

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

ORIGINAL

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

MEETING

DAY TWO

Washington, D.C.

Thursday, August 14, 2008

PARTICIPANTS:

Council Members:

KEM BENNETT, Chair

ROBERT GOUGELET, Vice Chair

DAVID BARRON

ANN BEAUCHESNE

JOSEPH BECKER

MAYOR MICHAEL BROWN

JOE BRUNO

CHRISTINE CATLETT

IRENE COLLINS

BOB CONNORS

RUSS DECKER

NANCY DRAGANI

CATHEY EIDE

ANGELINA ELGIN

LEE FELDMAN

JOANNE HAYES-WHITE

CHARLES KMET

KURT KRUMPERMAN

JOHN LANCASTER

MAJOR GENERAL JOHN WILLIAM "BILL" LIBBY

1 PARTICIPANTS (CONT'D):

2 Council Members (Cont'd):

3 SUE MENCER

4 KEN MILLER

5 KEN MURPHY

6 GERRY PARKER

7 JAMES PATURAS

8 PHILLIP REITINGER

9 JOHN STENSGAR

10 J.R. THOMAS

11 SUSY TORRIENTE

12 FEMA:

13 R. DAVID PAULISON

Administrator

14

ALYSON PRICE

15 Designated Federal Officer

16 ROBERT SHEA

Associate Deputy Administrator

17

Speakers:

18

PAULINE CAMPBELL

19 Director

Office of Equal Rights

20

JONATHAN SARUBBI

21 Regional Administrator, Region III

22 CHIEF FRED ENDIKRAT

P R O C E E D I N G S

(8:46 a.m.)

1
2
3 MR. SHEA: Good morning, and thanks
4 again for joining us here. The administrator is
5 on his way. He'll be joining us here
6 momentarily to make some remarks. In the
7 interim, though, we thought that we should
8 welcome you back. Hopefully you all got a
9 reasonable night's sleep and maybe something to
10 eat from a reasonable restaurant last night.
11 All that kind of thing.

12 Is it true, Rob, that your birthday
13 was yesterday? Rob, is that true?

14 MR. GOUGELET: Yes.

15 MR. SHEA: I think we should sing
16 happy birthday to Robert.

17 MR. CONNORS: I second the motion.

18 MG LIBBY: I think the New England
19 contingent would be glad to lead the song; is
20 that correct?

21 MR. PATURAS: I thought we did that
22 last night.

1 MG LIBBY: Did we? Well, do you want
2 to do it again?

3 (Chorus of Happy Birthday)

4 MG LIBBY: Alyson, I request we get
5 that in the minutes.

6 MR. SHEA: You can pay me later for
7 not singing, Bob, okay? No question.

8 I think we're graced with the
9 presence of the administrator of FEMA, Robert
10 David Paulison, otherwise known as Chief
11 Paulison. Can you hear me?

12 Turn your hearing aid up a little
13 bit then, David.

14 Do you want to speak with --

15 MR. PAULISON: Are you talking to me?

16 MR. SHEA: Yes, I was. I was talking
17 to you.

18 MR. PAULISON: How are you doing?

19 MR. SHEA: Good. How are you, sir?

20 MR. PAULISON: Good morning. This
21 thing won't hurt me, will it?

22 Can you hear me with that? All

1 right. This thing works.

2 Let me do a couple of things. I'm
3 not going to talk very long. I want to hear
4 from you, find out what's going on, and kind
5 of -- you've got too much stuff up here, Bob.
6 I said you've got too much stuff up here.

7 And then I want to answer questions
8 and talk to you, find out what the issues
9 are. And again, like I said yesterday, tell
10 you how much I really do appreciate your
11 service to our country.

12 What a difference a year makes.
13 Here this last year going through, picking
14 out people we wanted to serve on the
15 committee, asking you to do that, and here we
16 are now a year later, a very vibrant body
17 that's working hard. And I've been very
18 proud of what you've done. You're a strong,
19 robust committee. You're tackling real
20 issues. You're giving us feedback that we
21 need, and I appreciate that very much. You
22 are going to make FEMA a stronger

1 organization, and I hope you recognize that.

2 We swore in some new
3 members -- swore at some new members
4 yesterday. And again, people are handpicked
5 because of their expertise. John Lancaster
6 has been around for a long time -- sorry,
7 John. And is one of those people you really
8 seek wisdom and advice, particularly when
9 we're dealing with people with disabilities.
10 We didn't do that well during Hurricane
11 Katrina, putting people in mobile homes and
12 travel trailers. And John is one of the
13 people we seek advice from.

14 John Stensgar, you know very well
15 from the Business Council. And our tribes
16 are becoming very, very important in what
17 we're doing. And we have not had very
18 good -- we've had good relations but we
19 haven't done what we should be doing with
20 them. And John's going to help us do a
21 better job.

22 Ken Murphy, you know very well.

1 NEMA president, one of the most respected
2 emergency managers from around the country.

3 Sue Mencer, sitting here on the
4 front row -- brought her in because of her
5 expertise in what goes on in Homeland
6 Security. She worked there. Worked with our
7 grant process. Twenty years with the FBI,
8 and is a good friend, is doing a great job
9 for us.

10 Lee Feldman. Lee -- there's
11 probably not another person in the country
12 that has better knowledge of how local
13 politics and local governments work.

14 So those are the types of people
15 who were added to our committee, and we'll
16 continue to do that.

17 Let me talk about a couple -- two
18 or three things is all, and then we'll go
19 into questions. The National Disaster
20 Housing Strategy. I know Harvey Johnson
21 mentioned a little bit about it.

22 We put the housing plan in place to

1 get us through this year, but the strategy
2 that we rolled out earlier and that you're
3 reviewing now -- that strategy summarizes,
4 probably for the first time in a single
5 document anyway, the sheltering and housing
6 capacities and capabilities and principles
7 that are going to be guiding us through these
8 next several years. It charts a new
9 direction for where we want to go and the
10 efforts we want to put in place to meet the
11 needs of those individuals out there that
12 need disaster housing.

13 It's not designed to be a quick
14 fix. You need to hear that. The plan is in
15 place to get us through this year, as I said.
16 But the release of the strategy in July that
17 you have is going to give us additional
18 advice and input that we want to get from
19 you. And particularly as we work through the
20 annexes. Because I want this thing done by
21 the fall. We've distributed it on to you,
22 but the National Council for Disabilities has

1 it. Several federal agencies have it. The
2 state and local emergency managers have it.
3 We want to make sure that we get all the
4 input we can to make that document as
5 deliberate as we can. I want a deliberate
6 course. I want to make sure that we set the
7 vision of goals for this organization as we
8 move into this.

9 We believe that the strategy does
10 capture those lessons learned in Katrina and
11 a couple of other disasters we've had. And
12 it looks at the larger disaster issues, not
13 just the short-term housing piece. We're
14 going to be looking for innovative and
15 creative housing options for people, and not
16 just short-term issues of stuffing a travel
17 trailer in somebody's driveway like we've
18 done in the past.

19 We have to elevate the issue of
20 safety, security, and access to people with
21 disabilities. Some of those things, we
22 definitely learned during Katrina, where we

1 had over 140,000 families in travel trailers
2 and mobile homes. And we definitely learned
3 a lot of lessons. And we would be
4 unconscionable if we did not learn from those
5 lessons and put those in place. And that's
6 what we're going to do.

7 We know that the housing merits
8 full-time attention. It's not a one-time
9 issue. It's not a just-in-time, short-term
10 type of thing like we've done in the past.
11 And I know a lot of you are already hard at
12 work. I've already gotten some verbal
13 feedback from some of you, and I appreciate
14 it very much. This is probably going to be
15 the most important document that you work on
16 this next few months.

17 The other is a grants program. Sue
18 ran the grants program when she was here, and
19 we've -- it's one of those issues -- it's
20 probably one of the most key things we do
21 with local communities. It provides dollars
22 out there to states to really kind of run

1 their business and help this country become
2 stronger.

3 This year we announced -- Secretary
4 Chertoff announced almost \$1.7 billion in
5 grants that went out the door a couple of
6 weeks ago. They focus on tribes, states,
7 local communities, organizations, and help
8 individuals also prepare for national manmade
9 disasters, including acts of terrorism.

10 I think you can clearly see that
11 this administration, Department of Homeland
12 Security and FEMA are really committed to
13 providing the resources necessary to make
14 this country safer. And that money will go a
15 long way towards doing that.

16 We took over the grants just this
17 last year, and we worked very hard to make
18 that process as transparent as possible. We
19 want it efficient. We want it swift. In
20 fact, this year, the grants went out ahead of
21 schedule and ahead of our legal deadline.

22 And that's something that has not happened in

1 the past -- sorry, Sue. It's not her fault.

2 We're keeping the states apprised
3 of what we're doing. We're allowing them to
4 have input into our grant guidance before we
5 write it instead of afterwards. We're
6 bringing law enforcement people to look at
7 the grant guidance, like we do with the
8 firefighters. And this is going to work well
9 for us in the future, because by the time the
10 grant guidance comes out, everyone is going
11 to understand what's happening and how it's
12 being put together.

13 We have a new grants program
14 directorate, Ross Ashley. Bob, is Ross
15 addressing the group this time?

16 MR. SHEA: He is.

17 MR. PAULISON: Very good. You'll find
18 Ross a very engaging person. He was absolutely
19 the right person to do that. We created a
20 one-stop shop. We're putting grants people out
21 in the region so people don't have to keep
22 coming inside the Beltway to get information

1 about their grants.

2 We're emphasizing customer service
3 with the grants, to make sure the people get
4 the answers they need. And for the first
5 time we're creating a new initiative. One,
6 we're going to do many reviews; and two,
7 we're going to go back and assess what all
8 the grants doing. Have they been buying the
9 right things? Have we put the money in the
10 right place? Is this country safer because
11 of the \$25 billion that we put out the door
12 in grants over the last several years?

13 The next thing I want to talk about
14 is you're going to have a lot of people
15 coming in front of you asking for new
16 subcommittees. One will be Urban Search and
17 Rescue. I want you to listen to those people
18 very carefully. They're a group of
19 people -- we have 28 teams around the
20 country. They're called on to do some very
21 dangerous work at a moment's notice. They do
22 an outstanding job.

1 But there are going to be others
2 who come in front of you, and I would just
3 ask as they do that that you give those
4 people careful consideration. And I know
5 that every time you add a subcommittee, that
6 creates more work for you, so it takes views
7 on both sides.

8 I asked you the last time we met to
9 put an annual report together, and I know
10 you're working on that. And as we go into
11 this next transition, this next
12 administration, that report is going to be
13 key to transferring information to the next
14 group of people that comes in. So I'm
15 looking forward to reading that in the next
16 couple of meetings that we have.

17 Actually, although you're going to
18 be going into the next year, our winter
19 meeting coming up will probably be my last
20 one. And I have to tell you, I've been proud
21 to be part of putting this organization
22 together. You are going to be invaluable to

1 FEMA and to Homeland Security. And again, I
2 appreciate your service and what you've done.

3 So anyway, thanks for the work
4 you're doing, and thanks for the work you're
5 going to do. And what I'd like to do now is
6 just answer questions and -- whatever is on
7 your mind. And I'll try to move out from
8 behind this podium, because I can't stand
9 being behind a podium.

10 All right. Questions? Yes, you've
11 got to speak up. You know that I'm deaf.

12 MR. CONNORS: I've got a microphone,
13 Chief.

14 MR. PAULISON: My wife says it's
15 selective, but it's really not.

16 MR. CONNORS: First, thanks for your
17 service, sir. You're doing a great job and
18 really changed FEMA.

19 We as an advisory council advise
20 you there's going to be a change in
21 administration. We'll have somebody else
22 that we're going to provide advice to. What

1 advice are you going to give to the next FEMA
2 administrator?

3 MR. PAULISON: I think one, I think
4 the annual report you're going to do is going to
5 be very important. Two, I will make sure that I
6 pass on to the next administrator how important
7 this group is.

8 And three, I think that Kem or
9 whoever the chair is needs to meet
10 immediately with the new FEMA administrator
11 to set up that line of communication and
12 conversation.

13 You're going to be working on some
14 very important issues -- you already are.
15 And they're going to be key to FEMA. So I
16 think establishing, Kem, that early
17 communication piece. You know, Kem and I
18 have had a relationship for a long time. But
19 I don't know who the new person is going to
20 be so you're going to have to develop that.
21 And I think you all should do the same, too,
22 with the key committees. Just pick up the

1 phone and call them. And so it's going to
2 take some work, because it's going to be a
3 new person coming in, maybe not used to
4 working with a committee like this. And
5 maybe not understanding how valuable you can
6 be to a new administrator. It's all about
7 communication. Like everything else, it's
8 all about communication.

9 Yes?

10 MS. HAYES-WHITE: Good morning, Chief.

11 Joanne Hayes-White from San Francisco. How do
12 you envision that transition -- your departure
13 and your replacement?

14 MR. PAULISON: I'm sorry, what now?

15 MS. HAYES-WHITE: How do you envision
16 the transition of your departure and your
17 replacement coming in?

18 MR. PAULISON: I think that what I
19 want to make sure is that we don't lose anything
20 from one administration to another regardless of
21 who gets selected as President. We have put our
22 heart and soul -- literally put our hearts and

1 souls into rebuilding this organization.

2 I spoke to a group yesterday and
3 walked through what FEMA looked like when I
4 took over and the way it looks today, and
5 it's not even close to being the same
6 organization. I mean, we had an underfunded,
7 understaffed, demoralized system with simply
8 broken business practices. It simply just
9 did not work. When you go back and look at
10 it and look at all the issues and all the
11 things that were broken inside this
12 organization, it's no wonder FEMA didn't
13 perform as well as it should during Katrina.

14 I'm surprised it performed as well
15 as it did do, because there were simply not
16 enough people to do the job. The wrong type
17 of leadership, no leadership in a lot of
18 cases. So I don't want to lose that, and I
19 don't want to go back to the old FEMA.

20 I've committed that I'm going to
21 make sure that whoever comes in is going to
22 get everything, every bit of knowledge, all

1 those lessons learned that we've gathered
2 over the last 2-1/2 years and put it on their
3 plate. There is going to be no partisan
4 politics in this transition, and I'm going to
5 make sure of that.

6 We've made sure that our senior
7 career leaders in the organization have been
8 part of every decision we've made. They're
9 sitting at the table at staff meetings to
10 make sure that they're part of the decision.
11 They know why the decisions were made, and
12 they're buying into this new FEMA as we go
13 on. And I'd like to drop the "new" FEMA name
14 sooner or later and say this is FEMA. But it
15 is a different organization. That's why we
16 threw that "new" out there.

17 So I'm going to work very hard to
18 make sure that transition is as smooth as it
19 possibly can be.

20 What else? Is everybody awake?
21 Way in the back. You're going to have to
22 really speak up because you don't have a

1 microphone.

2 SPEAKER: I don't know if --

3 MS. PRICE: I m sorry. Questions
4 really are only for the NAC members. And so
5 members of the public, any sort of comments
6 during the meeting from the public need to be
7 only for during the public comment period. And
8 if you'd like, I can talk to you about this
9 later, but the purposes of the Federal Advisory
10 Committee are for the National Advisory
11 Committee only. I can talk to you about it
12 later if you'd like.

13 MR. PAULISON: I'll answer your
14 question and walk out the door. What else do
15 you have? Is everybody awake?

16 I did it again last night. I
17 stayed up -- I couldn't turn the TV off
18 watching the Olympics. I swore I was going
19 to go to bed early and at 11:30, I'm still
20 watching it.

21 MS. DRAGANI: Administrator, I have
22 kind of a philosophical question, I guess.

1 Oftentimes, years later, historians
2 look back on significant events and come to a
3 different conclusion than we might have come
4 to in the heat of the battle. So I guess my
5 suspicion, the more I read about FEMA's
6 response to Katrina, the more that I
7 personally believe there was a lot more
8 response than we are even close to being
9 aware of as the general public.

10 Do you think the perception 50
11 years from now will be significantly
12 different on what FEMA did do? And if
13 so -- and if you don't want to answer, I
14 understand -- if so, what do you think 50
15 years from now, historians will say about
16 that event and FEMA's response?

17 MR. PAULISON: I think they should
18 have a different view. But because of the tag
19 that FEMA got of being totally incompetent, I
20 don't know that we're going to be able to shake
21 that. I can tell you that over a million people
22 were moved out of Louisiana and Mississippi and

1 were housed by FEMA people. And we found places
2 for everybody to stay.

3 Nobody was on the street. That's
4 remarkable. The fact that we put 140,000
5 families in mobile homes and travel trailers.

6 Again, we didn't know about
7 formaldehyde back then, but that's another
8 issue. And now we have mold, by the way, so
9 I think next is going to be locusts. I'm not
10 sure. Maybe bedbugs.

11 But I think if you really go back
12 and look at it objectively, a lot of good
13 things did happen.

14 A lot of bad things happened. And
15 everything bad that happened wasn't FEMA's
16 fault. There was very, very poor
17 decision-making at the local level, at the
18 state level. The parishes did not have -- I
19 don't want to say they didn't have good
20 communication -- they had no communication
21 with the state at all, so there was a major
22 breakdown. So you didn't know what the

1 issues were. We normally deal directly with
2 the state. So lack of visibility of what was
3 actually happening, was a big problem. Not
4 even knowing what was going on at the
5 Superdome or what was happening at the
6 Convention Center or up on the bridges -- I
7 mean big, big problems.

8 So I don't know if that will ever
9 come out publicly. The people that were on
10 the ground -- the workers who were on the
11 ground did a hell of a job with the lack of
12 resources they had. They just really did.
13 And so, I don't know. We'll see. It's easy
14 to bash FEMA because -- we're probably
15 getting blamed for Russia and Georgia. I'm
16 sure we have something in that.

17 Sue?

18 MS. MENCER: As you know, I'm chairing
19 a symposium roundtable at the Democratic
20 National Convention on emergency preparedness
21 and --

22 MR. PAULISON: I'm sorry to hear that.

1 MS. MENCER: I know. And I will have
2 James Leewed (?), and P.J. Crowley (?), and
3 Stephen Flynn (?), and others on the panel.
4 What question would you like me to ask these
5 people?

6 MR. PAULISON: Oh, my goodness. Now
7 you're really going to get me in trouble here.
8 I think --

9 MS. MENCER: You can submit it in
10 writing if you'd like.

11 MR. PAULISON: I definitely won't do
12 that. I think if I -- you know, one of the big
13 issues -- somebody asked me yesterday what keeps
14 me up at night. There's a whole -- there's a
15 bunch of names -- you can say, okay, we've got
16 the anthrax threat out there. We have somebody
17 who's going to have a radioactive device. You
18 know, a whole bunch of things that go on. What
19 keeps me up at night is the lack of personal
20 preparedness in this country, taking personal
21 responsibility for yourself and your family.
22 That's what keeps me up at night.

1 And I would ask them what are their
2 recommendations -- how do we get across to
3 the American public that even if the local,
4 the state, and the federal government are
5 working perfectly in sync, you cannot take
6 care of everybody if they don't take some
7 responsibility themselves.

8 You've heard me talk about
9 Hurricane Wilma going through -- across the
10 top of my house. You know, my family did not
11 have to stand in line for food, water, and
12 ice two hours after the storm like tens of
13 thousands of people did. That shouldn't have
14 happened, particularly in Florida, who is
15 used to having hurricanes.

16 Joe will tell you -- they were down
17 there, too. And you could not keep up with
18 the lines of people that wanted an MRE and
19 two bottles of water. There just was no
20 reason for it. There was tap water. I mean,
21 so that's what bothers me. If something
22 really catastrophic happens in this country,

1 I'm concerned that with the lack of personal
2 preparedness, it's going to be very difficult
3 to deal with it. So ask them how to fix that
4 and let me know what they say.

5 Angela?

6 MS. ELGIN: Good morning, Chief. I
7 just wanted to give you an update. We had our
8 Emergency Preparedness conference in May over
9 3-1/2 days. And I wanted to thank you for your
10 leadership because Region VII really stepped up.
11 Administrator Hainje came and spent the evening
12 with us, and we also had Phil Kirk and Jackie
13 Snelling, who also came down. And I truly
14 believe that if at the top, that you did not
15 have the mindset or the motivation to motivate
16 individuals to send the message down that we are
17 the new FEMA, because Administrator Hainje, he
18 also did a presentation on the new FEMA as well.

