it and then tested it before a final version was launched to NCG membership.

After Putnam wrote up the preliminary survey findings and completed the key informant interviews, the Task Force met to discuss the findings, interpret them, and agree on their key implications for upcoming strategic planning.

II. ASSESSMENT FINDINGS

The review of data yielded findings that fell naturally into four primary areas:

- Internal disaster preparedness planning in the philanthropic sector
- Opportunities for building disaster preparedness and response capacity among grantees
- Disaster preparedness and response grantmaking
- Collaboration within the philanthropic sector and coordination across sectors

Internal preparedness planning in the philanthropic sector

Although many Bay Area philanthropic organizations learned from the Loma Prieta earthquake and, more recently, from the Katrina disaster that disaster preparedness is something that “we can’t do at our leisure” very few who responded to the online survey are prepared for the aftermath of a disaster. Approximately one fifth (19%) of philanthropic organizations report that they are very prepared to operate after a major disaster, and one half (51%) are somewhat prepared.

| GENERAL LEVELS OF ORGANIZATIONAL PREPAREDNESS | | | | | |
|---|-------------|-----------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| (% of organizations) (n=66-67) | Very | Somewhat | Little | Not at All | Don't Know |
| How prepared is your organization to operate after a major disaster? | 19% | 51% | 13% | 10% | 6% |
| How prepared is your organization to continue grantmaking services during and following a major disaster? | 18% | 49% | 15% | 11% | 8% |

Interviewees repeatedly commented how easy it is to put disaster preparedness on the “back burner” and develop only cursory policies and procedures. Among philanthropic organizations that have done some disaster preparedness, one Task Force member commented that much of the impetus has come from the ad hoc and sporadic grants made to support organizations when there has been a natural disaster, such as the forest fires in Southern California. The lack of interest or support from CEOs or board of directors is a barrier to organizations. “Our CEO has never said a word about this, which is why we haven’t done much about this. The CEO needs to be a champion. On our board, we have people very interested in underserved communities, but if we had a single board member who was carrying the torch for preparedness, it would make a dramatic difference.”

Although 70% of organizations report being very or somewhat prepared to operate after a major disaster, fewer than half of the organizations have more than one or two components of a comprehensive disaster plan in place for organizational functioning during and after a disaster. While almost three quarters (74%) of responding organizations back up computer files to an off-site location, and almost two thirds (62%) distribute staff and board contact numbers to all employees, fewer than half of organizations have the other preparedness components in place.

Key informant interviewees suggested adding the following disaster preparedness procedures:

- Plan how technology systems can come back online, including having a comparable system off-site.
- Have an adequate stock of supplies on hand that people know about and know how to use (flashlights, water, dust masks, etc.)
- Develop an emergency communication plan (emergency cards with home and cell phone numbers) and an identified place to meet off-site if foundation offices are destroyed.
- Develop agreements about how the organization would continue to do business (decide on a decision-making procedure if trustees are unavailable, a preordained back-up system, a grantmaking system, an off-site location for backed-up data, and a communications plan that allows contact with colleagues).

| DISASTER PREPAREDNESS PROCEDURES | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|
| (% of organizations) (n=57) | Yes, in Place | Yes, Process Begun | Not in Place but Interested | No, Doubt Will in Next Year | Don't Know |
| Computer files regularly backed up to off-site location | 74% | 14% | 7% | 3% | 2% |
| Staff and board contact numbers distributed to all employees and board members | 62% | 17% | 10% | 10% | -- |
| Identified person responsible for operating plan during disasters | 40% | 21% | 25% | 12% | 2% |
| Hard copies of important legal documents stored off-site | 32% | 12% | 39% | 12% | 5% |
| Dedicated communication device for CEO and board chair posted and distributed for disaster use | 30% | 9% | 30% | 28% | 4% |
| Comprehensive written plan for disaster preparedness during and after major local disaster | 23% | 21% | 30% | 26% | -- |
| Staff member(s) aware of county disaster response plans in all operational counties | 21% | 14% | 30% | 29% | 5% |
| Staff member(s) with established relationship to Office of Emergency Services | 21% | 5% | 26% | 44% | 4% |
| A process for testing the organization's disaster plan | 18% | 9% | 49% | 23% | 2% |
| Explicit plan for communicating to others, i.e., media or government agencies | 18% | 7% | 32% | 42% | 2% |
| Formal Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for sharing office space if needed | 12% | 4% | 30% | 19% | 5% |
| Explicit plan for communicating to grantees | 10% | 10% | 53% | 24% | 2% |
| Explicit communication plans with organizations/giving programs | 7% | 11% | 47% | 32% | 4% |

Among the components of strong planning and preparedness, several interviewees emphasized the importance of doing exercises and drills at least once or twice a year. One organization described conducting exercises with management, staff, and board members. A scenario was created in which the organization walked through what their response would be in real time, given the incident and the steps that would be put into place. The Incident Management Team assessed and activated their systems to check on employee safety through their phone and text message trees, and to assess the contingency plans that would be activated if, for example, employees could not make it to the office. After the four-hour exercise, “the realization hit us: Wow, we have a long way to go. Some of the nuances that show up in exercise show us that we have to drill down even deeper.” Another organization conducts annual operational/functional drills at the regional and national office levels that include staging an influx of patients.

Interviewees brainstormed a list of additional questions to ask NCG members to assess the current preparedness of their own organizations:

- Do you have a business resumption plan and, if so, how does it work?
- How do you plan to make decisions immediately following a disaster?
- Do you have reserve funds and/or the ability to raise money immediately?
- Do you have the ability to leverage money from other sources, such as institutional, individual, and corporate donors?
- Do you have a relationship established with an intermediary before a disaster?
- How do you plan to communicate with your grantees?
- What do you want to concentrate on in the event of a disaster? Food? Shelter? Medical needs?
- Have you participated in real-life exercises or drills? Are you exercising your preparedness and response plan?
- Are there populations that you work with that are likely to be especially vulnerable during a disaster?
- Do you know what resources are available through organizations such as Americorps, Peace Corps, National Voluntary Organization Active in Disaster (VOAD)?

A substantial percentage (44%) of organizations responding to the online survey were interested in conducting staff training on organizational and community disaster preparedness and response, and approximately one half of organizations have at least begun many activities to prepare staff for a disaster. They have offered, or begun, to

- distribute handouts on disaster preparedness and response (49%);
- conduct emergency response drills (41%);
- post emergency preparedness instructions (49%); and/or
- train staff on personal preparedness and response (47%).