19 So I want to thank you for your
20 leadership, and I also want to give kudos to
21 Region VII, as well as some of the members
22 from headquarters who came down to support

1 the event.

2 So thank you, and I also want to
3 let you know that it was a huge success.

4 MR. PAULISON: Thank you. I
5 appreciate that. And I'll pass that along to
6 Dick. He does a good job. Great administrator.
7 He really gets around. One of the things we
8 push the administrators to do is really open the
9 lines of communication with the governors. And
10 so they're a known quantity, a known entity.
11 They know their face, and that's really
12 important to us, so that they deal with those
13 people on a regular basis so when a disaster
14 does happen, they don't see a stranger standing
15 there. It's somebody that they've already had
16 conversations with.

17 Ken, are you going to -- I saw you
18 move the mike around.

19 MR. MURPHY: No, I was just thinking.
20 Probably more of a comment. One, number one,
21 thank you from the emergency management
22 community for working with us -- and that

1 transparency. And I hope that one thing you do
2 leave the transition team -- and I'm pretty sure
3 Nancy Ward will take this with her -- is just
4 that continued drive to rebuild and strengthen
5 and improve FEMA. I know the emergency
6 management directors, in talking to them,
7 they're seeing the results of the rebuild
8 program of the new FEMA.

9 And I know my state had one of the
10 first disasters after the term "new FEMA"
11 came out. And for those that understand any
12 of that, I was getting a declaration over my
13 BlackBerry in a Black Hawk helicopter. And
14 that's probably a first for most states. So
15 I just appreciate that, and I hope the
16 transition team and the new administration
17 really understand the benefit of that
18 relationship building, not only at your
19 level, Dave, but at the regional level.

20 MR. PAULISON: I appreciate that.
21 We've got a lot of work to do. I mean, we're
22 not done by any means. And there's logistics

1 issues we're still working on. Obviously, the
2 housing issues we're still working on. So a lot
3 of things we need to do.

4 And I just want to make sure we
5 don't fall back as we transition into -- Ken,
6 your organization is going to be key. Yours
7 and the local are going to be key to making
8 sure that you hold the next group's feet to
9 the fire when they --

10 MR. MURPHY: I'm hoping Nancy will
11 carry that holding the feet to the fire, because
12 we want the transition to be successful, too.

13 MR. PAULISON: And I know you do. I
14 appreciate that. You had a question. Yes, sir.

15 MR. STENSGAR: Good morning. This is
16 John Stensgar from the Colville Indian
17 Reservation in North Central Washington.

18 I'd just like to commend you for
19 your leadership. In Indian country,
20 historically the federal government would ask
21 for input and leaders would get together and
22 really pinpoint what the issues are, bring

1 them forward to the government, and two or
2 three months later, a decision comes out like
3 they never even heard us.

4 That was one of the reasons I made
5 the trip to Chicago, to see if the
6 powers-that-be actually listened to what the
7 committees were saying. And that's one of
8 the things that I definitely saw in Chicago
9 and today, that the powers-that-be actually
10 do listen to this committee. And there's a
11 lot of hard work that goes on in the
12 subcommittees.

13 And for myself, I really appreciate
14 that, and I have a lot of respect for you and
15 your leadership abilities. Thank you.

16 MR. PAULISON: I appreciate that. I
17 appreciate you serving on the committee. It's
18 been one of those areas we've been very -- it's
19 very difficult working with the tribes, not
20 because of your fault, because of our
21 fault -- as the system we set up. You know, we
22 go through the states, and some states allow us

1 to deal directly with the tribes, and some
2 don't.

3 One of the issues they had was when
4 the EMPG grants go out, some of the states
5 don't give any of it to the tribes, even
6 though they have an emergency management
7 center and a director and the whole system
8 set up.

9 So it's something I think we need
10 to work on, and I'm glad that you're here to
11 help us with that, because that's going to be
12 a big issue for us -- to make sure that you
13 are sitting at the table as partners along
14 with the state and the local communities.

15 What else? Yes, sir.

16 MR. DECKER: Chief, on behalf of the
17 local emergency managers, certainly I would want
18 to jump on Ken's comment and say that I know
19 from IM's perspective, we've really appreciated
20 the openness and the dialogue between
21 FEMA -- the new FEMA -- and local emergency
22 managers. We don't think we've had a

1 communication stream like that for a long, long
2 time. And we appreciate it.

3 On a personal note, I can tell you
4 that in my county where I'm an emergency
5 manager, we've had two presidential
6 declarations in the last five years, one of
7 them just last summer with the flooding. And
8 it was like night and day, the response that
9 we saw from FEMA last year versus what we'd
10 seen in previous disasters. And I attribute
11 that to the new attitude from the FEMA staff.

12 MR. PAULISON: Thanks, I appreciate
13 it. The declaration process is really very
14 interesting.

15 If a state gets a declaration,
16 we're heroes. If we're not, we're sorry
17 son-of-a-guns and nothing has changed in
18 FEMA.

19 We went back and looked at the
20 number of disaster declarations that have
21 been issued under President Bush, and he's
22 done more than any other president has ever

1 done as far as the numbers of them. Now, of
2 course, I think the disasters are up, too.
3 And the budget office keeps telling me that
4 I'm lowering the bar and giving more
5 declarations than I should, but the truth is
6 we want to get the "yes." And there is
7 criteria out there of how we do the
8 declarations. And sometimes, there's just
9 not enough damage to warrant a disaster
10 declaration and you have to say no. And
11 that's the breaks.

12 Anyway, what else? Yes.

13 MR. KRUMPERMAN: Again, I want to
14 agree with everyone to thank you for your
15 leadership and the openness and responsiveness
16 to us and to other folks in the emergency
17 community.

18 The question, back to what you said
19 what keeps you up at night, do you have any
20 positive examples, both within the country or
21 internationally, that you look at as a
22 positive example of individual preparedness

1 that we could learn from?

2 MR. PAULISON: I think what I saw in
3 the Midwest floods just this last month -- I
4 didn't see the dependency on state or federal
5 assets that I've seen in the past. I think
6 hopefully the message is getting out. That's a
7 group of people that are traditionally
8 independent anyway.

9 Now, we are working with housing
10 now. So there's a lot of people who are not
11 going to rebuild their homes because they're
12 probably going to get bought out by the state
13 with the FEMA mitigation dollars. So we're
14 putting a lot of mobile homes down. But even
15 if we put all these mobile homes down -- I
16 don't know if you've heard this story. We're
17 not using "trailers" anymore. I'm taking
18 that word out of my vocabulary. But we have
19 a lot of mobile homes.

20 Some of those mobile homes -- in
21 fact, the bulk of them have an exterior door
22 for where the hot water heater is. It's a

1 fire safety issue. Instead of an interior
2 door. So we normally don't open that up
3 because it's sealed. It's mostly for the
4 plumber, the electrician, or the gas person
5 to get in there and fix it. So they opened
6 one, and for some reason it had mold on the
7 inside of the door. And so the lieutenant
8 governor came back that night and said I want
9 every one of them out of the state.

10 Well, I had 750 of the ones with
11 the exterior door ready to go, already
12 formaldehyde tested, and only about 40 of the
13 ones with the interior doors. So it's those
14 type of things we deal with on a regular
15 basis. So now we're dealing with mold on top
16 of the formaldehyde. And like I said, who
17 knows what's next?

18 That's why working with
19 Joe -- Joe's done a great job and come up
20 with some alternative ideas for emergency
21 housing. And we're taking some of those
22 ideas, and that's what we want to incorporate

1 into our housing strategy. I'm not
2 convinced -- one, I'm not convinced FEMA
3 should be in the housing business at all. I
4 don't know how to get out of it.

5 And two, I'm surely not convinced
6 that the mobile homes or travel trailers are
7 the right answer. Right now, that's all we
8 have, so we'll keep using it until we can do
9 something else.

10 So this committee here can really
11 brainstorm and come up with some ideas. And
12 Joe, I appreciate you being here. Joe is one
13 of those very busy and very well-respected
14 emergency managers that takes the time to
15 serve on committees like this. I want to
16 thank you personally for that.

17 MR. THOMAS: Administrator, having
18 been a president of IAEM a few years ago and now
19 currently working with Save the Children, an
20 international organization, we've learned a lot
21 from the other countries that we deal with on
22 emergency response. Has there been much of an

1 international contingent, or have you really
2 reached out to other countries to see what
3 they're doing and how the responses take place?

4 MR. PAULISON: They visit -- I have a
5 lot of international traffic that comes through
6 my office from -- the Japanese have been in
7 there -- the Israelis, Arab countries, obviously
8 Canadians, Australians, New Zealanders, Germany.
9 They've all come through. We sit down for about
10 an hour and talk about different ideas. And
11 they're all struggling with the same things.

12 As far as short-term emergency
13 housing, really, nobody does it better than
14 we do. They're looking at us for answers.
15 They don't have mobile homes over there.
16 They don't have travel trailers.

17 So they really have a tough time if
18 they have to do some type of mass
19 evacuation -- and where to put people. It's
20 a struggle. So I think as far as emergency
21 management, I will put the United States'
22 local emergency managers and state emergency

1 managers up against anybody in the world.
2 I'll tell you right now, I don't think
3 anybody does it better than we do. That
4 doesn't mean we can't learn from them,
5 because there are things that they do that we
6 do learn from, but mostly they come here to
7 learn.

8 And they beg to get into our
9 classes in Emmittsburg. I gave them a copy
10 of our housing strategy -- the one that you
11 have -- the last group that came through.
12 And they just couldn't believe that we put a
13 document together like that. So yeah, we can
14 learn from each other, but for the most part,
15 they come here to learn.

16 Folks, thanks a lot. I appreciate
17 it. I've got a full schedule today, but I've
18 taken way too much time. But I just want to
19 thank you -- I know I've said it a dozen
20 times, but I can't say it enough -- for
21 serving on this committee. I really thought
22 when we were told we had to put a committee

1 together, oh, crap.

2 Sorry, but it's what I said. But I
3 have to tell you, with allowing us to
4 handpick people that had the right types of
5 expertise, and the fact that you got cranked
6 up in a very short order, you're doing good
7 work. I meant what I said. You are going to
8 be one of the most valuable tools that FEMA
9 has for picking your brains, for getting
10 advice, working on issues for us. And just
11 thank you for your service.

12 Thank you very much.

13 MR. SHEA: I need you to do a couple
14 of things.

15 MR. PAULISON: Okay.

16 MR. SHEA: We're going to try and use
17 just a brief agenda wrench right at the moment.
18 Yesterday -- I know this has never happened in
19 history -- I made a mistake. So we want to try
20 to correct it. John Stensgar is one of our new
21 councilmembers who was not sworn in yesterday,
22 so we want to spend just a moment to do that.

1 And then some of the other new members, we would
2 also use this opportunity to take an individual
3 photo with you if you don't mind.

4 MR. PAULISON: Okay.

5 MR. SHEA: John, would you come on up?

6 MR. PAULISON: How did you do that,
7 Bob?

8 MR. SHEA: I must have been asleep at
9 the switch. My wife tells me it happens quite
10 often.

11 MR. PAULISON: He does fall asleep at
12 his desk a lot.

13 John, congratulations.

14 (John Stensgar sworn in)

15 MR. PAULISON: Congratulations.
16 Welcome onboard.

17 (Applause)

18 MR. PAULISON: Thank you for being
19 here.

20 MR. SHEA: I would also like to
21 request that the other new members come on up
22 and take a photo with the Administrator as well.

1 MR. STENSGAR: Those are almost the
2 same words I used when I got sworn into the
3 Army.

4 MR. PAULISON: Well, there you go.

5 (Group photographs)

6 MR. SHEA: We want to try and do real
7 quick individual photos with the new members,
8 too. We'll send those to --

9 MR. PAULISON: Why don't we do it in
10 front of the flag?

11 SPEAKER: That's fine.

12 SPEAKER: Sorry, folks.

13 SPEAKER: John, you first? All right.

14 (Individual photographs)

15 MR. PAULISON: Kem, thanks a lot.

16 DR. BENNETT: I appreciate you being
17 with us this morning, Mr. Administrator.

18 It's interesting. He was talking
19 about the international people coming through
20 his office and what they're doing in
21 emergency management. I had the opportunity
22 to be in Great Britain here just a while ago

1 and met with the head of Great Britain's
2 emergency management. And I asked him what
3 is the topic that they're working on in Great
4 Britain -- what are his top four or five
5 things, and it sounded exactly like our
6 subcommittee list. I mean, it really was.
7 It was a one-to-one mapping of the same
8 issues we're looking at here. So he's been
9 out looking at our websites and seeing what's
10 going on.

11 It's interesting how that is shared
12 across the world.

13 I'd like to begin by summarizing
14 sort of what we did yesterday and where we're
15 going. First of all, I really do appreciate
16 the work of our subcommittees -- the NRF, the
17 Stafford Act, Special Needs, Public/Private
18 Sector Partnerships. I think we're making
19 headway. I think that was one of our
20 goals -- was to get to the point where we
21 were actually putting things out of this
22 committee to the administrator on some

1 recommendations.

2 And I believe we're moving there.

3 We have a full agenda today but
4 we're going to try to adjust that as we move
5 along to stay on schedule. We still, of
6 course, have to finish off some of the
7 discussions relative to the comments of the
8 Stafford Act, and we are going to have some,
9 I think, continued discussions today
10 on -- the Housing subcommittee also will be
11 bringing forward some issues that we need to
12 look at. So we'll adjust the schedule to
13 keep on track for today.

14 One of the other comments that I
15 want to make regarding the Stafford Act, it's
16 a little different from what we've done in
17 the past. In the past, we've sort of been
18 given a document that was in the make or
19 draft ready to go and said what do we think,
20 as opposed to being on the front end of that
21 and saying we're going to be looking at X.
22 What do you think are important issues? And

1 that's basically what we're doing with the
2 Stafford Act.

3 We have an opportunity before they
4 move forward to draft policies, and before
5 they move forward, to get public comment and
6 so forth -- to get our inputs from us on what
7 we think some of the issues are. Whether
8 they be pro or con, we don't necessarily have
9 to have unanimity in what the particular
10 issues are, but to lay them out as you move
11 forward in these areas -- here are what we
12 think are important issues and get a feel
13 from us.

14 And I think that's in the long run
15 a better way for us to work, to get in on the
16 front end as opposed to the rear end of some
17 of these issues. So I just wanted to make
18 that clear.

19 So when we were adopting individual
20 assistance or public assistance to go
21 forward, they're really recommendations of
22 what we think are things to keep in mind and

1 to look at. There'll be plenty of time for
2 the final review of the documents, and public
3 comments and so forth will come later. I
4 think there might have been a little
5 confusion there. I just wanted to make that
6 particular comment.

7 We will have a report this morning
8 from the minority director from the Office of
9 Equal Rights. We'll also have a
10 presentation, as Dave Paulison mentioned, by
11 the National Urban Search and Rescue chiefs.
12 And he has asked us to look at how we might
13 want to engage with that group and how they
14 will interface with our committee. And we'll
15 be looking forward to hearing from Chief
16 Endikrat this morning or this afternoon.

17 Then we'll have the reports from
18 the Post-Disaster and NIMS Subcommittees will
19 also take place today. So with that, let's
20 move into our agenda. I would like to ask
21 Pauline Campbell if she could come forward
22 and give us her report.

1 MS. CAMPBELL: Good morning. I'm
2 going to try to make this as brief as possible
3 because I understand your agenda is a little bit
4 behind schedule. So if there's something of
5 interest and I'm moving too quickly, just ask me
6 to pause and I'll go back and respond to it.

7 The most important thing I think
8 before I can really talk about what we look
9 like as an agency is to make sure everyone
10 understands what our staffing picture looks
11 like. FEMA's primarily comprised of
12 temporary employees. That's the largest
13 population in the agency. Most of those
14 employees are exempt from
15 Title V -- basically the OPM guidelines for
16 hiring -- and the rules and guidelines that
17 most federal employees follow.

18 So with that, we're looking at a
19 permanent full-time workforce authorized
20 ceiling right now of 4007. Within the next
21 category, we have disaster assistance
22 employees. Within that group we have what we

1 call reservists as well as local hires.
2 Reservists are individuals that work for us
3 on an on-call basis. Basically, they make
4 themselves available whenever they feel like
5 working and we call them up for whatever
6 disaster we need them on -- versus local
7 hires who are hired within the disaster area
8 to support the operations that are going on.
9 They generally work for us for about 120
10 days.

11 Katrina, many of them worked for us
12 for two or three years, but normally it's 120
13 days. And then we have our CORE employees or
14 Cadre On-call Response Employees. They're
15 term employees that are hired for a specific
16 period of time. We have individuals right
17 now that are in the category of two years.
18 We have some that are four years. Those four
19 years are pretty much going away, though.

20 Just to give you a historical
21 perspective of the agency, from 1996 to July
22 of this year -- you'll notice from the

1 permanent full-time workforce that there was
2 no real increase until 2008. We're roughly,
3 I'd say -- between 1996 and 2000, you'll
4 notice it went down. Between 2000 and 2007,
5 we went up a couple of hundred employees.
6 And now we are at 3100.

7 Now, our temporary workforce, if
8 you'll look at that, this includes the
9 disaster assistance employees, the local
10 hires, reservists, as well as CORE employees.
11 Now, COREs didn't exist back in 1996. We had
12 some other category. I won't even go into
13 that. But we had a reduction in 2000 from
14 that number. In 2007, our temporary
15 workforce was actually about 24,000. We had
16 the National Disaster Medical System, which
17 was a part of FEMA -- left the agency I want
18 to say like April or May. I can't remember
19 the time frame. So that was 10,000 employees
20 that we lost. Our current number of
21 temporary employees, 13,000.

22 So as you can see from a bottom

1 line in the last two years is when we've
2 really stabilized at the 16,000 mark. Now,
3 just from a graphic representation, very
4 quickly, if you will look at that great big
5 slide for disaster workforce, that's
6 50 percent of the agency's population, and
7 then another 30 percent is the CORE
8 workforce. So really, FEMA's permanent
9 workforce is about 20 percent.

10 And right now with our permanent
11 full-time and our CORE workforce -- and the
12 reason I include the CORE workforce in some
13 of these slides is because they are with us
14 two and four years, and many of them have
15 been renewed. So 53 percent of the workforce
16 right now is female. That's unusual.

17 Just to give you an idea -- between
18 2007 and 2008, by race and national origin of
19 the PFT and the CORE workforce -- I've noted
20 by each one of the categories what the
21 civilian labor force percentage is. And
22 that's basically how we measure. Right now,

1 you will note that the agency exceeds the
2 civilian labor force in African-American.
3 We're almost meeting Hispanic -- we're not
4 quite there. American-Indian, and we're not
5 quite there in Asian. So where we are short
6 or do not compare exactly is in our Caucasian
7 race.

8 We can skip that. For hiring. So
9 far in 2008, we've had 312 new hires for
10 permanent full-time employees, with
11 31 percent of them being minority, and 920
12 temporaries at 28 percent. And so here's a
13 perspective. In comparison on the percent of
14 totals, it was very interesting for me to
15 note that our hiring percentages are very
16 comparable to the percentage of who's onboard
17 right now. So Caucasian was about
18 64 percent -- 68 percent is what was hired
19 this year; 27 percent African-American, where
20 we stand at 24 percent. So these slides are
21 in your packets. As I said, I'm not going to
22 dwell too much in a lot of this. I just

1 wanted to make sure you know it's here.

2 In our disaster workforce hiring,
3 the percentages are closer to the civilian
4 labor force as opposed to the exception in
5 the civilian labor force. By grade
6 distribution, you'll notice I put these into
7 groups as opposed to breaking down every
8 single grade. In our Senior Executive
9 Service categories, 53 percent is
10 Caucasian -- excuse me -- 53 employees are
11 Caucasian, 2 are Hispanic, and 5 are
12 African-American. Within the grade grouping
13 of 13 through 15, there are 300
14 African-Americans, 13 American Indian, 38
15 Asian, 1237 Caucasian, and 36 Hispanic.

16 I'm going to jump to the
17 percentages. And if you'll notice in the
18 percentages, specifically in the 13 through
19 15, we're still exceeding the civilian labor
20 force in African-Americans, and Caucasian is
21 comparable to the civilian labor force.