But despite their stated interest, between one fifth and one third of organizations expressed doubt that in the next year they will train staff members on the Incident

Command System, train staff on community or personal disaster preparedness and response, or conduct emergency drills and exercises.

| <i>PREPARATION OF STAFF FOR DISASTERS</i> | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|
| (% of organizations) (n=55-57) | Yes, Offered | Yes, Process Begun | Not Begun, Interested | No, Doubt Will in Next Year | Don't Know |
| Handouts, etc., on disaster preparedness and response | 30% | 19% | 35% | 12% | 4% |
| Emergency response drills or tests | 30% | 11% | 34% | 21% | 4% |
| Posted emergency preparedness instructions in common spaces | 29% | 20% | 30% | 18% | 4% |
| Staff training on personal disaster preparedness and response | 21% | 26% | 30% | 21% | 2% |
| Staff training on the Incident Command System or other special chain of command | 18% | 7% | 39% | 34% | 2% |
| Staff training on organizational disaster preparedness and response | 16% | 31% | 44% | 9% | -- |
| Staff training on community disaster preparedness and response | 7% | 18% | 44% | 28% | 4% |

In addition to their own lack of preparedness, few organizations reported having made explicit plans to support their community during a disaster. Approximately 30% have put in place or have begun to work on a policy regarding employees taking time off during a disaster to attend to family issues. However, only 17% have in place, or have begun to make, recommendations to increase funding after a disaster, and only about 10% have plans to coordinate volunteer efforts of employees or to donate supplies that the organization may have.

| <i>PLANS FOR COMMUNITY SUPPORT DURING A DISASTER</i> | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| (% of organizations) (n=54) | Yes, in Place | Yes, Process Begun | Not in Place, but Want | No, Doubt Will in Next Year | Does Not Apply | Don't Know |
| Policy regarding employees taking time to attend to family issues | 19% | 11% | 37% | 26% | -- | 7% |
| Board or staff recommendation to increase funding after disaster | 11% | 6% | 28% | 46% | -- | 9% |
| Plans to coordinate employees' volunteer efforts to assist local response and recovery | 4% | 6% | 33% | 50% | 2% | 6% |
| Written plan to donate organization's supplies (trucks, water, food, clothing) | 2% | 7% | 17% | 52% | 13% | 9% |

Interviewees also suggested additional procedures that philanthropic organizations could use to better support their grantees and the community:

- Identify organizations who themselves have the capacity to recover and be operational.
- Execute preapproved MOUs with grantees so that, in the event of a disaster, grantees will receive a specified amount of money.
- Plan ahead so that trustee approval can be obtained without a quorum to make grants (e.g., executive director and board chair have checkbooks for emergencies)
- After a disaster has taken place, immediately contact grantees in the affected area and ask what types of support they need—general support or targeted project support, and how quickly they need it.
- Be prepared to change guidelines. Affected grantees often need unrestricted general-support grants and quicker mechanisms for flow of funds.
- Inform donors about how to channel their donations (e.g., making contributions directly to intermediaries).
- Identify intermediaries that can move money quickly.
- Give grantees opportunities to file late reports on their grants. Many literally might not have access to their offices. Extend a grace period to grantees.
- Provide nimble financial support to grantees to recover from the disaster.
- Cut through internal procedures to move money out the door.
- Plan to put in place something that is better than what was there originally.

Several interviewees pointed out that it is just good business planning for an organization to have provisions for disaster preparedness and response. A couple of interviewees said

they were either in the process of or had just recently completed a business continuity plan that includes establishing backup generators and incident response teams as well as assessing needs and identifying the tasks that are crucial to keep the organization functioning. In their minds, good preparedness enhances an organization's ability to be a good grantmaker.

Opportunities for building capacity among grantees

Many of the grantees funded by philanthropic organizations are likely to be first responders in a natural disaster. Interviewees overwhelmingly identified faith-based and community-based organizations (such as health centers, schools, senior centers, and childcare centers)—all of which may or may not be grantees—as conceivable first responders. Despite this reality, one interviewee observed, “We have trained the nation that there are a narrow group of people who are the responders (fire, police, Red Cross). We have branded nonprofits and businesses as *not* responders. Foundations put money in supporting response from a traditional point of view, but nothing in making nonprofits prepared and active in response.” An important part of philanthropic work—as done by individual organizations or by a collaborative—is to identify likely first responders, assess their readiness to respond, and plan how to support them in times of disaster.

Several interviewees said that building capacity among local nonprofit organizations (NPO) and faith-based organizations (FBO) needs to be a priority simply because so many are first responders. These organizations “are always among the first folks to get there,” said one interviewee. “They are not well-prepared, but they are the ones who feel it is their role to be there.” These community organizations “fill large gaps quickly and immediately, more so than FEMA and the Red Cross,” remarked another key informant

While many of these organizations are used to providing shelter and relief, the Katrina disaster was the first time they ever took on that role “with no regards to funds, their future, or normal operations. . . . Local groups sheltered as many people as the Red Cross did. Lots of people around the world gave to the Red Cross and Salvation Army, but none to these NPOs.” Those that reached out and became first responders themselves found no mechanism in place to reimburse them. After Katrina, “people spent an inordinate amount of time trying to figure out who was responsible for what,” remarked one interviewee. She recommended that Bay Area philanthropic organizations fund some kind of project “where you really get to know how the whole disaster system works, and better integrate NGOs into emergency management.”

According to interviewees, Bay Area faith-based organizations played a number of roles to assist displaced Katrina victims who came here, including

- seeking donations of food, money, clothing, and other necessities from their local and national organizations;
- opening their workshop halls and the homes of congregants to displaced people;
- providing housing and case management services to help them get connected to food stamps and other services;
- providing counseling by ministers; and
- partnering with other FBOs and NPOs to get additional support for evacuees.

Faith-based organizations were also involved in recovery and rebuilding. One interviewee observed, “The National Guard who went into New Orleans didn’t help with gutting and rebuilding. Instead, many congregations went in to do this. People were comatose. Where to start? Congregations were therapeutic; they brought in volunteers from throughout the U.S. Whole families came and decided their summer vacation was going to be helping people rebuild their homes.”