22 Where we're short is

1 American-Indian and Hispanic. So right now,
2 the agency is looking at recruitment
3 opportunities for those categories,
4 especially in our permanent full-time
5 workforce.

6 I don't know if it was mentioned,
7 but one of the initiatives that we are trying
8 to put together is one where we will be
9 partnering with tribal colleges,
10 Hispanic-serving institutions, as well as
11 Historically Black Colleges and Universities,
12 to establish an intern program so that a
13 region that may have predominantly tribal
14 colleges within their territory would have
15 interns working for them from those
16 universities. So we're trying to set that up
17 for FY 2009. We haven't quite gotten
18 everything worked out, but that's in the
19 works for next year.

20 Questions I can respond to?

21 MR. LANCASTER: Yes, John Lancaster
22 with National Council on Independent Living. Do

1 you have any statistics, or are you tracking any
2 way -- or what are your efforts in terms of
3 outreach to people with disabilities?

4 MS. CAMPBELL: Yes, I do. Right now,
5 our workforce for disabled employees -- in our
6 permanent full-time workforce, we have 21.
7 However, in our disaster workforce, we have
8 another 63, excuse me. We have decreased
9 because we have lost a few people through
10 retirements. Our numbers were a little better.
11 I'm a little disappointed right now, but we are
12 doing some outreach, through some job fairs,
13 that are focused on hiring disabled.

14 We recently, through a partnership
15 with our human resources office, are
16 establishing a specific recruitment activity
17 for disabled employees. So we are working
18 through that right now. We also are trying
19 to get some of our organizations looking at
20 the workforce recruitment program, which is
21 for disabled students. So we doing a number
22 of things in that area. We're not quite

1 there yet, but we are working on those.

2 Yes?

3 MS. ELGIN: Angelina Elgin. In
4 looking at your distribution by grade, as you
5 said, there is a great disparity in your SES
6 employees. In your recruitment efforts, are you
7 addressing that disparity between the American
8 Indian, the Asian? Are you addressing that, or
9 is there recruitment efforts only for the
10 introductory level?

11 MS. CAMPBELL: The recruitment efforts
12 primarily are from that 15 down. When you can
13 get the individuals staffed within that 13/15,
14 it's considered your feeder population for your
15 SES positions. So that's where you tend to do
16 most of your recruitment and focus.

17 MS. ELGIN: Are there any programs or
18 any -- is there anything that's in process now
19 to increase those numbers in the SES employees?

20 MS. CAMPBELL: I would not say that
21 there is a specific program. I would say that
22 our agency is using training opportunities. I

1 know that individuals go through details. The
2 13 through 15 numbers actually look very good in
3 comparison to the civilian labor force, as well
4 as to many other federal agencies. So yes,
5 there is effort working there. I will tell you
6 that just the number of African-Americans and
7 Hispanics in the SES right now is much improved
8 from where we were.

9 Other questions?

10 MR. SHEA: Thank you very much,
11 Pauline.

12 MS. CAMPBELL: Sure.

13 DR. BENNETT: Thank you, Pauline. I
14 think we'll move on before we break. We're
15 doing well here on time. So I would like to ask
16 if Jonathan Sarubbi is willing to come forward
17 and give us his report on Region III.

18 MR. SHEA: Regional Assistance
19 Committee, RAC.

20 DR. BENNETT: The RAC, excuse me.

21 MR. SARUBBI: Good morning. Can
22 everybody hear me? Good. Thank you. Let me

1 just get organized here.

2 Good morning, again. My name is
3 John Sarubbi. I'm the regional administrator
4 for FEMA Region III, and we're based in
5 Philadelphia. Our region covers the
6 mid-Atlantic states for Pennsylvania,
7 Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, and West
8 Virginia, as well as the National Capital
9 region area here in the D.C. area.

10 For the most part, we've had a very
11 quiet last couple of years. I think we've
12 had only a couple of minor disasters, of
13 which we're very happy. We have one small
14 disaster ongoing in West Virginia right now.
15 Our joint field office is ready to close down
16 here next week. We are, however, providing a
17 lot of support to folks in the Midwest region
18 with all the flooding out there.

19 As the slide says, we have about
20 125 full-time employees and about 450
21 disaster assistance employees, which Pauline
22 spoke about earlier this morning.

1 Our Regional Advisory Council first
2 met almost about a year ago, October 25th of
3 last year.

4 We have about 20 members of our
5 committee, and they have staggered
6 appointments from one to three years so that
7 they all aren't leaving at the same time.
8 Our group has decided to have quarterly
9 meetings, so we've had now four meetings.
10 Our first meeting being, as I said, in
11 October of last year, and our most recent
12 meeting being in Richmond, Virginia, in the
13 middle of July.

14 As you can see, we have a very
15 diverse membership. Those 20 members
16 represent a broad spectrum of disciplines.
17 We have two state emergency management
18 directors, two deputy state management
19 directors. We have law enforcement, health,
20 local county emergency managers represented.

21 You can see, Special Needs, we have
22 Joanne Knapp, who is the preparedness

1 disabilities coordinator for the state of
2 Maryland. At least one of our local
3 emergency managers is a woman from
4 Chesapeake, Virginia, is also the president
5 of the Virginia Emergency Managers
6 Association, so we have reached back into all
7 of the folks in that group as well.

8 So overall, I'm very pleased with
9 the diversity of folks that we have and the
10 representation from the different disciplines
11 in the group.

12 As far as our meetings go, as I
13 said, we've had four meetings to date. The
14 group has decided that they wanted to
15 alternate the locations of those meetings.
16 We've had three of our meetings in state at
17 the State EOCs in Delaware, Maryland, and
18 Virginia, and we had one in a
19 local -- actually Montgomery County, right up
20 the road here -- EOC.

21 And our next meeting is in November
22 in Chester County EOC in Chester County,

1 Pennsylvania. It gives the members an
2 opportunity to get to know the region -- get
3 out to see the different entities within the
4 region, as well as to pick up the local
5 issues in the particular states or counties
6 as well.

7 They get a chance to view -- get an
8 overview of the EOC, for example, in
9 Virginia. There, they got a tour of the
10 Fusion Center, which is also located in the
11 state EOC. So again, it gives them a good
12 opportunity to really become familiar with
13 the region.

14 Go ahead. During our first -- I
15 guess we really didn't gel until about our
16 third meeting. We tried to sit down and
17 figure out, well, what does this committee
18 want to accomplish? They know by the charter
19 that their mission was to advise me as the
20 regional administrator on a variety of
21 issues. What were those issues? So we sat
22 down, and basically, I communicated to them

1 my priorities as a regional administrator and
2 the things that were of concern to me within
3 the region.

4 And these are sort of a list of the
5 things that we gave the committee, and they
6 chose really four areas to focus on. The
7 first one was situational awareness and
8 information sharing. The second one was
9 regional exercise coordination. The third
10 was community preparedness. And then the
11 fourth was private sector integration.

12 After we chose those priorities, we
13 set up -- we call them advisory teams. For
14 some reason, the group didn't like the term
15 "subcommittees," so we changed it to
16 "advisory teams," and they were okay with
17 that. So we've got three advisory teams set
18 up on those first three initiatives. We
19 haven't really gotten into private sector
20 integration as yet, but that will be
21 something we'll probably start to move into
22 at our next meeting in Chester County.

1 These groups -- in between
2 meetings, they will have telephone conference
3 calls. We haven't done any VTCs yet but we
4 may do that as well, just to keep the
5 momentum going. Each of the advisory teams
6 has a subject matter expert assigned to them.

7 That is somebody from my staff who
8 is my expert in those areas, to help
9 facilitate the discussions and help capture
10 the information recommendations that they
11 bring back to us and so forth.

12 Go ahead. Let's see. I think I've
13 covered most of that. But just in terms of
14 some of the issues -- I'll go a little bit
15 into some of the issues that they've
16 addressed. As far as situational awareness
17 goes, as the chief indicated earlier, with
18 our new posture of leading forward, it's
19 really important that we have good, timely
20 situational awareness. And as part of that,
21 each of the regions are standing up their
22 RRCC watch -- 24 by 7 eventually. We've

1 stood up ours 12 by 7 to give us conductivity
2 in situational awareness of what's going on
3 throughout the region.

4 For us, we have so many operation
5 centers within our region. In fact, right
6 here in the National Capital region, I think
7 we have about 130. And there's a lot of
8 information out there. So we're starting to
9 try to figure out what information do we
10 really need to capture, and what are we going
11 to do with it, and who do we share that
12 information with?

13 We have responsibilities to report
14 information and situations up the chain, up
15 to the chief, and up to DHS through the RRCC.
16 We have a need to coordinate information
17 sharing within the region to make sure that
18 our state EOCs are aware of what's going on
19 within Region III.

20 So there's a lot of different
21 constituencies that we have to satisfy. So
22 we're using the advisory team to help us

1 identify what information we need to be
2 collecting, how we need to correlate and
3 analyze that information, and then how do we
4 share that information. We've gotten a lot
5 of positive feedback from our state EOCs, for
6 example, on a regional daily situational
7 report that we put together -- that kind of
8 gives a summary of what's going on in the
9 region.

10 A lot of states, through the EOCs
11 at both the state level and county level know
12 what's going on in their state, but they
13 don't necessarily know what's going on in the
14 region. So that's been a very positive
15 effort. And during the last meeting, our
16 advisory team gave us some good ideas on what
17 information we should be capturing and how we
18 should be displaying that.

19 Again, a lot of information is
20 coming in. We don't want to provide just
21 another report that people are just going to
22 delete in their e-mail and so forth. So we

1 got some good advice from them on that.

2 Another big area for us, we're very
3 good at collecting information on natural
4 disasters, and weather and so forth. But
5 we've got to get better at collecting
6 information from the intelligence and law
7 enforcement community. So we've been working
8 very closely in a number of different venues
9 in working with the Fusion Center, the FBI
10 JTTFs, and so forth.

11 But there's issues there as well.
12 What information do we want that consequence
13 managers and mercy managers want? And then
14 what do we do with that information?
15 Obviously, we're not policemen. We're not
16 going to go out and investigate cases of
17 white powder incidents or other kinds of
18 things, but we do want to know what the
19 intelligence says. What's going on in terms
20 of trends and analysis so that we can
21 anticipate what the need might be at the
22 federal level, should there be some terrorist

1 incident or something that might overwhelm
2 state and local law enforcement and so forth.

3 So we're working closely with our
4 advisory team members. As I said, we have
5 law enforcement, and with the state
6 directors, and some of the others, in
7 figuring out what kind of information we need
8 and how we can share that information in a
9 way that's useful to the leadership within
10 FEMA and DHS, and also our state and local
11 partners.

12 Let me talk real quick about the
13 other two -- if I can remember what they are.
14 Another one, the second one, is a regional
15 exercise program. There's a lot of things
16 going on with our national preparedness
17 director to improve exercises.

18 One of the things that we're
19 getting back from our advisory team is
20 there's too many exercises. And they're
21 overwhelmed with the number of exercises.

22 So we're trying to provide some

1 leadership at least within the region to
2 identify exercises and share that information
3 with everyone so we make sure we're all aware
4 of what exercises are going on and we're
5 doing the right exercises without
6 overburdening people.

7 And that's an effort that's going
8 to take, I think, some time to resolve. But
9 we're using the advisory committee to help us
10 do that, and also help us to make sure that
11 the exercises that are done and the exercises
12 that we participate in are the right
13 exercises in terms of helping us design
14 exercises that are realistic to our region,
15 and have realistic projected scenarios and so
16 forth.

17 There's an exercise, for example,
18 that's coming up here shortly that's going to
19 deal with power outages, which is something
20 our states wanted to deal with -- as opposed
21 to some of these other things that get thrown
22 on them. It comes from the bottom up, and I

1 think it's going to be a good exercise. And
2 we've asked the advisory team to help us to
3 communicate on that.

4 The last one I want to talk about
5 just briefly is community preparedness. You
6 heard the chief this morning talk about how
7 important citizen preparedness is and how
8 much more really needs to be done in that
9 area. This is something that I as well am
10 concerned about.

11 One of my objectives is to increase
12 citizen preparedness. We have a
13 representative -- one of my staff members,
14 Angela Heim, is a preparedness coordinator,
15 and she's working very closely with her
16 counterparts within the state. But I need
17 the advisory team to advise me on how we can
18 better promote citizen preparedness through
19 our citizen CORE folks, through our CERT
20 teams. And they've actually done some great
21 work.

22 We had a great discussion during

1 the last meeting, for example, on trying to
2 educate families through the children through
3 the schools.

4 We had a briefing from D.C. -- the
5 woman from D.C. Citizen Preparedness on the
6 Commander Ready Program, which is a program
7 that D.C. has developed and been very
8 successful with. And we were able to share
9 some ideas and best practices on how to do
10 that. So we're continuing that effort.

11 The other thing I wanted to
12 highlight in that area is educating and
13 message communicating to the special needs
14 community. We have Joanne Knapp -- again,
15 our citizen preparedness coordinator from
16 Maryland -- who is working on that issue and
17 helping us to -- well, first of all, we
18 realize, and I think most of you probably
19 already know this -- how do you define
20 special needs, particularly folks with
21 special medical needs?

22 So we've kind of had some

1 discussions on that. A lot of different
2 opinions on that subject just within our
3 region. And then the messaging. How do you
4 get the messaging out there?

5 Our advisory team is really working
6 on the issue, and I think that's a very
7 important one.

8 So that just gives you a couple
9 of -- a snapshot. I'm very pleased with the
10 folks we have on our committee. A great
11 group of folks, very energetic, very
12 appreciative of being on the team and helping
13 us to get better at what we do at the
14 regional level.

15 Also, I failed to mention, in your
16 notebook, I think you have a summary of all
17 the activities of all the RAC committees for
18 various regions and what they do. I think
19 you'll see there's some commonality in some
20 of the activities they're looking at. For
21 example, I think training and exercise is
22 something that many of the committees are

1 looking at as well. And then citizen
2 preparedness, I believe, is another one. So
3 I'll ask you to take a look at that.

4 If you have any particular
5 questions, I think you can ask Alyson on
6 those. But subject to any questions -- yes?

7 MR. CONNORS: Jonathan, first, thanks
8 for the update. My question is about the daily
9 situation reports. Some of us get the Region I
10 situation report and it's an outstanding report
11 that helps tremendously.

12 Is this a consistent thing that
13 happens across the regions? And if so, are
14 you offering that to the private sector like
15 Region I does? How do people subscribe to
16 the daily reports? I think they're really
17 valuable, and we need to be able to share
18 that information more freely, especially
19 people that have operations in every region.

20 MR. STENSGAR: I can't speak for what
21 the other regions are doing. I can tell you
22 from a Region III perspective, we've been

1 putting out a daily report now for probably a
2 little over a year. And it keeps growing in
3 terms of the number of people that are
4 interested in participating in it.

5 Right now, we have -- mostly it's
6 the state EOCs and some of our states -- like
7 I know West Virginia, for example, will send
8 it out to their county emergency managers as
9 well. We have our ESF partners. We have
10 other DHS entities and Fusion Centers. We
11 have not added the private sector, but
12 there's nothing in the report that's
13 sensitive at this point.

14 It's mostly a summary of what's
15 going on in each of the states. We'd
16 certainly be amenable to do that. Now, if
17 later on we get to a point where we include
18 intelligence or law enforcement information,
19 then we have to be somewhat careful because
20 some of that stuff is sensitive, but
21 certainly that could be edited out in a
22 report.

1 I mentioned, one of my fourth
2 priorities is integrating the private sector.
3 And that's something I think we really need
4 to build on. Prior to my coming into FEMA, I
5 was in the Coast Guard. I was at a Coast
6 Guard port in Philadelphia, and we worked
7 very closely with the private sector. So I'm
8 anxious to reconnect with the private sector.

9 Long answer, but to answer your
10 question, we'd be happy to add the private
11 sector.

12 Yes?

13 MR. GOUGELET: How do you coordinate
14 with the military in this area?

15 MR. STENSGAR: Our primary
16 coordination is through our defense coordinating
17 element. We have -- each of the FEMA regions
18 have an active duty contingent. We actually
19 belong to Army North -- within the regions.
20 They're headed up by an active duty Army
21 colonel. In my case, it's Jim Mathis.

22 And they're out gateway into the

1 DoD. They coordinate a lot of the base
2 commanders within Region III and a lot -- we
3 have JTF NCR here -- General Rowe, and others
4 through the National Guard.

5 So that's primarily how we do that.
6 Jim attends all of his meetings. We attend
7 his meetings. He attends our exercises, so
8 we're pretty well linked up with the DoD
9 folks.

10 MR. GOUGELET: Do they coordinate with
11 the regional exercises or participate in them?

12 MR. STENSGAR: They do. For example,
13 NLE 2-8, which was a national-level exercise
14 back in May, Jim Mathis was the DCO working in
15 the state EOC in Richmond, along with the FCO
16 for the National IMAT and our ERD 18, so yes, we
17 do.

18 MG LIBBY: Just to follow up on a
19 question -- did I jump in front of Christine?

20 MS. CATLETT: Go ahead, General,
21 please.

22 MG LIBBY: The decision by FEMA to put

1 a full-time DCO and DCE element in each region
2 was a real stroke of genius.

3 MR. STENSGAR: Absolutely.

4 MG LIBBY: It has been a breath of
5 fresh air in the coordination -- I can only
6 speak for Region I. Colonel Gary Stanley, the
7 new guy on board, has come to us, I think,
8 from --

9 MR. MURPHY: You stole him from us.

10 MG LIBBY: No, we didn't steal him.
11 He owns property in New Hampshire, so he's come
12 home. It's been a stroke of genius. And I
13 would tell you I wear all three hats in the
14 state of Maine, but I can tell you my fellow
15 tags in the area who aren't involved in
16 emergency management and aren't the homeland
17 security advisors have a direct and daily
18 relationship with the Gary Stanleys of the
19 world. And it makes a real difference during
20 exercise scenarios, and it makes a real
21 difference during response and recovery
22 operations. A stroke of genius on someone's

1 part.

2 MR. STENSGAR: Yes.

3 MS. CATLETT: Good morning. I'm
4 Christina Catlett from Baltimore, actually. I
5 was just curious what your IT connectivity with
6 the state EMAs is. Are you using a web-based
7 software like Web EOC, or E-Team, or how do you
8 communicate with the state EMAs?

9 MR. STENSGAR: Well, most of our
10 states within Region III use Web EOC. West
11 Virginia uses E-Team. FEMA is developing its
12 own system called E-MIMS, which is just now
13 being rolled out to the regions. So we've
14 undergone some training in it. I don't think
15 it's fully operational yet. But we do have
16 access to each of our state's Web EOC. It's
17 web-based, so they give us a password and we log
18 in every day. But it's individual states.
19 There's nothing that connects all of our states
20 together.

21 I think one of our goals -- I'm not
22 the expert on E-MIMS, but one of the goals is

1 to try to bring connectivity to all of the
2 different state software packages.

3 Yes?

4 MR. KRUMPERMAN: Hi, my name is Kurt
5 Krumperman, and I'm working on the private
6 sector committee here. You talk about the
7 private sector integration as an area you want
8 to work on in your regional committee. One, how
9 do you see doing that; and two, are there any
10 private sector reps on the committee, or how can
11 they get involved? It's my understanding that
12 you couldn't have non-governmental folks on the
13 regional advisory committee, so I was wondering
14 how you were addressing that issue.

15 MR. STENSGAR: Yeah, that was one of
16 the questions that I had -- and one of the
17 things I wanted to do was to have a private
18 sector member on our committee. And I was told
19 we could not do that. We were looking at the
20 possibility of perhaps making a private sector
21 member an associate member, and we have a lady
22 in Philadelphia -- what's her name, Tracey? I'm

1 sorry.

2 SPEAKER: Stacey Irving.

3 MR. STENSGAR: Stacey Irving

4 represents --

5 SPEAKER: Center City District.

6 MR. STENSGAR: Center City District.

7 And she's been to a couple of our meetings and
8 given out briefings. But it is something that I
9 think is important to include within this group.

10 We're still wrestling with the idea
11 of how to integrate private sector -- I've
12 tasked Tracey's boss, my federal preparedness
13 coordinator, Pat Twist, with establishing or
14 putting together sort of a summit -- a
15 private sector summit to sort of bring in
16 some folks from the private sector and the
17 emergency management community to start
18 talking about how we're going to do that.

19 I know some of our states are
20 further ahead than others. Like, for
21 example, down in Virginia -- Virginia has a
22 table in their EOC just for the big box

1 stores -- the Lowes and the Home Depots and
2 those kinds of things. So what I'd like to
3 do is bring our states together and start
4 sharing best practices and see how we can
5 further integrate those folks into what we do
6 on the government side of the house.

7 MR. KMET: You're still bitter because
8 I took your seat last night; right?

9 Jonathan, the question that I
10 had -- I actually started off -- I'm sorry,
11 Chuck Kmet with the Tohono O'oodhan Nation.
12 I started off my career in Virginia. I spent
13 eight years there and know that the region is
14 pretty heavy with volunteers for fire and
15 EMS, in particular, obviously. Do you see
16 challenges and/or do you see some best
17 practices that come out of those volunteer
18 areas in your region in particular, both for
19 the response part, but also for community
20 preparedness?

21 MR. STENSGAR: Absolutely. We have
22 within the region -- all of our states are very

1 active in citizen CORE and CERT programs. And
2 there's a plethora of examples of that. And
3 we're continuing to try to promote that, because
4 I think volunteers are a key part of the
5 equation.

6 Again, getting back to my Coast
7 Guard Days, we had a group of folks called
8 the Coast Guard Auxiliary which were
9 volunteers, and they worked for us in a
10 variety of things, whether it was sitting at
11 the front desk or going out on the water
12 doing patrols for us. And I really
13 appreciate what they bring to the table.

14 We're using this opportunity within
15 the RAC to try to continue to promote that
16 and promote citizen preparedness to try to
17 get families more prepared to deal with
18 disasters -- as the chief was talking about
19 this morning -- and also get them more
20 involved with the professionals in supporting
21 them to do their job.

22 MR. BRUNO: Hi, John. Joe Bruno from

1 New York City. How you doing?

2 MR. STENSGAR: Good morning.

3 MR. BRUNO: The deputy administrator
4 and the administrator of FEMA in their
5 conversations with us over the last meetings
6 that we've had -- four meetings or more -- have
7 pointed out they are attempting to move services
8 into the regions and make the regions more
9 self-sufficient. How is that working in your
10 region? In other words, for example, are they
11 putting planners out there, logistics experts,
12 where you're doing and relating directly to your
13 area through the region rather than through
14 headquarters?

15 MR. STENSGAR: Yeah, absolutely.
16 Actually, that's been a large part of what I've
17 been doing for the last seven or eight months.
18 We're hiring like crazy. In Fiscal Year '08
19 we've hired 24 Folks, and I've got 41 more folks
20 to hire this year, including these CORE
21 positions that Pauline talked about. We're
22 hiring them in the national preparedness area,

1 which includes exercise and training folks,
2 planning folks. In fact, we just hired three
3 this week. Yesterday being the most recent
4 hire, or selected -- they still have to go
5 through the hiring or finish the hiring process.

6 We've also stood up -- as I
7 mentioned, we stood up our operational piece
8 of our ROCC. We've hired now three watch
9 standers so that we can operate 12 by 7.
10 Along with that, we're hiring operational
11 planners that will actually do the actual
12 tactical development -- development of
13 tactical plans. I've got one onboard. I've
14 got two more I've got to hire.

15 And just to give an example of some
16 of the planning that they did that we weren't
17 able to do in the past is we had the National
18 Governors Association meeting in
19 Philadelphia. And as a result of having
20 those additional planners, we were able to
21 start -- actually planned with the
22 Pennsylvania State Police, as well as the

1 Philadelphia Police, and actually put people
2 in the JOC.

3 I think it was ATF JOC. We didn't
4 have the people to do that before, so we're
5 not just now -- in the past, we would just
6 show up sort of after the incident. Now
7 we're planning and integrating ourselves into
8 that so that they know who we are when we
9 show up and we have a plan on how we're going
10 to deal with law enforcement issues, as well
11 as the emergency management side of it.

12 So I would say that all the things
13 that the chief and the admiral tell you are
14 true. We're getting people like crazy. In
15 fact, we're going to be outgrowing our
16 facility. We're looking to move in 2009, and
17 Bob is helping us to do that. Right, Bob?

18 Thanks for letting me get that plug
19 in. But, no, it's all good.

20 MR. BRUNO: Thank you.

21 MR. STENSGAR: It's all good.

22 MR. BRUNO: Thank you.

1 MR. STENSGAR: Yes?

2 MS. CATLETT: As long as you're on the
3 topic of hiring, I sit on the Special Needs
4 subcommittee, and one thing we're going to be
5 advocating for is regionalization of the special
6 needs -- the disability coordination. So I was
7 wondering what your opinion of adding a position
8 like that to your regional office, if you would
9 find that a valuable asset?

10 MR. STENSGAR: Certainly. I think
11 that's one of our biggest concerns, not only in
12 the preparedness issue, but dealing with folks
13 with special medical needs in a disaster. And
14 one of our biggest concerns in Region III is the
15 Hampton Roads area, and how we're going to
16 evacuate that area. There's a new Army Corps
17 study that's going to be finalized here shortly
18 that's going to show that that particular area
19 is going to have greater inundation than was
20 suspected because of some new studies and new
21 techniques -- and there's a lot of hospitals
22 there. There's a lot of nursing homes. There's

1 a lot of assisted care facilities. And we've
2 had an ongoing working group with federal,
3 state, and local folks and the private sector in
4 dealing with those issues -- each group has
5 their own process of how they're going to deal
6 with it. And it wasn't very well-coordinated.
7 So it's a big issue.

8 It would certainly help to have
9 someone with the skill sets -- that kind of
10 ingenuities would bring to help us to address
11 those issues. Because there are some things,
12 as you well know, that are unique to that
13 community that we're not always aware of.

14 DR. BENNETT: Any additional
15 questions?

16 MR. STENSGAR: Thank you again for the
17 opportunity to come and talk to you today. I
18 appreciate it very much.

19 DR. BENNETT: I appreciate it, John.
20 Thank you so much.

21 We're going to go ahead -- I'm
22 going to adjust the agenda here a little bit.

1 We do have Chief Endikrat with us today from
2 the City of Philadelphia, on the National
3 Urban Search and Rescue presentation. And he
4 has graciously consented to come a little
5 early. And we'll do that, and then we should
6 be close to our break time by then. We'll
7 see. But if not, we'll go ahead with some of
8 our subcommittees. So we're moving along.

9 So Chief, we welcome you.

10 There should be two handouts. Has
11 everybody received those?

12 CHIEF ENDIKRAT: Dr. Bennett?

13 DR. BENNETT: Okay, Chief.

14 CHIEF ENDIKRAT: Good morning. I'd
15 like to thank the Chair, Dr. Bennett, and the
16 distinguished members of the Advisory Council
17 for the opportunity today to speak on behalf of
18 the National Urban Search and Rescue Response
19 System.

20 Chief Carr extends his apologies.

21 He had a last-minute scheduling conflict.

22 Chief Carr is the sponsoring agency chief for

1 Maryland Task Force I, chief of Montgomery
2 County Fire and Rescue, and he was going to
3 be here to represent the sponsoring agency
4 chiefs in the executive side of this
5 discussion.

6 Again, I'm here today to speak, and
7 I have the privilege to speak for the 6,000
8 members of the Federal Urban Search and
9 Rescue Response System. As Dr. Bennett
10 mentioned, you should have two documents in
11 front of you. The first one I'd ask you to
12 reference is a reference document that kind
13 of gives an overview and summarizes pertinent
14 background information on the federal US&R
15 system.

16 I know that many of you are
17 familiar with the system, and how it was
18 originally chartered, and what we've done.
19 And I know that some of you are not so -- if
20 you would allow me, I'll just go over a quick
21 background summary of that. And you can
22 follow along in the text if you so desire.

1 1990, in the federal government
2 response to the disasters of Hurricane Hugo
3 and the Loma Prieta earthquake, we realized
4 we had some gaps in the federal system on how
5 we respond. And Congress at that point in
6 time tasked FEMA to develop a national
7 civilian urban search and rescue capability.
8 And to this day, FEMA is still the primary
9 agency that deals with urban search and
10 rescue, and search and rescue on a broader
11 scale, since the reorganization of the
12 National Response Framework. And that's
13 under Emergency Support Function 9.

14 The primary purpose of the system
15 is to provide a nationwide network of heavy
16 search and rescue teams. And that's on the
17 civilian side. The teams can be rapidly
18 deployed to disaster incidents.

19 They're established at the local
20 jurisdiction level, and they are federalized
21 and deployed by FEMA as needed for nationwide
22 response. They provide an organized system

1 of resources to locate, extricate, provide
2 immediate medical treatment to victims
3 trapped in collapsed structures and to
4 conduct other lifesaving operations.

5 Currently, there are 28 FEMA US&R
6 task forces. They're the fundamental
7 operational or tactical units that respond
8 for the nation. They're strategically
9 located throughout the country.

10 If you would refer to page 3 of the
11 handout, there's a graphic there that
12 illustrates the locations of the 28 task
13 forces, and also the corresponding
14 relationship they have with the 10 FEMA
15 regions.

16 Just as a note, and as you look at
17 the sponsoring agencies and their
18 designations on that handout on the third
19 page, you'll see that the majority are
20 sponsored by state or local government
21 jurisdictions. They deploy with technical
22 specialists who are divided into management

1 and operational elements. Again, you can
2 look at that chart and see that a significant
3 number of the sponsoring agencies are
4 municipal fire departments, and firefighters
5 comprise the largest percentage of rostered
6 members within the system.

7 The system also provides an
8 overhead management capability for field
9 operations known as the Incident Support
10 Team, or the IST. If you would turn to the
11 top of the fourth page of the referenced
12 document, there's an overview of the IST.
13 And kind of just a quick summary of what the
14 Incident Support Teams do, and how they're
15 structured, and what they bring to bear when
16 they engage with state and local resources.

17 The fifth page of the referenced
18 document provides a current overview of the
19 system, and that's more of a narrative. It
20 speaks to the essential role that our system
21 has played in the federal response to the
22 terrorist attacks in Oklahoma City, the

1 Pentagon, the World Trade Center, and
2 specifically speaks to the response to the
3 Louisiana and Mississippi theatres of
4 operation during Hurricanes Katrina and Rita,
5 and the rescue of almost 6600 civilians by
6 federal US&R task forces.

7 Consistent with the new FEMA, it
8 also speaks to the foundation of an
9 all-hazard preparedness and response that our
10 system is built on, and it references
11 operational accomplishments and best
12 practices, administrative and training
13 initiatives with state and local US&R assets.

14 If you would go to the chart on
15 page 7 following right behind that narrative
16 two pages there, in the reference document,
17 that summarizes the event response history of
18 the federal US&R system. Just to give you a
19 point of reference, from the system's
20 inception after Congress tasked FEMA with
21 this, to most recently last month.

22 To give you a point of reference, I

1 wanted to put some slides on, and this was
2 done at the suggestion of Mr. Shea, just to
3 give you an overview of the types of
4 responses and the level of engagement that
5 the federal US&R task forces are involved
6 with. This is an aerial shot from a section
7 of the Mississippi theatre of operations from
8 Hurricane Katrina. I had the honor of
9 serving as the operations chief for that, and
10 I will tell you that there were 11 federal
11 task forces deployed, while simultaneously
12 the rest of the federal task forces were
13 deployed to New Orleans.

14 But we basically were tasked with
15 the search and rescue operations for a 1000
16 square mile area. And the system, as federal
17 task forces come into place and as the
18 Incident Support Team begins to engage with
19 state and local officials, the goal is that
20 there is a seamless transition in tactical
21 operations.

22 To give you an idea of some of the

1 technology the task forces currently have and
2 have been really at the forefront of
3 developing for the fire service across the
4 nation, this is a search operation conducted
5 by Utah Task Force 1 on the western side of
6 the operations at Hurricane Katrina in
7 Mississippi.

8 And what you see before you is a
9 2-1/2 story wood frame structure that has
10 been previously searched by our
11 reconnaissance elements and some search
12 markings. And I'll quickly go through these.
13 But you basically see the engagement of a
14 rescue squad gaining access or making access
15 for technical search equipment. And in this
16 case, that's search cameras.

17 You can see the member on the left
18 has the camera getting ready to go into
19 service. The camera goes down into that
20 voided space that has been expanded by the
21 rescue operations team. And there's a
22 small -- almost like a small television

1 screen that transmits video image back to the
2 operator. And as they work through there,
3 the search camera eventually comes across a
4 victim and how he's been -- and you can see
5 that his watch is there, and the time the
6 watch stopped, and the time of the incident.

7 But the reason I put this in is to
8 give you an illustration of some of the
9 technology that the federal task forces bring
10 to bear. And also some of the science and
11 technology interface we had with that
12 directorate within FEMA of where we're trying
13 to go.

14 And one of our overall goals that
15 I'll get into at the end of this is our
16 desire to bring this information and
17 technology down to the lowest level.

18 So local responders eventually
19 train with the same doctrine, the same
20 equipment, the same policies and operational
21 procedures, so we can do the most good for
22 the greatest number of people.

1 The Trade Center, certainly an
2 extreme example of our engagement. As
3 Mr. Bruno, knows the City of New York
4 initially requested eight federal task forces
5 and an Incident Support Team. And again, as
6 robust as emergency operations capabilities
7 are in New York City, this is not the type of
8 incident that any city or any municipality or
9 any state can do alone. And that's the whole
10 purpose of the fourth tier or our level of
11 response with the federal US&R program.

12 Again, to give you an idea of the
13 level of training and some of the
14 capabilities, this is a shot -- it happens to
15 be from Pennsylvania Task Force 1, but one of
16 our search canine that was put in that basket
17 and sent on a rope pylon system 110 foot from
18 the base of the North Tower to the top of the
19 North Tower, the debris there. And that
20 animal ended up finding seven New York City
21 firefighters that were buried in that
22 collapse.

1 So again, this is not the type of
2 resource that exists in any significant
3 amount at the local level. And certainly our
4 first response and engagement in the world of
5 terrorism, and the system primarily as I
6 mentioned to you before was set up with the
7 idea that we were going to be responding to
8 earthquakes and natural disasters. And
9 Oklahoma City was our first foray into
10 terrorism and terrorism response.

11 Again, if you can see that picture
12 in the center there, those are two members of
13 California Task Force 3 who are firefighters
14 in their everyday life that become
15 federalized and become rescue specialists on
16 the task force. But they are sent down by
17 rope system to secure that hanging slab. So
18 underneath that, shoring operations and
19 search operations are able to continue with a
20 little bit more of a degree of safety for the
21 members operating under there.

22 They're using coring tools and

1 power-actuated fastening devices to secure
2 that overhanging slab.

3 If you would take a look at the
4 last page of the reference document, there's
5 a funding history of the system. And it
6 illustrates the long-term commitment of the
7 agency of FEMA and the sponsoring agencies
8 over the past 17 years. In effect, the
9 nation's got a ready-reserve force of nearly
10 6000 highly trained rescue specialists
11 capable of immediate response to any type of
12 incident with an annual current cost to the
13 federal government of approximately \$6,000
14 per member. And we believe, and the agency
15 believes, that this is an outstanding example
16 of cost-effective cooperation between all
17 levels of government.

18 In 2008, a significant financial
19 commitment on the part of the agency is
20 demonstrated not only by the number amount or
21 the dollar amount that you saw on the last
22 page there, but by the significant commitment

1 from a staff of full-time employees. And I
2 believe with contractors now, the program
3 office is about approximately 20 full-time
4 employees. And there's also a dedicated
5 appropriate budget that comes from the Office
6 of Management and Budget, and then eventually
7 works its way through the Senate and House
8 Appropriations.

9 On the local side, there's also a
10 significant financial commitment. And that
11 is demonstrated by the sponsoring
12 agencies -- those 28 sponsoring agencies that
13 absorb many of the costs associated with
14 keeping the task force ready to respond on a
15 day-to-day basis. And when I mean ready to
16 respond, I mean on the federal side. The
17 estimate currently is about \$700,000 each per
18 year in support of this system for each task
19 force.

20 The advisory committee -- and
21 that's the reason I'm here today at
22 Dr. Bennett's request, to talk to you about a

1 little bit of historical perspective -- the
2 advisory committee that was in place before
3 for the Federal Urban Search and Rescue
4 Response System was a standalone committee.
5 It was solely focused on national urban
6 search and rescue response. And because of a
7 number of different reasons, that committee
8 has not been rechartered.

9 Sponsoring agency chiefs have been
10 looking at a way to re-engage with the agency
11 at their level based on their long-term
12 commitment. And you can see the composition
13 previously had sponsoring agency chiefs,
14 technical experts, labor officials, local
15 emergency management officials, state
16 officials, as well as representatives from
17 the agency.

18 As I mentioned to you, the system
19 has been functioning for approximately five
20 years now without an advisory committee. And
21 the purpose of the advisory committee was to
22 bring the diverse views of all levels of the

1 stakeholders, and get the input that we
2 needed to make strategic recommendations to
3 the agency to make sure that the system
4 continued to move forward and be able to
5 serve the public.

6 Certainly, the sponsoring agencies
7 want to continue this strong partnership.
8 And as we begin to engage in discussion at
9 our level, there's no real way to connect
10 with the agency on a formal level as far as
11 the voice of those 28 sponsoring agencies.

12 Dr. Bennett is one of those
13 sponsoring agency executives. There are a
14 number of significant strategic issues at
15 hand, and I'll just highlight those real
16 quickly and go through those. One of the
17 gaps we have in the national response
18 framework, and I'm sure that this high-level
19 body will be addressing this at some
20 point -- the response to terrorism and WMD
21 incidents.

22 If you look at the federal

1 compendium of WMD resources that the
2 government has put together, the federal US&R
3 system is by far the largest in terms of
4 people and resources that we can send to an
5 event of this type. I know we're not going
6 to talk tactical things here, but just to let
7 you know, we're working on this. We have
8 been working on this for many years,
9 especially since 9/11. But we have some big
10 gaps. How we interact with the military, how
11 we interact with other federal agencies in
12 this critical area, is going to set the tone
13 for how new FEMA is perceived when we respond
14 to one of these events.

15 We would also like to explore the
16 linkages between national, state, and local
17 use of our assets. As most of you know,
18 there are some parallel funding streams going
19 on here through urban area security
20 initiative grants and state homeland security
21 grants -- states have been developing their
22 own resources. Sometimes very robust state

1 systems have come out of that funding, but
2 there's really no linkage. And I know that
3 the agency has begun to discuss that to try
4 to get -- again, the most comprehensive,
5 effective response framework when it comes to
6 our specific world of urban search and
7 rescue, and how we interact with state and
8 local government.

9 We also would like to continue the
10 development of the national US&R system
11 within the confines of the new national
12 response framework. And we know that that's
13 a work in progress, but we want to make sure
14 that our system is tied into that at the
15 strategic level.

16 I know you have a subgroup on NIMS
17 and ICS, and again, we're concerned with how
18 our units -- how our tactical elements, as
19 well as our strategic planning ties into the
20 agency's vision of what that's going to be
21 for disaster operations.

22 US&R resource typing and disaster

1 site management is similar to where we're
2 trying to go and establish that linkage with
3 state and local US&R assets. We're trying
4 also to go in that direction here. The
5 exploration of linkages between US&R assets
6 in relation to response to water operations,
7 many of you from the emergency management
8 side of the house understand that this is
9 probably one of our most vulnerable areas.

10 We certainly have more people
11 killed in this country in water emergencies
12 than we do of any other natural type. And
13 again, we don't have a clear linkage or a
14 strategic view of where we're going to go
15 with US&R and how we tie in with state and
16 local government.

17 The new relationship between the
18 US&R system and the newly legislated FEMA
19 incident management assistance team, again,
20 how the public will perceive how we perform
21 is tied directly to strategically how we work
22 and operate, and whatever doctrine that we

1 develop with the new IMAT teams.

2 We also want to ensure continuity
3 of operations and continued development of
4 the national US&R system doctrine and
5 capabilities during the transition that Chief
6 Paulison mentioned. We want to make sure
7 that we are ready and working along the same
8 goals as the new administration is going to
9 put forth at the agency.

10 The last point we'd like to make is
11 that leveraging local and national US&R
12 experience of the sponsoring agencies will
13 bring a diverse balance of viewpoints for
14 strategic issues. And I'd just like to
15 summarize this by telling you humbly that I'm
16 here requesting guidance.