Despite the level of involvement among NPOs and FBOs in responding to disasters, and despite the fact that about two fifths of survey respondents reported being engaged in internal disaster planning and staff preparation activities, these philanthropic organizations have not done as much to prepare their own grantees for disasters. Between one half and two thirds of organizations have not yet begun—and are unlikely to start—communicating with grantees about disaster preparedness, offering training or assistance on this topic, or offering funds to develop and/or test grantee preparedness plans.

Some interviewees admitted that, in their experience, philanthropic organizations are less interested in helping grantees be prepared for a major disaster than in figuring out how to be internally prepared for one. “Organizations are just not interested. It would be worth considering having foundations require a certain level of preparedness on the part of their grantees. But philanthropic organizations don’t have a clue about how to do this.”

One interviewee said that, as a sector, philanthropic organizations do not “have our stuff together to be able to help our grantees” and thought it would be helpful to compile best practices and case studies. “[W]e feel [that] when our own act is together, we are more likely to be more involved in disaster preparedness with grantees. We could give some grants to build up the capacity [for] building efforts that exist in the community (e.g., Red Cross trainings) and provide time for a retreat to write up disaster plans.”

| <i>ASSISTING GRANTEEES IN DISASTER PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES*</i> | | | | | |
|--|------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|
| (% of organizations) (n=55) | Yes, Done | Yes, Process Begun | Not Begun, Interested | No, Doubt Will in Next Year | Don't Know |
| Communicated with grantees about disaster preparedness and response | 2% | 15% | 29% | 53% | 2% |
| Offered grantees training or assistance on disaster preparedness and response | 6% | 11% | 20% | 64% | -- |
| Offered funds to grantees to develop and/or test their preparedness | 4% | 6% | 20% | 67% | 4% |
| *Survey respondents also noted other types of assistance to grantees that their organizations provide, principally in the areas of arranging for financial assistance/grants and facilitating training and coordination. | | | | | |

One key informant suggested that FBOs can be better prepared to help out in a disaster if they know where community emergency resources are kept. For example, faith-based organizations could conduct an assessment of their neighborhoods and identify the locations of senior centers, childcare centers, and schools, along with places that are stockpiling emergency supplies. Establishing working relationships with the principal of a neighborhood school or director of a childcare center could help an FBO access supplies when they need them. Philanthropic organizations could fund local trainings in basic disaster response by focusing on the individuals of the congregation (personal and family preparedness), and then provide training for a core of congregants to prepare a disaster response and recovery plan for their neighborhood.

Assisting grantees to operate in a disaster

Community organizations that people have ties to need to be able to deliver essential services in the first critical period following a disaster. Yet many of the organizations that would be in the forefront of supporting communities are very fragile. “It would be alarming to me if philanthropic organizations aren’t interested in getting their grantees prepared,” said one Task Force member. Yet survey results suggest that Bay Area philanthropic organizations are more interested in being internally prepared for a major disaster than in helping their grantees be prepared, except for providing immediate relief.

One Task Force member observed, “Assessment in the past has been focused on the larger traditional institutions and less on the faith-based infrastructure and nonprofit organizations.” This is still true, according to results from the online survey.

Approximately one half of responding philanthropic organizations have not yet and are unlikely to put into place plans to assist grantees in their response *after* a disaster. While approximately one third of these organizations are interested in activities that can assist grantees in their response following a disaster, the organizations generally do not have

- MOUs for quick funding after a disaster;
- discretionary authority to make immediate grants after a disaster; or
- clear communications to grantees describing expense tracking expectations during a disaster (critical for subsequent reimbursement).

| <i>PLANS TO ASSIST GRANTEES TO RESPOND TO A DISASTER</i> | | | | | |
|---|----------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Does your organization have the following in place? (% of organizations) (n=54–55) | Yes, in Place | Yes, Process Begun | Not in Place, but Interested | No, Doubt Will in Next Year | Don't Know |
| Plan for supporting grantees during major local disaster | 11% | 15% | 32% | 41% | 2% |
| Formal discretionary authority to appropriate person to make immediate grants | 19% | 9% | 40% | 47% | 6% |
| Clear, simple communication to grantees describing disaster expense tracking expectations | 6% | 2% | 40% | 47% | 6% |
| Signed MOU or preapproved grants for quick funding to agencies that typically take a lead in disaster response, i.e., Red Cross | 9% | 2% | 29% | 55% | 6% |
| Signed MOU or preapproved grants for quick funding to community or faith-based organizations | 7% | 2% | 29% | 58% | 4% |
| Signed MOU with another philanthropic organization(s) to distribute pooled funds | 2% | 2% | 35% | 56% | 6% |

Some interviewees observed that “philanthropy has a key role in building civic infrastructure” and as such can help to reframe the disaster preparedness discussion. While the absence of preparedness and recovery planning means “that most vulnerable populations and community-based organizations will never be anything but victims,” the philanthropic community has the capacity to create best practices, templates, and models that could empower grantees.

While governments “take forever [to do] what foundations can do tomorrow,” philanthropic organizations could require all grantees to take small steps, such as

- placing disaster information on posters in bathrooms;
- requiring meetings sponsored with grantee dollars to include a 30-second safety message in the beginning (e.g., a reminder that, should there be an earthquake, the procedure is to drop, cover, and hold);
- placing signage as to where the first aid kit, tool kits, exits, and evacuation routes are located;
- distributing a one-page floor plan marking all things that are safety-related; and

- funding a basic class on nonprofit preparedness.

Some interviewees viewed good preparedness as being good basic organizational development. “If the data suggest that people respond in a very localized way, we need to support these findings. If people are going to turn to their synagogues, churches, etc., you aren’t going to change that. So it is important to build the capacities of these organizations to respond to their congregations and beyond their congregations.”

One Task Force member self-identified as a “stealth advocate for emergency preparedness.” As a program officer committed to capacity building, she asks basic questions about what her grantees are doing to be prepared. “I ask questions like: Are you engaged in your community on emergency preparedness, do you have reserve funds to pay salaries, are you in touch with county officials about surge capacity? How financially sound are you, and are you working toward a surplus in case of an emergency?”