17 We weren't sure exactly the
18 structure of the NAC. We got some
19 information from Mr. Shea and Dr. Bennett.
20 And we didn't want to suggest a certain type
21 of functional organization on how we might
22 plug in. But I would like to just say to you

1 that we're requesting guidance on how we
2 might be able to ensure a voice and active
3 participation in the strategic recommendation
4 process.

5 It's extremely important to the
6 chiefs and the executives whose agencies
7 sponsor FEMA task forces.

8 Administrator Paulison and Division
9 for a New FEMA speak to a shared
10 responsibility approach for emergency
11 management. The cornerstone of this shared
12 responsibility is partnerships between
13 federal, state, and local government.

14 This voice for the chiefs and the
15 executives will ensure a strong federal urban
16 search and rescue response capability that
17 corresponds to the agency's overarching goals
18 with measurable benefits through all tiers of
19 emergency response. So that's the stuff that
20 I spoke about before that will eventually
21 find its way to state US&R teams and local
22 responders to effectively be able to deliver

1 the service to the citizens.

2 So I thank you for your time, and
3 we look forward to your guidance on how we
4 might engage strategically.

5 DR. BENNETT: Joe?

6 MR. BRUNO: Chief, Joe Bruno from New
7 York City. How you doing?

8 CHIEF ENDIKRAT: Mr. Bruno.

9 MR. BRUNO: You know, we sponsor New
10 York Task Force 1 out of OEM, and it is a big
11 commitment from our side as well.

12 The one thing I have no hesitation
13 about saying is that the US&R program as a
14 response capability is a tremendous program.
15 I don't think you're coming here saying you
16 need to build that program. That's a great
17 program. It's well-schooled. It's
18 well-trained. It's got the best people, for
19 example, in New York. The very best. The
20 most elite people we have in PD and Fire are
21 the people who work in that. So we have a
22 terrific group. I'm sure it's the same with

1 you.

2 Is the question really you're
3 looking for from the NAC is -- that you feel
4 a lack of connection to FEMA? As well
5 as -- you made other points as well -- is
6 that one of the issues that you have now,
7 because there's a loss of the advisory
8 committee, no contact, that you don't feel
9 you have a voice? Is that what you're
10 looking to do?

11 CHIEF ENDIKRAT: I could answer that
12 two ways, Mr. Bruno. And I wish Chief Carr was
13 here, because I'm sure he could speak with some
14 authority for the sponsoring chiefs.

15 MR. BRUNO: I think you've done very
16 well.

17 CHIEF ENDIKRAT: Well, thank you. I
18 think that there is a connection and there is
19 dialogue. With the position I have as a
20 national task force leader's representative,
21 certainly I'm down here a lot at that level.

22 But I think what's lacking, in

1 direct answer to your question, is the
2 strategic level -- the sponsoring agency
3 chiefs, the one like yourself and
4 Dr. Bennett -- who make the commitment for
5 people and who send them out as federalized
6 assets, that's what's been lacking. The
7 chiefs have no role and no voice since the
8 unchartering of the advisory committee.

9 MR. BRUNO: Thank you.

10 DR. BENNETT: Any other questions?

11 Nancy.

12 MS. DRAGANI: When I look at the
13 funding chart, with the exception of '03 and '04
14 and the blip there of 60 million, it looks like
15 it's stabilized at about 30 million. Is that
16 your sense for direction forward, that we
17 stabilize now and the system can look forward to
18 an inject of about 30 million per year?

19 CHIEF ENDIKRAT: A few sides to that,
20 Nancy. The Office of Management and Budget
21 historically in years past would come out with a
22 recommendation of 7.5 million. Bob, I think

1 you're pretty familiar with that. That in the
2 last three years has changed. Between 20 and
3 25 million is the recommendation from OMB.
4 Congress and the Senate Appropriations
5 Committees have looked at the program in detail,
6 and they've recommended more. So right now,
7 it's not really a dedicated funded line item.
8 It's almost negotiated every year. You can see
9 actually the year after Katrina, it went down
10 \$5 million. While all of our task forces were
11 engaged the funding actually was reduced by
12 5 million, which caused us some concern.

13 But 25 to 30 million seems to be
14 where we're at right now. The agency did a
15 study, I believe in '04, looking through the
16 true costs of administering this program and
17 trying to take some of that burden off the
18 local sponsoring agencies, the number was
19 more like 52 million. So you know, we're
20 certainly grateful for 32.5 million last
21 year. But again, that year to year does
22 shift. But somewhere in that ballpark is an

1 accurate cost estimate.

2 Sir?

3 MR. BECKER: Maybe a question for Bob.

4 Could you please describe how FEMA is set up
5 with the professional staff to support this
6 work? Where does this report and who leads it?

7 MR. SHEA: Actually, let me ask Fred
8 to do that, because I think he has a working
9 knowledge of exactly how you interact with them.
10 Then I'll add a sentence or two if necessary.

11 CHIEF ENDIKRAT: Sir, in the past, the
12 program office staff was roughly around six or
13 seven people. And I think as the funding
14 increased, certainly after terrorist attacks.
15 And as Nancy mentioned, that spike in funding
16 gave our task forces a one-time infusion for
17 weapons of mass destruction capability response.
18 As more money came and more accountability came
19 with that money, the program office realized
20 that they didn't have adequate staffing.

21 And they did a business case and
22 over the past two years, they've hired

1 full-time employees and contractors up to
2 about 20. So they all have assigned roles
3 and responsibilities on different sections of
4 the program. They help the 28 task forces
5 manage, but it's still a work in progress,
6 but it's been getting better.

7 MR. SHEA: The only other thing, Joe,
8 I would add to that is that typically the role
9 of the FEMA staff is to work with the teams on a
10 daily basis -- operational, tactical
11 issues -- but it's also to decide when to
12 federalize them. So in other words, we asked
13 for that and work through issues, and then work
14 with the community to decide who to dispatch to
15 events.

16 DR. BENNETT: Nancy?

17 MS. DRAGANI: I'll let Susy go first.

18 DR. BENNETT: Okay.

19 MS. TORRIENTE: How long has the group
20 been without an advisory board?

21 CHIEF ENDIKRAT: It was recharted
22 shortly after the 2001 attack, Susy, and then it

1 sunsetted again. It was pretty much -- I
2 believe, Bob, you could correct me if I'm
3 wrong -- it was an annual renewal and it was
4 rechartered every year. And there were some
5 changes, I guess, in philosophy at the higher
6 levels of DHS and FEMA as they looked at the
7 whole Federal Advisory Commission Act and how we
8 would possibly engage. And I think they thought
9 that maybe it was too narrow a focus. It was
10 just urban search and rescue. So it's been the
11 last four or five years. We've had some starts,
12 but it really hasn't been seated in about that
13 time.

14 MS. TORRIENTE: Thank you. And then
15 to Dr. Bennett, at the right time, I'd just like
16 your thoughts as to should we have a role as a
17 group, especially during the transition? You
18 know, what are our options, let's say, in terms
19 of assisting, if at all.

20 DR. BENNETT: That's a very good
21 question. I think if you recall back to -- I
22 believe it was our first meeting that we had of

1 the Council, where we were trying to determine
2 what were the issues we needed to look at and
3 form subcommittees and so forth, and how we were
4 going to organize ourselves -- FEMA did come
5 before us recommending that we look at forming a
6 subcommittee to look at the US&R issue and have
7 a voice forward.

8 I think it kind of got lost at the
9 time because we were on the other issues, and
10 then what I heard the Administrator say this
11 morning again is he wants us as a committee
12 to look at this. I think FEMA is looking for
13 a how do they interact? They don't have
14 subcommittees or committees of different
15 groups all over the place, and they're trying
16 to look at how that can that interface into
17 our group as a NAC.

18 And so I think options are to form
19 a subcommittee if there's interest in that,
20 to work on these issues and have a voice for
21 interfacing with FEMA. Not in the day-to-day
22 operations, but on the strategic level and

1 the kind of issues we do. Another one is to
2 perhaps look at forming a working group to
3 flush out which directions we may wish to go
4 if it's not the subcommittee. But I think
5 those are the type of options before us.

6 But right now, I believe we do need
7 to take some kind of action and some kind of
8 interaction. This is an extremely critical
9 group of service to this country, and we're
10 not talking about people who are on the
11 payroll at FEMA. These are professionals, as
12 many of you have been involved in these
13 teams, that need a high-level voice and need
14 to be able to make sure that those important
15 issues are brought and have advocates. And I
16 think the NAC -- I keep doing that -- serve
17 in that capacity, and it's a personal
18 opinion.

19 MR. BRUNO: Kem, it would seem to me
20 that -- I'm familiar with the arguments that
21 have been made -- that our job here at the NAC
22 is to advise FEMA.

1 I'm not so sure that we need to
2 have a subcommittee. What I think we need to
3 do is see how best we can assist this group
4 in this very important program to reconnect
5 in a way which they will advise. There are a
6 number of things -- obviously they had a
7 subcommittee that had an advisory committee.
8 That may not have been sufficient. I don't
9 know. I think it may have been deficient in
10 certain ways -- in connecting with sponsoring
11 agencies, for example.

12 My view would be -- at least I
13 heard Dave Paulison say he'd like us to look
14 at this -- some type of working group that
15 takes a look at this and gives FEMA some
16 advice on what we think should be their
17 permanent connection to the US&R program.
18 They have a connection already. They have
19 staff. But I think we would look for FEMA to
20 connect with other entities involved and
21 create a mechanism by which either the NAC,
22 if it's ultimately going to be, or some other

1 similar group that existed previous to the
2 advisory committee, that can start relating
3 back to the sponsoring agencies, to FEMA, and
4 the other agencies involved so that there's a
5 connection. It looks like the connection has
6 been lost. Maybe we can help FEMA reconnect.

7 MS. EIDE: Cathey Eide. I'm very
8 familiar with the US&R program, so I would like
9 to volunteer to assist in any way I can to come
10 up with ideas, whether it be to develop
11 subcommittees or a working group. So I would
12 like to help with the effort in any way I can.

13 DR. BENNETT: Kurt?

14 MR. KRUMPERMAN: I just want to make
15 an observation. I think this is an issue. I'm
16 working with an advisory committee with HHS
17 related to NDMS and the DMATs. And there seems
18 to be a similar issue in that how does it fit
19 into the overall -- at the strategic level, how
20 does it fit into the overall response plan that
21 we have in the national response framework? And
22 so I think there's a similar -- I'm just

1 observing that there's a similar issue for US&R
2 as there is for NDMS, in my opinion.

3 So I just wanted to put that in
4 context -- that there are these things that
5 we've created over the last few years that
6 we're struggling with how does it all fit in.
7 So I wouldn't want necessarily for us to just
8 look at this in isolation. Perhaps there's a
9 larger problem at hand. I think that's the
10 role of the advisory committee here, is to
11 sort of look at things at that level and
12 provide advice.

13 DR. BENNETT: Good point. Chief?

14 MS. HAYES-WHITE: Yes, I'd like to
15 say, first of all, Chief, thank you for your
16 presentation. And I'd also like to participate
17 in whatever we deem is appropriate, probably not
18 a subcommittee, but a work group. San Francisco
19 does not have a US&R team, but our neighbors in
20 the Bay area, Oakland and Menlo Park, do. My
21 observation is, like Mr. Bruno said, the elite
22 and very dedicated committed groups of people,

1 but I do hear very clearly, and I would concur,
2 that there is a huge lack of coordination at the
3 highest levels, or support for these teams. And
4 so whatever we can do to assist with linking
5 that back in I think is important, and I'm happy
6 to participate in.

7 MR. BRUNO: Kem, could I just add one
8 thing to that. I'm sorry, Bob. A few years
9 back when the funding was problematic, we were
10 actually in New York -- and all the teams
11 were -- wondering would there be funding? How
12 much could it be? How much would it be cut? It
13 was very erratic, and that is a real problem
14 when you're supporting a very sophisticated
15 group of people with lots of equipment, lots of
16 capability, and you're not sure whether you're
17 going to be able to fund programs.

18 So that is one of the key issues
19 that they had had. They needed a steady
20 stream, and I think Nancy pointed out it
21 looks like it's kind of settled now around
22 30 million, and that may not be enough. I

1 don't think they think it's enough, but
2 whatever.

3 I don't think we're capable of
4 making that decision. But we certainly need
5 to have that regularized. And the kind of
6 interface with FEMA through the sponsoring
7 organizations as well, along with the
8 response groups that make up the US&R teams,
9 will probably help to stabilize that or give
10 these guys a better chance to understand what
11 they're going to be able to work with.

12 So I think those are very important
13 areas that we can help out with. There is a
14 bigger issue, sure. There are lots of other
15 teams out there. This is a real standalone
16 program -- I think quite different than IMATs
17 and other teams that are put out there. I
18 would suggest we look at US&R separately and
19 find the lessons learned in our relationship
20 here in the study of this to try to fix other
21 things as well, rather than take on too many
22 areas.

1 MR. PATURAS: Jim Paturas. Chief --

2 MR. BRUNO: It's your birthday, and I
3 apologize for --

4 DR. BENNETT: We're going to Jim now.

5 MR. PATURAS: Chief, excellent
6 presentation. Excellent program. I don't think
7 anybody has any question about that. I'd like
8 to echo some of Commissioner Bruno's comments.
9 I think the working group would be a good start.
10 Who knows how that will develop into maybe a
11 subcommittee at some point down the road.

12 Where I would take a little bit of
13 difference is I think primarily, it should
14 focus on the US&R activities, but I do agree
15 with Kurt that since there are a lot of other
16 response teams in different capacities, it
17 would be wise for the work group to at least
18 have some initial orientation to some of
19 those so that we don't lose sight that we've
20 got a lot of different groups in the country
21 doing volunteer work in response capacities.

22 And it would be nice at some point

1 to see some collaboration and integration at
2 a strategic level. I mean, clearly it's
3 happening on the ground in different
4 instances.

5 So while it should primarily focus
6 for the efforts of US&R, I think we would be
7 remiss if we didn't at least consider those
8 other opportunities of teams that are out
9 there also. And at least see how they fit
10 within the bigger picture.

11 DR. BENNETT: Rob, would you like to
12 comment?

13 MR. GOUGELET: Thank you, Chief. I'd
14 like to ask the question, did you actually get a
15 chance to review the NRF and NIMS documents that
16 came from this group?

17 CHIEF ENDIKRAT: No, I didn't. I will
18 just say not in detail. That came specifically
19 from the NAC?

20 MR. GOUGELET: Right, specifically
21 from the subcommittees.

22 CHIEF ENDIKRAT: No.

1 MR. GOUGELET: So I think I'm
2 certainly in favor of a work group, and I think
3 most of us are. Whether that's a transition to
4 a subcommittee or continues to be a work group,
5 but I think the important thing is that you get
6 involved in the workings of what's going on at
7 some of the subcommittees.

8 And so the other confusion I have
9 is, we talked about, I believe two work
10 groups. One to consider what to do, and then
11 whether there should be just the US&R work
12 group. And I think functionally, just a
13 standalone US&R work group might be helpful
14 to get things going, and then each of the
15 chairs appreciate the input that you would
16 have on the work that they're doing.

17 CHIEF ENDIKRAT: Thank you. Angela?

18 MS. ELGIN: Angela Elgin. Thank you,
19 Chief, for your presentation today. I'm very
20 familiar with the US&R group. I'm from St.
21 Louis, a battalion chief from St. Louis, so very
22 familiar with Missouri Task Force I. And I

1 would want to just say for the record,
2 Dr. Bennett, anything that I can do to assist
3 with either a work group or a subcommittee -- I
4 think it's very important that at least they can
5 at least starting hearing, and maybe look at a
6 broader picture of if there's any other issues
7 with groups such as US&R and other groups that
8 are deployed by FEMA. If there's other issues
9 there, maybe we should also explore those as
10 well.

11 CHIEF ENDIKRAT: Thank you, Chief.

12 DR. BENNETT: Any final comments here?

13 Nancy.

14 MS. DRAGANI: I guess just now to echo
15 something Rob said. It sounds like there's a
16 fair amount of consensus that we need to at
17 least look at a work group to figure out
18 movement forward. So how do we make that
19 happen, I guess?

20 DR. BENNETT: I think what I would
21 like to do would be to have it in the form of a
22 motion that we form a US&R working group. And

1 I'll need to establish a chair and members. So
2 I've heard lots of volunteers, which is good.
3 So I think we will have an active committee. So
4 if I could have a motion that we form a working
5 group to review the US&R -- I'm not sure exactly
6 how to do their charge. We're going to have to
7 work on the words there, but I think we do need
8 to form a working group. Kem?

9 MR. MILLER: I'll make that motion.

10 MS. ELGIN: And I'll second.

11 MS. DRAGANI: I'll second it.

12 DR. BENNETT: Chief, you did a good
13 job.

14 CHIEF ENDIKRAT: Thank you very much.

15 DR. BENNETT: We have a motion on the
16 floor, and we had several seconds. Let's give
17 credit to Angela on this one since I saw her
18 hand waving first from here. We have a motion
19 and a second that we form a US&R working group.

20 All those in favor say aye.

21 SPEAKERS: Aye.

22 DR. BENNETT: All opposed? Passes

1 unanimously. I will take in advisement who
2 would be a good -- Joe, would you be interested
3 in chairing?

4 MR. BRUNO: I would.

5 DR. BENNETT: I'll ask Joe to chair
6 the committee, and then if you can bring forward
7 some of the names -- you've heard some good
8 volunteers and there might be more. And we'll
9 get this established and running. And I would
10 suggest that we be sure on this working
11 committee we include some of the key chiefs from
12 the organizations as our subject matter experts
13 on this subcommittee with us to look at these
14 issues.

15 Susy?

16 MS. TORRIENTE: I'd like to volunteer
17 as well.

18 DR. BENNETT: Okay. Okay, Chief.

19 CHIEF ENDIKRAT: Thank you.

20 DR. BENNETT: We are at break time, so
21 why don't we break for 15 minutes, and we'll
22 come back with our subcommittee discussion.

1 Thank you very much.

2 (Recess)

3 DR. BENNETT: We're going to reconvene
4 our meeting now. If you would take your places.

5 Okay, we'll go back into session
6 now. They do have cards. I think most of
7 you may get in again for our lunch today, so
8 they'll be handing those out again. So when
9 you go -- I think we have pork and chicken
10 today. And veggies, right.

11 We're going to go in the following
12 order. We're going to do the NIMS
13 subcommittee report out first. It's been
14 conveyed to me that they need to go first.
15 And then we will follow up with Nancy, if
16 you'll be prepared to continue on with your
17 items.

18 Depending on time, we will most
19 likely be at the point where we'll break and
20 come back and do the housing, but the housing
21 may -- if we have time, we might get started
22 on some of it. But we'll see where we are at

1 that point. Maybe we can go to lunch a
2 little early or whatever.

3 But we'll start with NIMS now. So
4 Russ, you have the podium.

5 MR. DECKER: Thank you. Our report is
6 going to be fairly short and sweet, which people
7 will probably appreciate maybe. The
8 subcommittee, of course, met on Tuesday. Just
9 to refresh everyone's memory as to our charge,
10 it's to offer guidance and recommendations to
11 the administrator for revisions and
12 implementations to the National Incident
13 Management System.

14 During our committee meeting, one
15 of the things we did -- we spent a lot of
16 time actually receiving the feedback from
17 FEMA and the administrator on the five
18 recommendations that we put forward from the
19 NAC. And of course, Dennis Schrader briefed
20 the entire NAC on that yesterday. We were
21 pretty pleased, in fact, that all five
22 recommendations put forward were concurred

1 with, and that they were all accepted in one
2 form or another.

3 A question that came to us from the
4 FEMA staff -- they had some questions about
5 what type of documents and what types of
6 issues was the subcommittee interested in
7 hearing about. And we had some discussion
8 about that, and decided that certainly
9 anything that's directly tied to NIMS, the
10 NIMS subcommittee would be willing to look at
11 and provide some input in if they wanted to
12 bring it to our attention.

13 And so when you talk about NIMS,
14 it's such a big project that there are a lot
15 of things that sort of go into NIMS, but we
16 were certainly interested in looking at
17 things that directly relate to NIMS.

18 One of those being the next bullet
19 point, which is the new intelligence and
20 investigations function guide which will be
21 coming out. We'd been asked if we'd be
22 willing to take a look at that, again, and

1 give some recommendations on that new
2 document as it comes out. And we certainly
3 said that we thought that was exactly the
4 type of project that the committee should
5 continue to look at.