Disaster preparedness and response grantmaking

Very few philanthropic organizations are engaged in proactive, predisaster grantmaking, and most of those that provide funds in response to a disaster limit their support to immediate relief. There are several reasons for this. One Task Force member cited apathy as the biggest challenge. “Most folks, particularly when you talk about earthquakes, acknowledge that we are at risk, but that doesn’t necessarily prompt action.” Other interviewees cited barriers due to the way organizations are used to making funding decisions:

- “Philanthropic organizations give money away in exactly the opposite way that you need to in an emergency. They can’t make quick, easy decisions. Philanthropic organizations are not set up to deal with this in their usual practice.”
- “Resources are a challenge in an environment where resources are limited for current needs. The idea of trying to devote some of those resources to something that hasn’t happened yet is difficult.”
- “Philanthropic organizations are like penguins. They scoot to the edge, waiting to see if someone else falls in, and if they come up with a fish, then they’ll go in. A lot of philanthropic organizations wait until other organizations are doing something—they don’t want to look foolish.”

Only 25% of organization representatives stated that their organization provided support in past Bay Area disasters. Those that did provide support provided grants or emergency funds to their existing grantees (80%), staff time to work in the community (62%), grants or funds to new grantees (57%), and donations such as food, trucks, and warehouse space (39%).

Other forms of assistance that respondents provided during a previous disaster included

- direct grants to key affected grantees;
- member volunteer support; and
- meetings of responders and other funders to collaborate on distributing resources and identifying gaps in services.

| GRANTMAKING AND COMMUNITY SUPPORT IN PREVIOUS DISASTERS | | | |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| (% of organizations) (n=52) | Yes | No | Don't Know |
| In the past, did your organization provide support during a Bay Area disaster, such as the Loma Prieta earthquake (1989) or East Bay fire (1991)? | 25% | 50% | 25% |
| FORM OF SUPPORT PROVIDED IN PAST | | | |
| If you provided support in the past, what form of support did your organization provide? | | | |
| (% of organizations who provided support in the past) (n=13–15) | Provided This | Did Not Provide This | Don't Know |
| Grants or emergency funds to then-existing grantees | 80% | 13% | 7% |
| Staff time to aid the community | 62% | 31% | 8% |
| Grants or emergency funds to then-new grantees | 57% | 14% | 29% |
| Donations such as food, trucks, warehouse space | 39% | 46% | 15% |

Survey respondents were asked how their organization might prioritize preapproved grants to fund organizations in the event of a disaster. Responses generally fell into five categories:

- Twelve respondents said they would fund groups providing basic needs and services for the most vulnerable populations. About half indicated they would limit their funding to service agencies or current grantees serving these populations in the organization’s grantmaking or business geographic area.
- The next largest group said they would fund current grantees—service agencies with which the philanthropic organization already has a working relationship and that have already demonstrated capacity to appropriately manage funding.
- Three respondents said those types of funding decisions would be made by their board or would be subject to some other preapproved agreement, such as a pooled fund.
- Two respondents indicated they would fund groups in a specific geographic region.
- Two respondents said they would fund grantees based on what group(s) was most ready to respond.

Of the four main stages in disaster preparedness and recovery (preparedness, relief, recovery, and reform), organizations are most likely to fund relief immediately following a disaster (64%) and recovery efforts to return life to normalcy (60%). They are less likely to fund preparedness planning prior to a disaster (25%) or reform efforts to use the crisis to improve conditions (29%). The Institute for the Study of International Migration describes the concern around such a lack of preparedness funding: “Currently, most funding is made available for disaster relief over a comparatively short period of time.... In virtually all cases, too little attention is paid to disaster prevention and mitigation, leaving communities vulnerable to future crises.”⁶

Smaller organizations with annual grantmaking budgets of less than \$1 million are much less likely to fund preparedness activities than are larger organizations, especially those with budgets of between \$5 million and \$25 million. Only 8% of organizations with budgets of less than \$1 million state that they would likely focus funding on preparedness, compared to 50% of organizations with budgets of between \$5 million and \$25 million. Organizations with budgets in the \$5 million to \$25 million range are more likely to fund efforts at all four stages than organizations with smaller or larger budgets.

| <i>GRANTMAKING RESOURCES—FOCUS OF DISASTER-RELATED FUNDING</i> | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|
| (% of organizations by grantmaking budget) | All Orgs. (n=53) | <\$1M (n=13) | >\$1 M– \$5M (n=13) | >\$5M– \$25M (n=12) | >\$25 M (n=14) |
| Preparedness (planning prior to a disaster) | 25% | 8% | 23% | 50% | 29% |
| Relief (immediately following a disaster) | 64% | 69% | 38% | 75% | 78% |
| Recovery (efforts to return life to normalcy) | 60% | 54% | 62% | 75% | 64% |
| Reform (efforts to improve conditions) | 29% | 23% | 15% | 58% | 29% |

Surveyed philanthropic organizations are more likely to fund certain needs and services after a disaster. Respondents report that their organizations are likely to support health (39%), social services (37%), housing (32%), education (32%), and infrastructure (30%). Fewer organizations foresee funding in the areas of environment (20%), mental health and substance abuse (19%), workforce development (19%), and the culture and arts (15%).

⁶ *Philanthropic Grantmaking for Disaster Management: Trend Analysis and Recommended Improvements*, Institute for the Study of International Migration, Georgetown University, 2006.

| <i>SPECIFIC NEEDS AFTER A DISASTER THAT ORGANIZATIONS ARE LIKELY TO SUPPORT</i> | | |
|---|--------|-----|
| (% of organizations) (n=54) | Number | % |
| Health | 21 | 39% |
| Social services | 20 | 37% |
| Housing | 17 | 32% |
| Education | 17 | 32% |
| Infrastructure | 16 | 30% |
| Environment | 11 | 20% |
| Mental health/substance abuse | 10 | 19% |
| Workforce development | 10 | 19% |
| Culture/arts | 8 | 15% |
| Other | 7 | 13% |

The aftermath of disasters provide many lessons that could benefit and guide philanthropic organizations faced with questions about how best to rebuild and strengthen the nonprofit infrastructure that can be devastated in a Katrina-size disaster. In 2003, for example, there were 3,200 nonprofits in Louisiana with \$13 billion in assets. Katrina left at least one third of the state’s nonprofits without offices. With the massive displacement of people and the destruction of many facilities post-Katrina, the lack of service providers left a huge void of advocacy and community groups.⁷

In the wake of a large disaster, there is much for philanthropic organizations to think about that can help them prepare for the next one. Who should be funded? What are an organization’s priorities in the rebuilding process? How often is equity considered? Who is the most vulnerable? Who is the most devastated? Is there a plan to quickly get money to organizations (e.g., wire transfers) when banks are closed?

Noting that private donors provide billions of dollars for relief and the government provides billions for recovery, but that neither sector provides very much for reform, the Louisiana Discovery Recovery Foundation decided on a post-Katrina grantmaking strategy that includes support for community organizations and emphasizes equity.⁸

- Disparate community voices are heard.

⁷ “Philanthropy and the Response to Disaster: Lessons from Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.” Ambassador James A. Joseph, Chairman, Louisiana Disaster Recovery Foundation; President Emeritus, Council on Foundations. New York Regional Association of Grantmakers, July 12, 2005.

⁸ Ibid.

- New jobs and opportunities will be shared fairly.
- New housing will serve all income levels and sustain the integrity of all communities.
- The cost of development is shared fairly.
- The need for leadership renewal, community healing, and reconciliation are addressed.

Ambassador James A. Joseph suggests that foundations use their “reputational” capital as collateral in funding agencies that serve the most vulnerable populations but whose own formal credentials and written proposals may not be competitive, understating their “potential and reliability.” A grant is in many ways a “Good Housekeeping seal of approval that says to others in the community that we have done due diligence and find this organization credible, accountable, and effective.” This is especially helpful to groups that are often marginalized, whose leaders may be most effective in working with the formerly excluded (e.g., substance abusers, incarcerated individuals) precisely because they were once victims of the same predicament.⁹

Philanthropic organizations can make a significant contribution by filling critical gaps in underfunded areas, such as disaster rehabilitation, prevention, research, and education activities. The following eight principles of good disaster management were developed after a yearlong study by a joint working group of American and European philanthropic organizations:¹⁰

- *First, do no harm.* Not all disaster assistance is beneficial. Inappropriate items can overwhelm limited transportation, storage, and distribution capacities, thereby delaying the delivery of assistance that is desperately needed. Aim to ensure that your grant contributes to the solution and not to the problem.
- *Stop, look, and listen before taking action.* Information is the key to good disaster grantmaking. Every disaster has unique characteristics. Take the time to learn about the specifics of a disaster before deciding how to respond.
- *Don't act in isolation.* Coordination among disaster grantmakers, among NGOs operating on the ground, and between these two groups can reduce duplication of effort, make efficient use of resources, and ensure that the highest-priority needs are addressed first. Grantmakers can participate in various standing and ad hoc forums—both real and virtual—where needs are discussed, information is exchanged, and assistance is coordinated.
- *Think beyond the immediate crisis to the long term.* The emergency phase of a disaster attracts most of the attention and resources. Grantmakers can play a very useful role before the crisis by supporting disaster prevention and preparedness activities and afterward by filling gaps between emergency relief and long-term development programs.

⁹ “Philanthropy and the Response to Disaster: Lessons from Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.” Ambassador James A. Joseph, Chairman, Louisiana Disaster Recovery Foundation; President Emeritus, Council on Foundations. New York Regional Association of Grantmakers, July 12, 2005.

¹⁰ *Disaster Grantmaking: A Practical Guide for Foundations and Corporations.* The Report of a Joint Working Group of the European Foundation Centre and the Council on Foundations. November 2001; reprinted January 2005. http://www.cof.org/files/Documents/International_Programs/disasterguide.pdf

- *Bear in mind the expertise of local organizations.* Community-based organizations and NGOs with a local presence are the first on the scene when disasters occur. They know best what assistance is needed and they understand the complex political, social, and cultural context of a disaster. However, these organizations are often hampered by lack of resources and organizational capacity to carry out their important role. Working with and/or supporting these organizations can prove mutually beneficial.
- *Find out how prospective grantees operate.* Organizations that work on disasters vary greatly in their approach and overall philosophy. Some specialize only in emergency relief while others have a long-term development orientation. Some support the work of local organizations while others do not. It is wise to know what approach you are supporting before making a grant.
- *Be accountable to those you are trying to help.* Grantmakers should be accountable not only to their donors, boards, and shareholders, but also to the people they seek to assist. Grantmakers need to go beyond merely determining how their grant was spent to engage their grantees in a process that assesses social impact.
- *Communicate your work and use it as an educational tool.* Highlighting examples of good disaster grantmaking is an excellent way for grantmakers to educate both internal and external audiences about the disaster process. It is useful to build a knowledge base, capture lessons learned, and share your experience with boards, staff, employees, other grantmakers, the media, community groups, public officials, and international organizations.

Collaboration within the sector and coordination across sectors

An important section of the online survey asked respondents about partnerships and coordination within the philanthropic sector. When asked if they were aware of *any* disaster preparedness or planning activities in the Bay Area philanthropic community, 25% of all respondents (21% of organizations) replied “Yes.” Seventeen percent (17%) of individuals (13% of organizations) stated that their organizations were involved with such activities.

| <i>AWARENESS OF PARTNERSHIPS AND COORDINATION OF DISASTER PREPAREDNESS</i> | | |
|--|---|---|
| | Individual Respondents (All Respondents) (n=71) | One Designated Representative from Each Organization (n=53) |
| Are you aware of <u>any</u> philanthropic-based disaster preparedness or planning activities in the Bay Area, such as disaster-related research, funding, planning efforts, dissemination of best practices, etc.? | 18 (25%) | 11 (21%) |
| Are you or your organization involved with any of these activities? | 12 (17%) | 7 (13%) |

Respondents who were aware of philanthropic-based, disaster-related activities were asked if they were aware of specific activities through which *resources could be coordinated* for disaster response. Six individuals (8% of those responding to questions in this section) from five organizations reported that they were aware of such activities, and three organizations were involved in such activities.

| <i>AWARENESS OF PARTNERSHIPS AND COORDINATION OF RESOURCES</i> | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Individual Respondents (All Respondents) (n=71) | One Designated Representative from Each Organization (n=53) |
| Are you aware of any existing partnerships within the Bay Area philanthropic sector whereby resources can be coordinated for disaster response? | 6 (8%) | 5 (9%) |
| Are you or your organization involved with any of these activities? | 3 (4%) | 3 (6%) |

More than one quarter (28%) of organizations are absolutely interested or very likely interested in joining with other philanthropic organizations in a coordinated effort for disaster preparedness and response. However, 28% of organizational representatives do not know the level of interest in their organization for such a partnership.