6 We were also briefed on a new NIMS
7 national strategy. Although the NIMS
8 document has been out for a while, there's
9 actually not been a strategy document for the
10 NIMS system and the NIMS process. And so
11 they are in the process right now of
12 drafting. It's still in the drafting phase
13 of creating a NIMS national strategy. And
14 we've asked FEMA staff to share that with the
15 subcommittee as they get into maybe a first
16 draft or second draft, so we can kind of take
17 a look at where they are heading -- where
18 they're heading with the national strategy
19 for NIMS, and maybe some input that we could
20 offer them on ways to tweak that or maybe
21 make some recommendations if we see
22 opportunities to do so.

1 On our next meeting in Dallas, it's
2 our hope that we move into the implementation
3 side of NIMS a little bit more. We want to
4 talk and get into a little bit about
5 compliance. What does it mean to be
6 NIMS-compliant. Who's setting those goals
7 about compliance. What kind of outreach
8 programs are there to assist people in
9 becoming compliant. Talk about the training
10 courses that are out there and whether
11 they're adequate -- whether we have too many
12 courses or not enough courses or who's
13 required to take what courses.

14 We want to start those types of
15 discussions and dialogues because we think
16 that is an important area.

17 And then the last thing that we
18 talked about was a connection that we think
19 to Ann's committee on the private/public
20 partnership. We've actually had some private
21 sector folks -- chemical companies and some
22 others -- that have talked about being

1 NIMS-complaint and what does that mean in the
2 private sector. And again, who's
3 establishing what does it mean for a private
4 sector company to be NIMS-compliant?

5 In my home county up in Northwest
6 Ohio, we actually had a chemical plant that
7 the U.S. EPA had mentioned in a write-up that
8 they felt that this company was
9 non-NIMS-compliant. And the plant manager
10 came to me as the local emergency manager
11 going how is this possible? I said I have no
12 idea.

13 So that's what started this
14 conversation. So we thought that this might
15 be one of those projects down the road where
16 our two subcommittees might want to meet
17 together and talk about NIMS and how it
18 relates to the private sector, and how we can
19 maybe help work through some of those types
20 of questions in the future.

21 So that's really where we are. The
22 two things that we would expect certainly to

1 work next on our plate would be this
2 intelligence and investigation function
3 guide, the NIMS national strategy, and then
4 our discussions about implementation. That's
5 kind of where we see our next course of
6 action.

7 Any questions?

8 MR. FELDMAN: Russ?

9 MR. DECKER: Lee?

10 MR. FELDMAN: Do you all -- or maybe
11 Bob would know if FEMA has any measure at this
12 point of how many local communities are -- claim
13 or are -- NIMS-compliant?

14 MR. SHEA: I don't have the exact
15 statistics in front of me, Lee, but this has
16 been in our grant guidance for a couple of years
17 now. So I think there's a fairly high level of
18 compliance out there. There's a voluntary
19 process they go through, and there's actually a
20 system set up now called NIMS Cast that helps
21 people walk through this process on a
22 step-by-step basis.

1 So the compliance level is pretty
2 high, at least in terms of that kind of a
3 measure. How well it's been tested from an
4 exercise or real world, that may be a
5 different issue. But there's a lot of
6 attention paid to it on a regular basis. Let
7 me put it that way.

8 MR. FELDMAN: Do you see sometime in
9 the future assistance being tied to whether a
10 community was NIMS-compliant or not -- financial
11 assistance or --

12 MR. SHEA: I think there's going to be
13 a linkage there. It's very difficult to take a
14 position that we would deny something to
15 somebody because they're not totally compliant.
16 I think our posture would be to do what I would
17 call aggressive technical assistance. We would
18 go in there and help them become complaint is
19 what that will result in. Our regional offices
20 would get heavily involved in that.

21 MR. FELDMAN: So nothing punitive if
22 you're not NIMS-compliant?

1 MR. SHEA: I've been doing this for a
2 little over 30 years. Punitive doesn't work.

3 MS. DRAGANI: Bob, this is Nancy.
4 Right now, the preparedness grants are tied to
5 NIMS compliance, which I think is appropriate,
6 but I think FEMA has been very careful to
7 separate response and mitigation from the
8 preparedness side of the house.

9 MR. CONNORS: Russ, with respect to
10 the private sector, I'm especially interested in
11 this part because I'm trying to promote this
12 within my company, and I know others are. Are
13 you looking for additional subcommittee
14 membership representing the private sector? Is
15 there no private sector folks on that right now?

16 MR. DECKER: If you want to get on the
17 committee, just send me an e-mail and I'll push
18 your name forward to the chairman.

19 MR. CONNORS: I'd like to talk to you
20 about that then.

21 MR. DECKER: Sure.

22 DR. BENNETT: Cathey?

1 MS. EIDE: Yes, my question is related
2 to the public sector and being NIMS-compliant.
3 I know that a lot of the public sector -- or the
4 private sector, I'm sorry -- there is funding
5 that is going to some of the private sector
6 organization, and is there any kind of NIMS
7 compliance tied with that? So if a private
8 agency accepts Homeland Security funds, are they
9 obligated to become NIMS-compliant?

10 MR. SHEA: There was a section of the
11 PKEMRA that is delving in the area of
12 preparedness and capabilities of the private
13 sector. It's not very well-defined at this
14 point, Cathey, but work is going on. I guess,
15 Ann, you could address that better than I.

16 MS. BEAUCHESNE: I guess the question
17 is what kind of funding are you talking about
18 that would be going to the private sector?

19 MS. EIDE: I know that some of the
20 funding that we're looking at, including private
21 agencies, some of our UASI funding allows for us
22 to give private agencies funding.

1 MS. BEAUCHESNE: Agencies or
2 companies?

3 MS. EIDE: Companies. Companies. And
4 so my question is, is that tied to any kind of
5 NIMS compliance?

6 MR. SHEA: I'm not aware of a
7 connection there. As a general rule, the
8 federal government almost never gives grants to
9 any kind of business. It's just sort of as an
10 underlying theme of life in the feds to never do
11 that.

12 MS. EIDE: Okay.

13 MR. SHEA: Go ahead, Susan.

14 MS. MENCER: The buffer zone
15 protection plan grants can give money to private
16 sector companies to shore up their perimeter
17 security -- lights, cameras, fencing, stuff like
18 that. UASI and the State Homeland Security
19 grant program generally is not intended for the
20 private sector. That's first responders state
21 kind of funding. So I'm not quite sure what
22 that is.

1 I just handed Bob some legislation
2 that passed in the state of Colorado this
3 year by the legislature to require that
4 schools -- every school in the state of
5 Colorado be NIMS-compliant so that they will
6 know how to respond in the time of a
7 disaster. Of course, we had Columbine in
8 Colorado, and Platt Canyon, so we're very
9 sensitive to that issue.

10 The only thing that the legislation
11 does not define is who in the schools gets
12 this training, which I think is kind of an
13 interesting gap there. But I think it's
14 something for all states to consider. I
15 think that would be a real good thing.

16 MS. EIDE: Thank you.

17 MS. DRAGANI: Cathey, I think that
18 would be a good question for Ross. Because my
19 understanding is, as the SSA for the Homeland
20 Security grants in Ohio, any subgrantee is
21 required to be NIMS-compliant now. So even if
22 you are subgranting to a private ambulance

1 company, for instance --

2 MS. EIDE: Yes, exactly.

3 MS. DRAGANI: To purchase equipment
4 because they're under contract to provide that
5 service, my understanding is they still as a
6 subgrantee have to be compliant.

7 MS. EIDE: Have to be. Okay. I'll
8 ask him.

9 MS. DRAGANI: But that's a good
10 question for Ross.

11 MS. EIDE: Okay, thank you.

12 MR. MURPHY: I'll just validate that.
13 I'm a SSA, too, and you've got to be
14 NIMS-complaint. The only money that I'm aware
15 of specifically for the private
16 sector -- there's specific grants for private
17 non-profits. And so as Sue mentioned, we have
18 the buffer zone protection, but yeah, if you
19 want the money, you've got to hit that NIMS
20 qualification.

21 DR. BENNETT: Yeah.

22 MR. KRUMPERMAN: And I guess just to

1 reiterate, I think that is true. I know I'm
2 from the ambulance sector and the ambulance
3 association, the association is that if you want
4 to participate as a subgrantee or benefit from
5 any of the grant programs, you need to be
6 NIMS-compliant. And I think some states
7 actually in the EMS world require that as well,
8 just as a general principle, that you need to be
9 NIMS-compliant just to operate in the state.

10 DR. BENNETT: Any additional comments?

11 MR. DECKER: One other comment,
12 Dr. Bennett. A note just handed to me.
13 Apparently when Dennis was here yesterday, he
14 forgot to mention, and he wanted us to mention,
15 I guess, that there is going to be a NIMS Summit
16 October 27th and 28th in Somerset, Kentucky,
17 hosted by the National Preparedness Directorate.
18 And that if anyone on the NAC is interested in
19 that summit, I guess we need to let Alyson know
20 and she can get us more information and things.

21 SPEAKER: I'm sorry, what were those
22 dates again?

1 MR. DECKER: October 27th and 28th.

2 MR. CONNORS: Just one more quick one.

3 From the private sector perspective, a place to
4 start, there's many private sector agencies that
5 have their own fire departments and police as
6 well.

7 We should be looking at them to
8 make sure they're NIMS-compliant, because if
9 they did need mutual aid, those who are
10 showing up at the scene are probably going to
11 be running -- using NIMS -- and they should
12 be talking the same languages. So I think
13 that's a place to start with the private
14 sector -- is identify those areas where they
15 have their own fire departments and whatnot,
16 and try to get them engaged right off the
17 bat.

18 DR. BENNETT: Ross, thank you very
19 much.

20 MR. DECKER: Thanks.

21 DR. BENNETT: Nancy, you have the
22 floor.

1 MS. DRAGANI: Thank you, Alyson. I
2 think that we can get through this fairly
3 quickly.

4 As everyone recalls, there were
5 three issues that we did not forward or put
6 on the table and accept a motion because we
7 needed to go back and do a little bit of work
8 on them.

9 I will start with issue one. All
10 of them were in the Individual Assistance
11 area. This was IA Issue 1. And just to
12 remind everyone, this was the issue that
13 streamlined the recertification of assistance
14 for disaster applicants. And if you look at
15 the very bottom of the screen, we added a
16 bullet that reflects that in some cases, the
17 permanent process may suffice and a
18 face-to-face visit may not be necessary.

19 And again, this was a reflection
20 that perhaps the system currently works in
21 most cases, and let's allow it to work as
22 intended, keeping face-to-face as an option

1 as needed. Any discussion? Comments?

2 Yes, Susy?

3 MS. TORRIENTE: Would that be at the
4 discretion of FEMA?

5 MS. DRAGANI: you know what? We
6 didn't address it. I think there was a question
7 about does FEMA determine whether or not the
8 face-to-face visit is necessary or does the
9 applicant? And there was some concern that if
10 the applicant determined, they might take
11 advantage.

12 MS. TORRIENTE: So you just might want
13 to leave the discretion at FEMA so that they can
14 come and go.

15 MS. DRAGANI: So that we don't -- I'm
16 sorry. Any other comments or questions?

17 MR. GOUGELET: I was just going to say
18 that we're just sending this off to FEMA for
19 them to consider the issues so we don't have to
20 get to that level of detail, because there may
21 be some administrative considerations that come
22 in. And they know the process of what goes on

1 now better than we do. So my real concern was
2 that if the victim really requests --

3 COURT REPORTER: Sir, turn your
4 microphone on.

5 MR. GOUGELET: My concern is that the
6 victim have access to face-to-face if they
7 really need it. So I think this is good as it's
8 written.

9 DR. BENNETT: Christina?

10 MS. CATLETT: I just need a little
11 background. I didn't realize that the personal
12 housing plan was going away. Now, the victim
13 does not have to show evidence that they're
14 moving forward in their housing plans?

15 MS. DRAGANI: That will be covered in
16 the face-to-face visit. And I think we
17 discussed that -- in fact, that the elimination
18 of the personal housing plan, which has proved
19 problematic, quite frankly, for most of the
20 applicants, is not necessarily a bad thing. But
21 if they eliminate it, they have to include in
22 the face-to-face discussion some discussion

1 about how are you moving to a permanent
2 solution.

3 Any other questions? Comments?

4 Okay, Dr. Bennett.

5 DR. BENNETT: I would entertain a
6 motion to adopt, if we have one.

7 MR. BECKER: So moved.

8 DR. BENNETT: Joe Becker moves that we
9 adopt -- I did it again. One, be adopted. Do I
10 have a second?

11 MR. FELDMAN: Second.

12 DR. BENNETT: Second, Lou? Second.
13 All right. All those in favor of the motion say
14 aye. All those opposed, like sign. It passes
15 unanimously to go forward.

16 MS. DRAGANI: Thank you. The next
17 issue is -- I apologize for Alyson and I. This
18 is IA Issue 2, part 2. Okay? So it says IA
19 Issue 3, but this is really IA Issue 2, and this
20 is the Individual Assistance rental repair
21 pilot. A lot of discussion about this. At the
22 end of the discussion, there seemed to be

1 consensus that the first eight bullets were
2 okay, but we needed to add some bullets that
3 reflected concern.

4 So the bullets that we added, the
5 first bullet was encouraging FEMA and HUD to
6 develop processes that ensure all properties
7 included in the pilot project adhere to
8 applicable civil rights and disability access
9 regulations. There was some concern that we
10 actually reflect that in our issues or
11 statements back to FEMA.

12 The second bullet is that
13 discussion about how do we get report
14 backs -- how does the NAC get reports
15 back -- Alyson noted when we worked offline
16 that there is already a congressionally
17 mandated pilot progress report due in March
18 of '09, so we have specifically asked that
19 the NAC receive copies of that so we can see
20 what the report back and the progress looks
21 like.

22 And then the final bullet I think

1 is the one that really addresses our concerns
2 about are we rewarding poor personal behavior
3 or poor public policy. So we're encouraging
4 FEMA-HUD to develop a mechanism -- I'm sorry,
5 I'm getting off on the transportation. I
6 apologize for that. This one was ensuring
7 that the properties are appropriately
8 insured; that they're appropriately
9 maintained if they take advantage of the
10 pilot project; and that they're available for
11 future emergency housing situations.

12 And then I thought an interesting
13 idea that came up that Joe brought up was one
14 of the ways FEMA-HUD could do that is place a
15 lien on the property commensurate with the
16 amount of repair dollars that they got to
17 ensure accountability for those activities.
18 And again, devil's in the details. That
19 would be FEMA's issue to work out. But that
20 is certainly one way that they could ensure
21 that accountability.

22 Comments? Questions? Concerns?

1 Clarification? Wow, great.

2 DR. BENNETT: Do I hear a motion to
3 adopt?

4 MR. BRUNO: I so move.

5 DR. BENNETT: Joe Bruno has moved that
6 we adopt. Do I have a second?

7 MR. STENSGAR: Second.

8 DR. BENNETT: John Stensgar seconds
9 the motion. All those in favor of the motion
10 signify by saying aye. Opposed, like sign.

11 Passes unanimously.

12 MS. DRAGANI: I want to make a note
13 just for the record that IA Issue 3, which was
14 the Individual Assistance program lessons
15 learned, there was a recommendation and it was a
16 simple language change. We made that change.
17 It was to change utility "deposits" to utility
18 "payments." And that included cable and
19 internet access. So that was done. I don't
20 have that on here but it was a fairly simple
21 change.

22 Now on to IA Issue 4. And this was

1 the transportation assistance to individuals
2 in households that were relocated by FEMA
3 during an incident of significance or a
4 catastrophic incident.

5 We had the additional subcommittee
6 discussion. This will go right up front at
7 the very beginning of our response back to
8 FEMA. And this is the discussion, that we're
9 concerned that the regulatory change will
10 create the appearance of rewarding poor
11 public policy and leadership, as well as a
12 lack of personal responsibility. Also
13 concern that by doing this, FEMA may be
14 setting a precedent for assistance that may
15 be difficult for them to manage.

16 Where do you draw the line? Is it
17 for every evacuation or just federally
18 mandated or federally supported evacuations?
19 And to that end, believe that it's critical
20 that FEMA develop very, very clear guidance
21 that determines the conditions under which
22 this assistance is provided.

1 The second then is -- second bullet
2 revises bullet No. 1 to add an example to
3 help understand what we're talking about
4 here. Examples include the mass evacuation
5 of New Orleans residents post-Hurricane
6 Katrina, or transportation efforts initiated
7 by a FEMA mission assignment. Discussion?

8 Questions? Clarification? Does
9 that first bullet capture our concerns?

10 MR. BECKER: I think you nailed it.

11 MS. DRAGANI: Dr. Bennett?

12 DR. BENNETT: Do I have a motion to
13 adopt?

14 GEN. LIBBY:: So moved.

15 DR. BENNETT: Moved by General Libby.
16 Second?

17 MS. EIDE: Second.

18 DR. BENNETT: Second by Cathey Eide.

19 All those in favor of the motion, signify by
20 saying aye. Opposed, like sign.

21 Carries unanimously. Thank you.

22 MS. DRAGANI: Thank you.

1 DR. BENNETT: Way to go.

2 (Applause)

3 MS. DRAGANI: Just to wrap up just the
4 subcommittee work, we now have 10 policy issues
5 to look at, so the subcommittee will probably be
6 scheduling, I would say in the fall, another
7 conference call and will begin to address those
8 10 policy issues that we didn't get to because
9 we were focused on these regulatory issues.

10 DR. BENNETT: We're debating here what
11 to do. We have time -- you would prefer to go
12 together or do you want to start? Because we
13 have to give them a half hour notice before
14 lunch. Okay, if you don't mind. We'll go ahead
15 and start the housing report out.

16 MR. BECKER: While we're teeing the
17 slides up maybe I can take a side comment here.
18 You know, when we spend a lot of time with each
19 other, we learn a lot about each other, some of
20 which we can even share in a public meeting.

21 But in honor of the Olympics, I
22 would like to share that one of the members

1 of the Post-disaster Housing subcommittee is
2 a former state champion in gymnastics. Our
3 very own Cathey Eide. Amazing. Facts you
4 didn't know about the people in the room.

5 Okay, since we have the slides, I
6 have to stop talking about personal issues.

7 MG LIBBY: You should have been there
8 last night for the demonstration.

9 MR. BECKER: You have these slides in
10 front of you. They were handed out earlier this
11 morning. I'll start with the charge that you
12 might remember, and there were three pieces to
13 the charge for our subcommittee. We said we
14 wanted to provide standards and criteria for
15 FEMA in determining post-disaster housing
16 strategies. And then from that move to a
17 toolkit or housing options that FEMA should
18 consider beyond the current practices. And then
19 lastly, so how does the state or local or tribal
20 government operate and implement that?

21 And I would say now that we're this
22 far into our work, we would in our

1 subcommittee recommend to you that our
2 original charge might have been a bit naïve.
3 I'm not sure we fully understood all of the
4 work that was in progress -- in particular
5 some of what FEMA had afoot that we didn't
6 understand at the beginning of this process.
7 And in fact, our key work of everything we've
8 done ended up being reacting to the housing
9 strategy that FEMA has put together that we
10 all received copies of.

11 A little bit of background here.
12 PKEMRA required FEMA to create a national
13 housing strategy.

14 That was in the legislation. The
15 Act also required FEMA to coordinate that
16 strategy with some external constituents, and
17 the NAC was named as someone FEMA needed to
18 coordinate with in the development of that
19 housing strategy.

20 The strategy was released the week
21 of July 17th. That was the first look our
22 subcommittee got of the strategy. We were

1 not involved in the writing. We did not have
2 input into the writing. So our first receipt
3 of that strategy was the same day the whole
4 NAC got the e-mail with the strategy
5 documents.

6 Our first work was to create
7 reactions to the strategy, and then what we
8 tried to do was to move from reactive
9 statements, turning those more into
10 guidance -- general guidance statements to
11 FEMA on a higher level than might be reactive
12 specifically to elements that were in the
13 housing strategy.