| <i>INTEREST IN JOINING A COORDINATED EFFORT</i> | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|-----------|-------------------|
| (% of organizations) n=54 | Yes, Absolutely | Very Likely | Somewhat Likely | No | Don't Know |
| Would your organization like to become a part of a partnership and/or coordinated effort for disaster preparedness and response? | 11% | 17% | 33% | 11% | 28% |

Organizations with budgets between \$5 million and \$25 million are more likely than larger and especially than smaller organizations to be interested in joining a coordinated effort. Only 8% of organizations with annual grantmaking budgets of less than \$1 million, and only 15% of those with budgets between \$1 million and \$5 million, would like to become part of such efforts, compared to 58% of those with budgets between \$5 million and \$25 million.

| <i>INTEREST IN JOINING A COORDINATED EFFORT, BY BUDGET</i> | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|
| (% of organizations responding “Yes, absolutely” or “Very likely”) | <\$1M (n=13) | >\$1 M– \$5M (n=13) | >\$5M– \$25M (n=12) | >\$25 M (n=14) |
| Would your organization like to become a part of a partnership and/or coordinated effort for disaster preparedness and response? | 8% | 15% | 58% | 36% |

Among NCG members that responded to the survey, one quarter are interested in joining a coordinated effort. More than one third (38%) of the subset of organizations that form the Corporate Contributions Roundtable are interested in joining such a partnership.

| <i>INTEREST IN JOINING A COORDINATED EFFORT, BY NCG AFFILIATION</i> | | |
|--|---------------|--------------|
| (% of organizations responding “Yes, absolutely” or “Very likely”) | NCG (n=53) | CCR (n=8) |
| Would your organization like to become a part of a partnership and/or coordinated effort for disaster preparedness and response? | 26% | 38% |

Collaboration among national donors is critically important, both with each other and with local groups who have the advantage of proximity, local knowledge, experience, and trust. When asked what it would mean for a philanthropic community to have a collaborative disaster plan in place, interviewees said components of such a plan would include

- MOUs among organizations signing up to be a part of this effort;
- preidentification of organizations that should be funded;
- knowledge of who will be “on the ground” providing services;
- preidentification of those likely to be in greatest need and where are they likely to be located; and
- practice sessions of drills and exercises for disaster response.

Task Force members talked about the inherent challenges in coordinating and collaborating in the philanthropic community. First, high-level leadership is critical. “If the senior management and trustees of an organization don’t think this is important, it makes it really difficult. We need champions within the field [who] think that this is important. There has to be a sense that this is an area of importance similar to current program areas,” said one interviewee.

Second, it is important to know where the gaps are where philanthropic organizations can step in and help. Another Task Force member commented, “It is hard to figure out who has done what in the Bay Area. Some organizations are chipping away this way, others that way, and government their way. With disaster preparedness, we want to avoid

throwing money away in an ineffective way [at] a problem that's going to need a whole lot of collaboration.”

After Hurricane Katrina, virtually every philanthropic organization in the New Orleans had to temporarily close down. Asked about how Bay Area organizations could partner with systems outside of the region or the philanthropic community to respond effectively, interviewees made the following recommendations:

- Have agreements in place so staff can be placed in an area that is not affected.
- Coordinate some level of grantmaking so that if there is agreement about who the first responders are, resources can be focused for those organizations to raise the level of scale of their response.
- Establish agreements with philanthropic organizations outside the area, and give them a list of grantees and the authorization to disburse funds.
- Plan how to quickly get supplies to the nonprofit and faith based organizations that will be first responders. Partner with companies that can provide supplies such as water, new clothes, prepared meals, etc.
- Learn the scope and limits of what FEMA, the Red Cross, HUD, Food Stamps, etc. are responsible for so that foundations can fill the gaps.
- If a disaster is of such a scale that donors across the country and the world want to respond, decide in advance on an intermediary that will be ready to swing into action quickly.
- Have an alternate plan if the intermediary suffers a loss of building or infrastructure.
- Coordinate among philanthropic organizations that fund similar population areas to add disaster preparation and response in those areas (e.g., all organizations that focus on the elderly could develop a consistent response to support this population).

Coordination with government

Interviewees discussed how philanthropic organizations could coordinate with local, state, and federal government efforts. Government can bring a “vast scale of resources. Through coordination with government, we can identify gaps. We need to plug into the bigger picture rather than having a parallel structure.” Ideally, private funds should be leveraged with government resources for critical areas. “At a minimum, the philanthropic community should be able to approach the mayor to say we are providing XYZ and we expect that you are going to provide radios, etc., to police and fire,” commented another interviewee.

Task Force members expressed frustration in trying to understand the role of government, which of course is a critical sector that “ultimately has to be the anchor” and yet is unable to respond quickly enough in the first day or two following a disaster. One Task Force member commented, “I hear the government isn’t going to be able to take care of everybody. I also hear that the government is so independent from the nonprofit sector we’ll never be able to coordinate with them.” Another interviewee cautioned that, during disasters, “Depending on the government for funding is always a risky business,

especially if you need it immediately.” Another Task Force member observed that even if the external message is that the philanthropic community is ready and willing to be a part of a pool of people who would support immediate relief, “let us be really sure that we’re not taking responsibility off the hands of government.” One interviewee suggested that the NCG public policy committee examine how to put appropriate pressure on government around preparedness.

Depending on the disaster, there may be interest beyond the affected community. NYRAG described an educational program that helped its members learn what other member organizations were doing, which helped inform their grantmaking on the Gulf Coast. As a result, the group quickly shifted its mission toward helping grantmakers everywhere, not just in New York. “The availability of our guide was made known through national magazines, causing us to suddenly realize that we were no longer a local organization, because our resources were being used nationally and internationally.”

Pooling funds

Several interviewees discussed pooling funds from several philanthropic organizations to create a regional disaster fund as a strategy in a collaborative disaster plan. Under this system, organizations would commit funds and agree on one set of guidelines and application procedures so that resources could be quickly directed to the needs.

Several interviewees suggested NCG as the most appropriate place for a pooled-fund governance structure. One Task Force member said, “I would like to avoid some of the territorial issues that come with Bay Area community foundations.” Another felt that Bay Area philanthropic organizations lack the “competency for collaboration.” One interviewee suggested that if NCG lacks capacity, funds could remain in individual foundations or in one of the large foundations that has an accounting and information technology staff that could gear up quickly. Pooled funds could be preapproved for 10–15 preidentified critical agencies (e.g., food banks, schools, community centers, churches, synagogues, and mosques) to help them to prepare in advance so that if a disaster hit, the funding would become response dollars, not preparedness money.

Several interviewees had questions about pooled funding, such as: Who would govern and make decisions? Would the fund be focused on preparedness or recovery? What would the decision-making protocol look like? What tracking mechanisms and accountability would be put into place? One Task Force member pointed out the tension between having funds put away for a crisis that hasn’t yet happened when there is already so much unmet need in communities that have scarce resources. Another interviewee was concerned that a cooperative funding mechanism might be too slow, while a third worried that philanthropic resources would largely be directed at San Francisco, which typically receives the most coverage, even though other areas in the region could also be seriously affected.

Collaboration in the philanthropic community would also entail overcoming the tendency to think competitively. One interviewee commented, “We as philanthropic organizations tend to stake our visibility and credibility on who can raise the most resources, so there is a little competition for donors. We have to talk that through so we are comfortable with the notion that this is not a competition. Disaster preparation and recovery are just not

that clean in terms of what the end product of this would be. We'll have to talk this through.”

Collaboration with corporations

Some interviewees commented that corporations, through their business units, have the ability to help communities affected by disaster in ways they may not have anticipated. For example, information technology companies could play a huge role in coordinating information, and the pharmaceutical industry now warehouses disaster recovery kits that could be immediately shipped. During the tsunami disaster, American Express was able to trace lost family members through their credit cards.

NCG's role

Survey respondents were provided a list of seven possible roles that NCG could take on to aid in philanthropic-based disaster preparedness and response. They are interested in seeing NCG

- maintain a website/clearinghouse of information before, during, and after a major disaster (64%);
- educate or provide resources for philanthropic sector staff members about disaster preparedness and planning (64%);
- provide sample documents (i.e., disaster plans, MOUs) used by organizations or corporate giving programs (62%);
- develop standards or samples of best practices of disaster preparation for the philanthropic community (60%);
- convene organizations or corporate giving programs to prepare for a major local disaster (53%); and
- develop and maintain a communications system that is likely to function in disaster conditions (51%).

Interviewees felt that, as a minimum, NCG could convene discussions and possibly set up mechanisms for pooling funds for disaster preparedness (see **Pooling Funds**, above).

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations reflect a broad range of best practices and specific needs within the Bay Area philanthropic community. While these recommendations are derived from the needs assessment data, they may not all necessarily be addressed by the NCG Initiative.

1. **Internal preparedness.** In order to withstand an emergency and to continue their mission to serve their grantees, foundations must take steps to prepare to survive a large-scale disaster. One Task Force member succinctly commented, “In order to achieve our mission, we need to stay in business.” After Hurricane Katrina, most foundations had to close their doors. Internal preparedness efforts, including business continuity planning, protects the organization’s employees *and* its grantees in the

event of an emergency. Those that remain functional after an emergency can help their staff restart operations and can continue to provide financial support to their grantees. There is existing literature that offers guidance on creating internal preparedness plans. (See the Council of Foundations and Northern California Grantmakers websites). Typically, these plans advise foundations to

- set up phone trees among staff;
- have a hard copy of all employee, vendor, and grantee information regularly updated and located off-site;
- choose an off-site meeting place for employees;
- pick an out-of-state or out-of-area repository for data and continually update important data;
- create contingency banking plans, which include
 - ✧ obtaining authorization from trustees to make emergency grants in the event that trustee approvals can not be obtained;
 - ✧ designating a person authorized to distribute funds; and
 - ✧ obtaining preapproved spending amounts for disaster relief;
- minimize paperwork in the event of an emergency for grantees; and
- communicate these systems to grantees, especially those likely to be involved in disaster relief and recovery.

NCG could develop an online toolkit complete with checklists, templates, best practice documents and other resources to support internal preparedness. Additionally, NCG could convene philanthropic staff responsible for internal preparedness planning.

2. Philanthropic organizations can use their leverage to **help their grantees prepare for emergencies**. There is widespread agreement that in a major disaster, people will turn to local service organizations such as faith-based organizations, senior centers, health clinics, and food banks for help. Nonprofits will be pressed into service during an emergency: “Community-based organizations and NGOs with a local presence are the first on the scene when disasters occur... Working with and supporting these organizations allows them to carry out their important role while providing grantmakers with valuable information about the situation on the ground.”¹¹

To assist their grantees to be prepared internally and externally, philanthropic organizations can use their leverage as grantmakers to ask grantees to create emergency preparedness plans. For example, the City of San Leandro asks nonprofits that receive municipal funding to participate in disaster preparedness classes.¹² One expert commented, “I’m always pleased when a grantmaker like PG&E requires training in disaster preparedness for their grantees.”

¹¹ *Disaster Grantmaking: A Practical Guide for Foundations and Corporations*, Council on Foundations and the European Foundation Centre, 2001.

¹² *Disaster Preparedness: A Guide to Planning for California Community Foundations*, League of California Community Foundations, 2001.

On a smaller scale, funders can require organizations to engage in bite-size steps, such as placing disaster information on posters in bathrooms and making sure employees and clients have flashlights and whistles.

3. Philanthropic organizations can be good disaster preparedness and response **grantmakers**. To do so, they must create nimble emergency grantmaking processes to get funds out the door quickly in an emergency. “Foundations give money away in exactly the opposite way that you need to in an emergency,” explained one Task Force member.

Philanthropic organizations can focus particular attention on bolstering capacity to grantees that serve those with special needs, such as low-income, disabled, non-English speaking, elderly, and homeless populations.

NCG could be a clearinghouse for best practices in disaster grantmaking. In addition the NCG Disaster Preparedness and Response Task Force could sponsor training sessions and briefings on this topic to the larger Bay Area philanthropic community.