14 So our hope today is to present to
15 you our high-level guidance strategy
16 statements to FEMA. And then some get a bit
17 tactical in terms of what the next steps
18 forward are. And we talked again last night
19 when we met again last night. Our hope is
20 that the conversation would be a lot like
21 what happened yesterday afternoon -- that
22 this becomes better for having been a part of

1 this process. And so we hope that's the
2 case.

3 I know you all received a copy of
4 the strategy. I don't want to presume too
5 much, so I'll assume you don't remember a lot
6 of the details. It was in the big pile of
7 e-mails that you got, and maybe you don't
8 remember all 80 pages of the strategy, so
9 I'll go a little bit more into detail on some
10 of these.

11 I think if you asked people who
12 care deeply about this issue or people in the
13 industry what the one-sentence reaction to
14 the housing strategy is, a lot of external
15 constituents would say it looks like FEMA
16 kicked the can down the road, didn't deal
17 with the tough issues, and created a task
18 force that will handle all the hard problems.

19 I think that sells the strategy
20 short, but I think that's been a lot of the
21 reaction to the strategy. The national
22 housing strategy names a full-time disaster

1 housing task force that would stand up. It's
2 not folks like us that have full-time jobs
3 and give of our time. These would be FTEs
4 who would work on a task force to tackle some
5 of the harder issues. And frankly, if these
6 were easy, they'd have been solved a long
7 time ago.

8 I think we want to say from our
9 subcommittee and recommend to the NAC that we
10 see this strategy as a good start. Just like
11 a strategy, it's not as tactical as people
12 were looking for. It's not as operational as
13 people were looking for. I think there was
14 an expectation -- and be real clear
15 here -- PKEMRA didn't say what the strategy
16 should look like. It just said there should
17 be one. And I think what came out of that
18 was the task force will then develop the
19 concepts of operations and move to the next
20 steps.

21 So what you see in the bullet point
22 is, just like PKEMRA didn't create the right

1 expectations necessarily for the strategy, we
2 believe that the strategy doesn't wind the
3 task force up and give it a clear
4 mission -- give it a narrow enough mission
5 that they can actually be successful.

6 We don't think that the strategy
7 told the task force what's most urgent and
8 what's most important. What should you focus
9 your work on in that concept of operations?
10 And then there were no timelines or
11 expectations on what would be done by when.
12 So we are asking FEMA to consider those in
13 the creation of a task force, which actually
14 is anticipated standing up in the next couple
15 of months, perhaps by September -- by next
16 month.

17 And then lastly, if you look at the
18 document, the task force -- the permanent
19 members, the full-time members -- are called
20 out to be from FEMA, HUD, and the Red Cross.
21 And our view on the subcommittee is that it
22 needs to be more clearly articulated that

1 there are full-time permanent members that
2 represent state, tribal, local government,
3 private sector, and NGOs. It seems too
4 national of a task force to be addressing
5 very local issues.

6 The strategy document calls for
7 their inclusion in the task force work, but
8 we're saying, no, they should be permanent
9 members of the task force -- someone who can
10 bring that perspective to the problem, not
11 just people who are brought in and out of the
12 process along the way.

13 Dr. Bennett, please. Yeah.

14 MR. BRUNO: Joe, can I ask you a quick
15 question? You indicated state, tribal, local,
16 but it doesn't say that there so we're going to
17 add that, right?

18 MR. BECKER: Thank you, yes.

19 Dr. Bennett, these are separate recommendations.
20 They build on each other as we go forward. Do
21 you want to vote each one or vote the package?
22 The belief of the subcommittee was it would get

1 voted as a package.

2 DR. BENNETT: I'm willing. Do you
3 think we're going -- if we get bogged down, we
4 may have to pull something out, but let's go
5 ahead, under the assumption.

6 MR. BECKER: We've got a couple in
7 here that we might want to pull out because
8 they're a little tougher than the others.

9 DR. BENNETT: Let's ask for comments,
10 though, on the recommendations as we go. Could
11 we do that? Are there comments on this?

12 MR. PATURAS: Jim Paturas. Joe, just
13 a question on -- I guess it's the first bullet,
14 the third sub-bullet, specifying
15 timelines -- did you imply in that also that
16 there would be some sort of a standard reporting
17 process?

18 So as the task force is
19 developing -- narrowing its mission, sort of
20 beginning a Con Ops and timelines -- were you
21 also assuming in that that there'd be some
22 standard reporting process for how this is

1 actually unfolding?

2 MR. BECKER: No, we didn't, but I
3 think that would be a great add. That's my
4 opinion. I think that would be a great add.

5 MR. BRUNO: Is that reporting, you
6 mean directly to FEMA?

7 MR. PATURAS: As well as even possibly
8 back to the -- just the reporting process that
9 could be shared.

10 MR. BRUNO: I don't think we're asking
11 the task force to report to the NAC. I think
12 we're asking them to report back to FEMA.

13 MR. BECKER: We'll talk about the NAC
14 relationship in another one down the road.
15 Yeah.

16 DR. BENNETT: Lee.

17 MR. FELDMAN: Joe, how would you
18 envision the permanent full-time inclusion of
19 state, local, and tribal, since this will be
20 staffed up by full-time FEMA, HUD, and Red Cross
21 employees?

22 MR. BECKER: We talked about that

1 quite a bit, because you're asking somebody to
2 detail for perhaps two or three years on an
3 assignment into something like that. And one
4 of our thoughts was to go to the umbrella
5 associations -- NEMA, the folks that are in the
6 room, private sector -- and perhaps look to them
7 for resources -- recently retired or someone who
8 could take that role. It's not easy. We would
9 recognize that. Because I'm not sure there's
10 going to be very many local -- and it's not just
11 emergency management. This is local government.
12 People who care about zoning and housing, and
13 things like that. But not very many who could
14 give somebody up for a few years. I think that
15 would need to be worked out by FEMA.

16 MS. DRAGANI: Can I then ask a follow
17 on, Joe? Because I had the same question that
18 Lee did.

19 So the concept isn't permanent
20 full-time, employed by state and local,
21 detailed to this task force for three years,
22 but perhaps looking at recently retired

1 employees that are members of associations?

2 MR. BECKER: The task force is
3 envisioned to have six to eight members that
4 would be full-time employees of FEMA paid for by
5 FEMA.

6 MS. DRAGANI: Okay.

7 MR. BECKER: I'm sorry. That was our
8 understanding. Bob, is that correct?

9 MR. SHEA: Yeah, I think that's
10 essentially correct. There are some mechanisms
11 to use that we can employ if we were requested
12 to do it. Intergovernmental personnel
13 assignment is a mechanism that we often employ
14 to either get that kind of input or get it and
15 sustain it through a process. It would be a
16 tough call, because whoever at the state or
17 local government level, or the tribal level was
18 going to provide somebody, they would lose them
19 for that period of time.

20 MR. GOUGELET: My question would be
21 would that person at the state or local level be
22 doing that job anyway? And would we supplant

1 their normal position? So I imagine people in
2 Louisiana now are still working on housing for
3 that area. So if they become part of the team,
4 then we're actually helping them out
5 significantly in supporting their salary that
6 way. Is that right?

7 MR. BECKER: I'm not sure our
8 subcommittee went into the level of operational
9 implementation of this as much as who's at the
10 table. And I think the macro issue here is we
11 want to make sure that this is not a national
12 view only.

13 We want to make sure that this
14 incorporates the widest view. If there's
15 another way to do it that FEMA comes up with,
16 that's great. But we just want to make sure
17 that happens.

18 DR. BENNETT: Cathey?

19 MS. EIDE: I just want to make a point
20 about the reporting of the task force. Our
21 recommendation No. 5 was to have an advisory
22 committee formed.

1 MR. BECKER: Yeah.

2 MS. EIDE: And so that would imply
3 that they would take care of that reporting
4 process.

5 DR. BENNETT: Nancy?

6 MS. DRAGANI: Can I then just -- I'm
7 sorry, I'm still back on the permanent full-time
8 inclusion, because most states and locals can't
9 afford to give up a body. Even if we don't have
10 to pay for it, we can't afford to give up the
11 position for that long.

12 I think that bullet probably needs
13 a little bit of refinement or clarification.
14 Because as I read it, it sounds like you're
15 looking at the kind of programs that DoD has,
16 or that you referred to, Bob, where people
17 are actually assigned on a temporary basis
18 for up to three years to another agency. If
19 the intent is representation, that there is
20 permanent, full-time inclusion that would
21 represent state and local government and
22 NGOs, I think that then kind of speaks to

1 association and recently retired members.

2 MR. BECKER: Perhaps that's a better
3 way to say it. What we really care is that the
4 point of view is at the table.

5 MS. DRAGANI: Right. Right.

6 MR. BRUNO: Can I just --

7 MR. BECKER: We'll make that change.

8 MR. BRUNO: Joe, can I comment on
9 that? I think that may be another way to look
10 at it. What I'd not like to happen is to have
11 FEMA take their local state government rep and
12 say, well, now we've got local and state
13 government inclusion. So I think we should let
14 this work out. I mean, I think we change the
15 language, but ultimately, let's see where FEMA
16 goes with this. Ultimately, I'd love to see
17 actual local people, and maybe some can do it.
18 Maybe there's another way if you say recently
19 retired people who could represent locals. But
20 I would not want to see federal employees who
21 are in that area of local and state
22 relationships being the person.

1 MS. DRAGANI: I agree --

2 MR. BECKER: Thank you. So if we
3 adjust this language to more say that that
4 viewpoint is at the table or we come up with
5 language like that, is that the consensus of the
6 group? Okay. Thank you.

7 Number two, this is probably the
8 most significant shift in the housing
9 thinking -- is who makes what decision, and
10 who is in the process when housing happens,
11 particularly on the interim and long-term
12 housing solutions? I think there's a current
13 perception that once you're past the
14 emergency shelter phase, that the interim
15 housing and the longer-term housing solutions
16 are often something that FEMA does to a
17 community.

18 And I think you could look at that
19 from two sides. Did the local leadership
20 step up to its role and its responsibility,
21 and if not, did FEMA have to step in and make
22 decisions that really should have been made

1 by local officials? Or did FEMA do something
2 to a community? And I think opinions would
3 vary on that. If you see a seismic shift in
4 the housing strategy, what FEMA is saying is
5 this is a collaborative process. Decisions
6 need to be made at the lowest level, at the
7 community level, and it's a collaborative
8 process all the way through. And I think
9 that's something we in the subcommittee were
10 looking for, had talked a lot about over the
11 last months, and perhaps of the strategy, we
12 appreciate that the most. It's a FEMA-led
13 initiative, FEMA-led problem that needs to be
14 solved. But it's a very collaborative
15 process.

16 So I think what we're saying here
17 is we applaud that that's in the strategy.
18 And then subsequent slides will build from
19 that.

20 MR. PATURAS: Jim Paturas. A question
21 on that second -- go back to it -- on that first
22 bullet -- not having the strategy in front of me

1 and also not remembering it -- where does the
2 other federal agencies' involvement come in in
3 terms of collaboration? We've heard about HUD.
4 We heard clearly from the administrator more
5 than once. I believe he said even as long ago
6 as a year ago that he doesn't believe FEMA
7 should be in that business, but they are. So my
8 question is as it relates to that bullet which
9 is well-put, where do the other federal agencies
10 come in in terms of collaboration?

11 Is it in the strategy already?

12 MR. BECKER: Yes, it is.

13 MR. PATURAS: So then would you
14 mind --

15 MR. BECKER: We're going to get to
16 that. Can I park that one for a few minutes?

17 MR. PATURAS: Sure.

18 MR. BECKER: And we'll come back to
19 it. Thank you.

20 This is where it gets a little
21 harder. This is the meat of what we're
22 proposing, or in essence, here's how we think

1 this ought to work. Here's how our
2 subcommittee thinks the interim and long-term
3 housing, in particular, ought to work, and
4 what we're commending to you in that regard.

5 Housing -- and I know you know
6 this, but I'll just please remind you of
7 it -- housing solutions post-disaster in New
8 York City are very different from housing
9 solutions in Mississippi. Is there even land
10 to put a mobile home on in New York City?

11 No. The issues that people are
12 dealing with very dramatically, and in
13 today's world, FEMA has a very small toolbox
14 of operations that it can deploy for
15 post-disaster housing. And what we're saying
16 is we're not thinking broadly enough about
17 what should be in that toolbox -- what FEMA
18 should have.

19 And so what you read into these
20 bullets is we're calling FEMA to some very
21 specific roles. And we want to be clear
22 about it because we don't see a lot of this

1 in the strategy. The first thing we're
2 calling FEMA to be is an incubator. We want
3 FEMA to be working with the best ideas that
4 are out there.

5 We received a presentation a
6 meeting or two ago from Joe Bruno on what his
7 team was doing in New York, where they said
8 we don't have all the answers. We know we've
9 got big problems. We don't have all the
10 answers. So they had a competition and
11 invited anybody with a good idea to help
12 solve the unique issues in New York.

13 We would suggest that's a great
14 model, and you need to have the same kind of
15 thinking applied to a very rural environment,
16 or unique environments around the country.
17 We want FEMA to be the incubator, that one
18 place that gathers the good ideas. What
19 problems there are in New York are problems
20 that probably never occur to somebody
21 somewhere else. And we've got to bring that
22 altogether into one place.

1 We then want FEMA to vet solutions
2 with the right stakeholders. What should be
3 in that toolbox? What dozen or two dozen
4 options should we have that we can deploy
5 once we -- to get you out of the shelter and
6 to get you into some kind of interim housing,
7 assuming that the local housing stock has
8 been used up and there's no more motels, or
9 travel trailers or mobile homes -- I didn't
10 say travel trailers. Sorry. But the options
11 are exhausted and you say now what? What's
12 that toolbox that FEMA has?

13 Then we would want FEMA to have
14 contracts in place and prototypes built of
15 what those options would look like. Here's
16 one of this. Come here and kick the tires
17 and see what you think, local official, state
18 official. We would want FEMA to literally
19 build the prototypes and go through the
20 contracting process, and have contracts in
21 place for everything that would be in the
22 toolbox that could be developed.

1 Once that's done, we're halfway
2 there. So what we're really trying to say
3 here is FEMA, your job is to be the bright
4 idea folks. And your job is to bring
5 everybody who's got a good thought to this
6 process, and develop as wide an array of
7 options as possible that could be considered.
8 And not just develop them as good ideas, but
9 develop them as finished products that we
10 could pull the trigger on right away. So
11 that's what we're saying through the first
12 two bullets there.

13 And then this is what's not in the
14 strategy where it gets a bit difficult. If
15 you look at the housing strategy, FEMA says
16 we'll have this full-time task force that
17 works on this kind of stuff, and then when
18 there's a disaster somewhere, we want them to
19 stand up a housing task force as well.

20 And they did that in the Midwest
21 floods. And there was some good success
22 there. What we're saying is no, the state

1 task force should be stood up now. What we
2 want is pre-event, we want that thinking to
3 happen. So we want to stand up state task
4 forces that are going to take this menu and
5 start to apply it locally.

6 If we can go to the next slide,
7 please. I'll give an example. If there's a
8 city on a river that floods repeatedly -- and
9 you can define "repeatedly" every 100 years
10 or every 50 years, or whatever it is -- we
11 want the local officials to have the
12 conversation before the disaster happens.

13 Are we going to rebuild here next
14 time? Not post-event. We want a local
15 housing strategy. And what we're commending
16 to the NAC to consider is we want a state
17 task force that is receiving these great
18 ideas from FEMA and its task force and
19 helping local communities come up with their
20 own post-disaster housing strategies.

21 And I know you've seen one
22 disaster, you've seen one disaster. So our

1 housing plan -- at least it's what we all
2 agree is our starting point we'll deviate
3 from. But let's have a strategy in place, or
4 our local options in place before the event
5 happens. So what we're moving to here is
6 FEMA-funded state task forces that are not
7 stood up post-event, but exist to do the same
8 thing -- to implement on a local level what
9 we see FEMA doing on a federal level and
10 creating the options.

11 Maybe before I go on, I should stop
12 there and maybe do a clarity check or get
13 feedback, if I could. Nancy?

14 MS. DRAGANI: I'm struggling with why
15 FEMA would need to fund a state-level task
16 force. What kind of funding would be required
17 for the state to pull together a housing task
18 force?

19 MR. BECKER: We've spent a lot of time
20 with the FEMA staff. And I think when they're
21 very candid with us, they would say if this
22 isn't somebody's full-time job, it doesn't get

1 done. And that's why they want the national
2 task force. It can't be other duties as
3 assigned, or it can't be what I do between
4 events, because we're always in events. And so
5 the thinking here is that there would be a state
6 group that would have kind of the same kind of
7 flavor as the federal task force -- the FEMA
8 task force -- but more on a state level. It
9 would have different points of view, not just in
10 emergency management thinking, but different
11 points of view on what post-disaster housing
12 could look like and should look like. That's
13 half of the answer to your question.

14 The second half is, this can't just
15 be a good idea. There's got to be
16 expectations around it. And our thinking was
17 follow the money trail. And if the positions
18 are grant-funded with clear expectations and
19 timelines and all of that that we would
20 expect a state to have, and states could
21 implement locally, then we've got more
22 accountability in the system for something to

1 be done on the ground before FEMA shows up
2 during the disaster.

3 MR. BRUNO: Joe, could I add something
4 to that?

5 MR. BECKER: Please.

6 MR. BRUNO: A good example of that
7 would be the RCPG, the Regional Catastrophic
8 Planning Grant that came out, and making that
9 more like the UASI funding for catastrophic
10 planning. UASI is a yearly program. The RCPG
11 goes through regional planning. And this is
12 kind of a combination of those. I don't know if
13 that's exactly what would happen. It would be
14 up to FEMA to figure that out.

15 But that's the thinking that you
16 would want. So you have this thing split up.
17 It's funded. It's a regular program like we
18 do through UASI. And that really puts meat
19 on it, in our view.

20 MR. BECKER: I think FEMA could
21 develop all the most wonderful options in the
22 world and have contracts and prototypes and be

1 ready to go, but if the community hasn't thought
2 through -- or at least at the state level
3 looking at the vulnerable areas in the state, if
4 we haven't thought through and put on paper what
5 it is we think we would want to do, then it can
6 move a lot quicker.

7 Let me go back to -- you know,
8 you've got the emergency shelter phase.
9 You've got the interim housing phase. You've
10 got the long-term solution phase. What we're
11 trying to do is shrink the middle. You know,
12 we want to get you out of a shelter as quick
13 as we can. We don't want to put you in an
14 interim solution that's wonderful. We want
15 to move you to the long-term solution.

16 And the quicker we can move people
17 through that or go straight to the long-term
18 solution out of a shelter or out of my
19 mother-in-law's house -- what we're trying to
20 do is make the progression as quick as we
21 can. And part of that is the decision-making
22 on what the option is and which ones we're

1 going to implement.

2 MR. FELDMAN: Joe, I've got two
3 questions, concerns. First, I think you're
4 correct in we have to start posing the questions
5 to local government. You know, what are you
6 going to do after. My concern is, how far do
7 you push that down to the decision-making level?
8 For example, if you have housing that is within
9 a floodplain currently, it would make sense not
10 to build back in the floodplain if that is the
11 result of the catastrophe. However, local
12 government can't make that decision now without
13 invoking takings and having to compensate
14 property owners with dollars that the local
15 government may not have at the current time.

16 So I think creating the framework
17 of what questions should you ask immediately
18 after the disaster and to think through that
19 is good. I don't know that I'd push it to
20 making the decision at this point. And
21 that's just a general comment.

22 Going back to your first slide,

1 though, under No. 3, the use of federally
2 approved contractors. Providing that list to
3 state and local governments. Do you think
4 that there's really a need to focus on
5 federally approved contractors? Or should
6 locals be encouraged to identify local
7 contractors ahead of time and not worry about
8 whether they meet all the federal standards,
9 which can be cumbersome and costly?

10 MR. BECKER: I would add to your
11 sentiment what we also discussed in our
12 subcommittee is there is great political
13 pressure to use people from here as often as
14 possible post-disaster. We want the local
15 economy going. The flip of that is you've got
16 the 75/25 cost share, and you've got some pretty
17 tight parameters around -- if FEMA is going to
18 foot the bill, it needs to go through the
19 contracting process.

20 And our thought was if the local
21 community had that as one of its priorities,
22 then it should be pushing local contractors

1 into that process, and to try to get them
2 through the FEMA contracting process.