4. Philanthropy can play a large role in **reframing** the disaster preparedness discussion. Disaster relief is traditionally thought of as the exclusive province of the government and such organizations as the Red Cross. That paradigm must shift if the philanthropic community is going to be an active participant in relief and recovery. “We have trained the nation that there [is] a narrow group of people who are the responders.... We have branded nonprofits and businesses as *not* responders,” says Ana Marie Jones. “Funders are in the best position to make things happen in the community,” she adds. The lack of widespread preparedness and recovery planning means “that most vulnerable populations and community-based organizations will never be anything but victims.”
5. The philanthropic community can play a **role in the overall emergency management system**:
 - Designate an intermediary organization to connect grantmakers in the region at all levels of disaster preparedness.
 - Inventory local, state, and federal resources for disaster relief and recovery. (*Disaster Preparedness: A Guide to Planning for California Community Foundations*, League of California Community Foundations, 2001, is an excellent resource).
 - Consult and coordinate with existing disaster relief agencies and collaboratives, including Voluntary Organizations Active in Disaster (VOAD)¹³ and the Coordinated Assistance Network (CAN)¹⁴, to identify gaps in services.
 - Coordinate with Office (s) of Emergency Services in local jurisdictions to identify gaps in services and to communicate disaster relief plans. Ask to be part of the region’s disaster relief and recovery system.

¹³ VOAD coordinates planning efforts by many voluntary organizations responding to disaster.

¹⁴ CAN supports coalitions of non-profit disaster agencies, including the development of shared databases of survivors and clients. (See www.can.org.)

6. The **corporate sector** is generally further ahead of the philanthropic community in terms of disaster planning. Many have whole infrastructures in place for disaster preparedness (e.g., PG&E and Kaiser Permanente). In addition, such funders as PG&E require disaster planning of their grantees. Foundations should explore opportunities for leveraging resources, building a learning community, and enhancing coordination with this sector. One Task Force member commented, “The voice of corporate philanthropy is really important. We may be surprised at how much it would mean to businesses for communities to be ready.”
7. Interviewees suggested that a critical role for NCG is **information dissemination**, as complex issues (e.g., race, economics, neighborhoods) arise. “Thinking through all these dynamics is an ongoing process. NCG should really take this and put it on a three-to-five-year trajectory so that people are educated on salient issues—whether they are best practices, new technologies, or experiences from other places—and develop capacity to coordinate testing the level of readiness of first responders.”
8. Another key opportunity for collaboration is the development of **regional planning and pooled funding**. This can encompass coordinating with other existing efforts, developing educational campaigns, coordinating advocacy efforts on behalf of the philanthropic community within the government sector, and/or pooling funds for relief, recovery, and/or rebuilding that would be activated in case of disaster. While controversial, these are areas that need to be explored fully. (At a minimum, NCG can convene discussions in this regard.)

Appendix A: List of Interviewees

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Mark Bartolino Consultant United Way of the Bay Area</p> | <p>Ruth Maurice Research Associate The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation</p> |
| <p>Harold Brooks Chief Executive Officer American Red Cross – Bay Area</p> | <p>Eric McDonnell Executive Vice President United Way of the Bay Area</p> |
| <p>Marty Campbell Vice President of Programs The James Irvine Foundation</p> | <p>Stephanie Rapp Program Officer, Jewish Life Walter and Elise Haas Fund</p> |
| <p>Cecilia Echeverria Program Officer The California Endowment</p> | <p>Lyman Schaffer Director of Corporate Security Pacific Gas and Electric Company</p> |
| <p>Larry Goldzband Manager of Corporate Contributions Charitable Contributions Department Pacific Gas and Electric Company</p> | <p>Ed Schoenberger Executive Director, United Way Helplink United Way of the Bay Area</p> |
| <p>James Head Director of Programs The San Francisco Foundation</p> | <p>Michael Seltzer Former President New York Regional Association of Grantmakers, Inc.</p> |
| <p>Ana Marie Jones Executive Director Collaborating Agencies Responding to Disaster (CARD)</p> | <p>Matt Sharpe Director of Operations and Technology The David and Lucile Packard Foundation</p> |
| <p>Kaycee Pomeroy Senior Project Manager Fritz Institute</p> | <p>Skip Skivington Interim Vice President of Supply Chain Kaiser Permanente—Northern California</p> |
| <p>Anisya Thomas, PhD Managing Director Fritz Institute</p> | <p>Sherece West Chief Executive Officer Louisiana Disaster Recovery Association</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Dorothy Thomas Director of Long-Term Recovery Louisiana Association of Nonprofit Organizations (LANO)</p> | <p>Landon Williams Director of Housing and Small Business Development Louisiana Disaster Recovery Association</p> |
|--|---|

Appendix B: List of Organizations Participating in the Online Survey

AAA of Northern California
Atkinson Foundation
Ayala Foundation USA
Bechtel Corporation
Bella Vista Foundation
Bernard Osher Foundation
Blue Shield of California Foundation
Bothin Foundation
California Council for the Humanities
California Endowment
California HealthCare Foundation
Changemakers
Cisco Systems Foundation
Common Counsel Foundation
Community Foundation of Santa Cruz County
Community Foundation Sonoma County
Community Technology Foundation of California
David & Lucile Packard Foundation
Dean & Margaret Leshar Foundation
eBay Foundation
Episcopal Charities
Evelyn & Walter Haas, Jr. Fund
Fleishhacker Foundation
Foundation of the State Bar of California
Frank H. & Eva B. Buck Foundation
French American Charitable Trust
Friedman Family Foundation
Full Circle Fund
Give Something Back
Hirsch & Associates
Horizons Foundation
Housing Trust of Santa Clara County
Hewlett Packard
James Irvine Foundation
Jewish Community Endowment Fund
Junior League of San Francisco
Kaiser Permanente
Koret Foundation
Leavens Foundation
Levi Strauss Foundation
Lisa and Douglas Goldman Fund
Marin Community Foundation
Morris Stulsaft Foundation
Oracle Corporation

Pacific Forest and Watershed Lands Stewardship Council
Pacific Gas and Electric Company
Peninsula Community Foundation
Philanthropic Ventures Foundation
Pottruck Family Foundation
Richard and Rhoda Goldman Fund
Rosenberg Foundation
S.H. Cowell Foundation
S.D. Bechtel, Jr. Foundation
San Francisco Foundation
Shinnyo-en Foundation
Skoll Foundation
Sobrato Foundation
Stuart Foundation
The California Wellness Foundation
Truckee Tahoe Community Foundation
United Way of the Bay Area
van Löben Sels/RembeRock Foundation
Vesper Society
Wallace Alexander Gerbode Foundation
Walter & Elise Haas Fund
Whitman Institute
William and Flora Hewlett Foundation
Y & H Soda Foundation
Zellerbach Family Foundation