3 That might not be the answer you're
4 looking for, but that's as far as our
5 subcommittee was able to take it.

6 MR. FELDMAN: No, I think that's a
7 very good answer. I think the issue may be how
8 do we up front pre-qualify pre-disaster our
9 local contractors into the federal process so
10 that they can be there ready and willing after
11 the disaster to assist.

12 MR. BECKER: J.R.?

13 MR. THOMAS: Lee, I think that bullet,
14 which is the No. 2, refers back to the
15 contractors that are building the prototypes and
16 building those housing structures. I don't
17 think it particularly meant to talk about the
18 people who actually come in that may be local
19 contractors. I think the contractor meant those
20 groups of prototypes that we were talking about.

21 MR. BECKER: I think we should trust
22 FEMA to put a process in place, and the

1 overarching strategy here is we want this to be
2 locally driven.

3 We want this to be locally decided.

4 And the process should include exactly what
5 you're referring to as much as possible.

6 Absolutely. I think that's the sentiment of
7 not just our subcommittee. That's actually
8 the sentiment of the housing strategy. They
9 just didn't get into this kind of here's what
10 it looks like when it's right.

11 MR. BRUNO: Joe, can I just add
12 something? Lee, in this area -- GSA does this
13 all the time -- they have requirements,
14 contracts, buyoffs. A lot of people buy off
15 these contracts. You want prequalified. I
16 think J.R. is correct. We're talking about the
17 people who build the prototypes. So that when
18 the time comes that you open up this menu of
19 options, you have a good idea of where this is
20 going to be built. FEMA knows who's going to
21 build it. They've already prequalified these
22 people. And they're willing to pay for it.

1 It's another thing if you do it locally to try
2 to build prototypes.

3 It's unlikely you could do it
4 locally. But assuming you wanted to try to
5 do it locally -- the question really would be
6 is would it meet their standards -- FEMA's
7 standards? Would they pay for that because
8 it doesn't meet some of their standards?
9 There's a lot of pretty involved standards
10 here, even if you did it just locally, of
11 what you would want in that housing. You
12 want to do that upfront.

13 You want FEMA to vet those entities
14 that can build the menu of options that
15 they're going to create. You want to get the
16 ideas for the menu of options from people
17 like us in New York City and other places
18 around the world that are -- the things that
19 they're doing. And then you want FEMA to
20 start building some prototypes so that we
21 know they work and we can also kick the
22 tires. It's not that complicated.

1 I mean, obviously this is a big
2 deal because it's the United States of
3 America that we're talking about. But this
4 is a big problem. So you're not going to
5 solve it with travel trailers. You're not
6 going to solve it with one solution. Not
7 certainly in this country.

8 So we're talking very big-time
9 solutions here, but very operational
10 solutions. And that is what the strategy did
11 not have, and that's what I think we've come
12 up with here. Very operational approach to
13 solving this problem, which is a huge
14 problem. No one suggests this is going to be
15 short and sweet or cheap. But that's why
16 people in this country pay the taxes they
17 pay. They're entitled to have that kind of
18 protection. And FEMA is the agency that
19 should be leading this. And that's what this
20 is saying.

21 DR. BENNETT: Nancy?

22 MS. DRAGANI: Wordsmith and then a

1 concern. I don't think bullet No. 1 says
2 "standing" to me. When I read that, I don't get
3 anything out of that that says pre-event
4 standing task forces at the state level. So
5 that's kind of a clarification.

6 But at the same time, having made
7 that clarification, while I absolutely agree
8 and recognize that housing is a huge issue in
9 parts of the country, a standing committee
10 funded by FEMA at the state level may not be
11 the most cost-effective solution for other
12 parts of the country. Housing is not
13 typically an issue in Ohio.

14 Our largest trailer program only
15 involved 50 trailers, and it was because it
16 was a rural area and we were trying to get
17 people next to their home as they initiated
18 repairs.

19 So this feels a little bit like a
20 one-size-fits-all solution. And I think it
21 is needed absolutely in New York City.

22 Absolutely urban areas that may have

1 difficulty, or areas that are at a high-risk
2 for hurricanes. I don't know, and this is my
3 gut reaction, that in the Midwest, a standing
4 funded committee is going to last unless
5 there are events that cause it to be an
6 issue. That's just my reaction.

7 MS. EIDE: If you remember when we
8 were writing this, we discussed that
9 specifically, and changed the language to make
10 it a suggestion, or strongly encourage it. Not
11 a must, but a should. And you know, if you need
12 it type of deal.

13 MS. DRAGANI: Okay.

14 MR. BECKER: We got into great debates
15 over language and we pulled the "must" stuff
16 out. But I think to your point, we can even
17 make it stronger if you want us to and say
18 "where appropriate" or something like that. Is
19 that the consensus of the group? I don't want
20 to put words in your mouth.

21 MR. KMET: To kind of satisfy -- this
22 is Chuck Kmet -- to kind of satisfy what Nancy

1 is talking about, can we maybe attach it to the
2 UASI cities? Tier 1 and Tier 2. Would that be
3 something to consider, just like some of the new
4 requirements that UASI has for some of their
5 catastrophic planning and whatnot? Could you do
6 it that way?

7 MR. BRUNO: UASI is really
8 threat-based, terrorism-based. I think we
9 should not try to add natural disasters to UASI.
10 We should not. I mean, we certainly would
11 oppose that strongly in New York.

12 MS. EIDE: And that limits it, too. I
13 don't think we want to limit it. We want to
14 make it available to anybody that needs it.

15 MR. KMET: Good point.

16 MR. BECKER: Okay if we make that
17 change? Where appropriate? Okay.

18 Okay to move on? The second
19 bullet -- no, I'm sorry, same slide. The
20 second bullet is only one sentence but it's a
21 big thought. And it's a big deal.
22 Post-disaster housing is not just about the

1 building. It's not just about what structure
2 am I living in. It has a lot to do with
3 where is the structure? What safety and
4 security do we have here? What access to
5 community services do I have -- medical,
6 schools, libraries? All the things that we
7 all ran up against in post-Katrina. You
8 can't just create a place and put it in the
9 middle of nowhere and presume that people
10 have the daily life that they need.

11 And so we asked a task force of our
12 subcommittee to stand up. And J.R. led it
13 and brought in a lot of good thinkers from
14 the organizations that typically would
15 provide those services. And Mark Messick
16 from FEMA created a whitepaper for their team
17 to work with. And we're still in the final
18 stages of that. We're in the bottom of the
19 ninth. We asked for a few more tweaks and
20 we'll receive that next -- in September.

21 But what we're trying to really
22 crystallize here is -- those are being called

1 wraparound services. What do we need to wrap
2 around a client with beyond just the
3 building? And let's articulate those.

4 And let's say -- and we posed four
5 questions back to J.R.'s team. You know,
6 what are they? Who provides it? Who pays
7 for it? And something I'm not thinking of.
8 And what we're trying to do is nail that down
9 in the local thinking ahead of time. And
10 what we wanted to say here is when we're
11 providing those wraparound services, if at
12 all possible, we'd like those resources to be
13 as local as they can be.

14 So we're spending a lot of out
15 though time here on the building and the
16 structure that people are living in, and
17 that's important. And it'll take various
18 forms. But for their lives, this one
19 sentence is a big piece here of post-disaster
20 housing. And I don't want to give it short
21 shrift because it's kind of buried in the
22 middle of this slide. We see that as quite

1 important.

2 Then the third bullet point here
3 has to do with case management. And I know
4 you know this, but a bit of history.
5 Pre-Katrina, recovery case management was
6 pretty much the purview of local voluntary
7 organizations, often faith-based, or my
8 organization, or other organizations. And
9 it's a local decision. Who helps these
10 clients? Often, counties create unmet needs
11 committees and various organizations come to
12 the table. And that was case management.
13 And it was kind of a cottage industry.

14 We know who the usual suspects are
15 that are going to show up in the non-profit
16 sector to do case management.

17 When Katrina happened and the
18 number of cases was so significantly large,
19 FEMA stood up in a contractual form Katrina
20 Aid Today and outsourced it to, including
21 voluntary organizations, how that was done.
22 Well, there's been a lot of movement on case

1 management post-Katrina. And the view as we
2 see it on our subcommittee is -- probably the
3 best word to describe a strategy on case
4 management today would be "confused." I
5 think we used a more polite word up here,
6 "diffused."

7 And what we're saying is, FEMA's
8 got a case management strategy. HHS has a
9 pilot going for case management strategy.
10 HUD has case management. And you still have
11 the voluntary agencies doing it on all the
12 smaller disasters all the time anyway. And
13 we don't see that in a cohesive strategy.

14 And just as the wraparound services
15 are just as important as the building, who
16 helps me plug into those and who helps my
17 family through this is just as important.

18 And so what we're looking for here
19 is, we want the task force to say what
20 elements of social support and case
21 management should be there. And again, we
22 want the preference to be local as best as

1 possible. Local resources.

2 So maybe I should stop there,
3 because those are some shifts in what the
4 current practice is and things that are not
5 in the thinking of the strategy that we would
6 commend to the NAC. And I would suggest that
7 that might be a place to stop for a vote, if,
8 Dr. Bennett, you would agree.

9 DR. BENNETT: Is there any discussion
10 that we need? You're talking about -- oh, I'm
11 sorry.

12 MS. TORRIENTE: Just real quick. If
13 at all possible, I would highly recommend these
14 points.

15 I think they're excellent. And it
16 became very evident in Miami after Hurricane
17 Wilma. We did everything right. Everything
18 was prepared right before, right after. But
19 then it all fell apart at case management.
20 You know, we didn't have the structure. So I
21 would really kind of highlight and underline
22 and bold these. They're great

1 recommendations.

2 MR. BECKER: Thank you.

3 DR. BENNETT: I would entertain a
4 motion to put forth recommendations 1 through 3,
5 all parts; is that correct?

6 MR. BECKER: Yes, please.

7 DR. BENNETT: Do I have such a motion?

8 MR. PATURAS: Jim Paturas makes the
9 motion.

10 DR. BENNETT: Do I hear a second?

11 MR. GOUGELET: Second.

12 DR. BENNETT: All right, Rob. Any
13 discussion? All right, I'll call for a vote.
14 All those in favor that we put forth these three
15 recommendations, signify by saying aye.

16 All opposed? Recommendations will
17 be carried forward. So let us now break for
18 lunch, or did you have a final word?

19 MR. BECKER. No, the boss back here
20 said it was a good idea to break for lunch.

21 MS. PRICE: Chuck Kmet has a question
22 real quick.

1 MR. KMET: If I could, and I don't
2 want to throw a whole lot into it, because from
3 the travel standpoint, we definitely agree with
4 all these things, but I would for the
5 subcommittee ask if there's a possibility of
6 doing like a task force or something to help
7 address some of the issues that the tribes may
8 have, just because you've got federal trust land
9 and allotments and stuff. And I apologize if
10 you covered some of this before.

11 I was out on my phone call earlier.
12 But there definitely would be some issues
13 that may need to be considered at a little
14 bit later time. And it could be like a task
15 force kind of thing or something -- I know
16 that I wouldn't be the best person to answer
17 all of those questions. John would be pretty
18 good at it, but I know that there are some
19 other people that may be able to reach out
20 to help the subcommittee with that because
21 it is going to be a problem trying to solve
22 some of these issues on lands that are

1 allotted lands or federal trust lands that
2 you can't really do anything with.

3 So trying to come up with some
4 solutions with that is going to be kind of
5 difficult if you had something catastrophic
6 that involves tribal areas or something along
7 those lines. So I bring that back to the
8 committee to consider.

9 DR. BENNETT: Okay.

10 MS. PRICE: On your way out to lunch,
11 which is in the same room, please pick up a
12 little choice of pork or vegetable or chicken
13 from Laila. I'm going to ask that we come back
14 at 1:30 sharp to continue discussions.

15 Members of the public should be
16 aware that if we finish early, then we'll go
17 directly into the public comment period. At
18 this point, I don't have any public comments,
19 so if you did plan on making some, please let
20 me know.

21 With that, we're taking a break for
22 lunch. Thank you.

1 (Whereupon, at 12:16 p.m., a
2 luncheon recess was taken.)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 So what we're moving on to in the
2 next slide would be roles. And one of the
3 things that the housing strategy took great
4 lengths to do was to articulate roles. And
5 we applaud the idea that it started with the
6 person. What's the responsibility of the
7 person? And then all the way up to each
8 level of state, local, tribal, federal
9 government, other government agencies. And
10 all we want to do is offer a couple of
11 additions to the roles that were in the
12 strategy. Otherwise, we support what was in
13 the strategy.

14 But there's a couple of real key
15 catches here. One of them is -- and God love
16 FEMA. No good deed goes unpunished. In an
17 effort to be very collaborative in styling
18 the document -- very, very
19 collaborative -- we felt that FEMA didn't
20 call itself out as the leader as strongly as
21 FEMA should.

22 And it's on two phases here. The

1 first one is FEMA needs to be very clear that
2 post-disaster housing is a FEMA issue to the
3 leader, be the convener, bring all the other
4 government agencies and bring government
5 at-large together and the voluntary and
6 for-profit sector together. FEMA needs to
7 say that's us. And I'm not sure we see FEMA
8 doing that. And we appreciate the fact that
9 it was probably stemming from an interest to
10 be very collaborative and very collegial in
11 the approach. So we ask for that.

12 And then secondly, very tactically,
13 there were several points in the document
14 that talked about the task force, and the
15 membership of the task force, and the
16 make-up. And it defined a very, very, very
17 broad mission. But FEMA never said we're in
18 charge of the task force. And we think FEMA
19 should step up and say in the document we are
20 the leaders of this task force. We're the
21 conveners. We own this.

22 And I think it was probably meant

1 to be implied in the document, but FEMA needs
2 to say that. Everybody needs to know who's
3 the lead here.

4 And I think that's important. The
5 second piece on roles is probably what
6 might -- this is Joe's opinion, not the
7 subcommittee's opinion -- might be some of
8 the most problematic in this whole continuum.
9 You know, we talked about the emergency
10 response phase where you're sheltering. Then
11 you've got the interim housing phase. And
12 then you've got the long-term.

13 In the long-term, when you look at
14 the new NRF and you look at the new
15 construct, HUD is called out to lead the
16 long-term housing. And it's not clear that
17 HUD is stepping up to that role in a way that
18 I think will move on the same timeline as the
19 other phases of this strategy.

20 When we interface with HUD or we
21 listen to the people from HUD, it sounds like
22 they don't have the authorization. Give me

1 the authorization and give me the money, and
2 we'll go forward. And when you think those
3 things are articulated, there's just not a
4 lot of traction there. And we don't see HUD
5 moving in this process in a way that I think
6 our partners at FEMA would want that to
7 happen. That's the view from the advisory
8 committee standpoint. That's not a FEMA
9 staff view.

10 But we need that third third, the
11 long-term housing piece. There's a lot to do
12 there, and we need HUD to step up and take
13 the lead on that.

14 We're still in the same section,
15 next part. I'm sorry. Question?

16 MS. ELGIN: Have you had any feedback
17 from HUD at all regarding what their beliefs are
18 as far as their role in this?

19 MR. BECKER: Frankly, not from the
20 subcommittee directly to HUD. It's more on
21 relationships that members of the subcommittee
22 have with HUD. We're a NAC -- we're FEMA's

1 subcommittee, frankly. And I think what we're
2 trying to express is we want to see movement on
3 all aspects of the housing strategy. And we can
4 see a path from here to where we want to go, but
5 HUD is out of our control. HUD is out of our
6 purview.

7 MS. ELGIN: I understand that. But
8 I'm just curious as to -- because in another
9 subcommittee, we have also expressed the concern
10 that HUD needs to step up, but I've never heard
11 us speak about have we -- has anyone talked to
12 them? Have they given us some feedback on where
13 they see their role? I mean, I don't know if
14 that's in your purview as a subcommittee, but in
15 general, I'm just concerned about where do they
16 see themselves in this role.

17 MR. BECKER: I can tell you in my work
18 with the Red Cross, we've engaged HUD very
19 directly and asked for that. And the answer is
20 we don't have the authorization and we don't
21 have the money.

22 MS. ELGIN: That's what I was looking

1 for. Thank you.

2 MR. BECKER: I was just speaking for
3 the Red Cross there. I wasn't speaking for the
4 subcommittee.

5 Yes, sir?

6 MR. KRUMPERMAN: We're still back on
7 this -- on the HUD issue and the role of FEMA.
8 I'm a little confused, partially due to the
9 administrator's comments which he's made several
10 times -- we want to get -- we really probably
11 shouldn't be in the housing business. And it
12 seems odd for an agency to take the lead in
13 something and also say, well, we really
14 shouldn't be in this.

15 So it seems to me that FEMA has
16 feet in both camps, which makes it difficult
17 to take the lead. So to me, I still see that
18 in the way this is written right now. It's
19 confusing to me. So I just want to raise
20 that as a concern, is that you either are or
21 you aren't. And given your concerns about
22 HUD, at least the way it was just

1 articulated, it seems like this is something
2 that could easily fall through and not -- and
3 just stay in the current state, which no one
4 sees as acceptable. So I have concerns on
5 the way it's being formulated right now.

6 MR. BRUNO: Joe, can I just comment on
7 that?

8 MR. BECKER: Yeah.

9 MR. BRUNO: I'm not confused. FEMA
10 has this. This is its job. Unless something
11 changes, they're going to have to go forward
12 with it. HUD is really the permanent housing,
13 which is what FEMA would like to push over to
14 them. HUD is looking for FEMA to fund that. I
15 think they do -- they have the authority to do
16 it, but they just are not stepping up at this
17 point. We're just telling FEMA get out there;
18 straighten this out.

19 But I don't think there's any
20 question that FEMA's got this responsibility.
21 It's going to have to be changed some other
22 way. I don't think anyone is letting them

1 off the hook of this, nor do I really think
2 they don't want to do it. I have heard Dave
3 Paulison say we shouldn't be in the housing
4 business, but that seems to have evolved into
5 we shouldn't be in the permanent housing
6 business.

7 MR. BECKER: I think the distinction
8 here is, and take the three sections of
9 this -- FEMA is over sheltering, but FEMA
10 doesn't operate a shelter.

11 They're not the service provider.
12 That's done by others. But FEMA owns that in
13 the NRF. That's OESF6 (?) under FEMA, but
14 they don't actually provide that service.
15 But they own the coordination.

16 And I would suggest long-term
17 housing would be the same construct, where
18 FEMA shouldn't be in the business of
19 providing long-term housing. HUD's got the
20 core expertise in that, but FEMA owns it, as
21 Joe said. FEMA needs to still be that
22 coordinating umbrella for post-disaster

1 housing. They need to lead the whole issue,
2 but HUD needs to be the provider, with
3 funding from FEMA and authority from
4 Congress.

5 MR. KRUMPERMAN: Okay.

6 MR. BECKER: Susy.

7 MS. TORRIENTE: Perhaps you can
8 rewrite it the way you just said it right now.

9 It's more clear.

10 MR. BECKER: Can we back up, Alyson?

11 MS. PRICE: Yeah.

12 MS. TORRIENTE: The way you just
13 explained it, it's kind of FEMA on top and then
14 have other folks take care of certain expertise.
15 And so you're saying it's FEMA over it but HUD
16 being the provider.

17 I just think it's a little more
18 clear perhaps.

19 MR. BECKER: Is that the consensus of
20 the group? We can adjust that.

21 Okay, move on?

22 MR. BRUNO: Joe, the only comment I

1 have on that is, I don't know ultimately what
2 HUD is going to be doing. We don't know. I
3 don't know if we can say to FEMA this is what
4 HUD should be doing. I think what we're saying
5 here is they have to step up in the area of
6 long-term housing. Exactly how that works out,
7 I don't know. I have no problem with changing
8 the language, as I said, but that may not be
9 where it ends. It's hard to know at this stage,
10 but I think the language change is fine. I
11 don't think we know, nor are we in a position to
12 tell FEMA that ultimately that's what it will
13 be. Probably something like that.

14 MR. BECKER: You know, when you're in
15 your subcommittee and you're wordsmithing and
16 every word just becomes super-important, I can't
17 tell you how much time we spent on the word
18 "authorization." What is it we were saying HUD
19 didn't have? You know, and we felt like, well,
20 they have the money because FEMA funds them.
21 And they have the authority. But for some
22 reason, they don't feel like they have an

1 authorization or is there a want to. And so we
2 struggled with that. And I'm not sure what a
3 better word than authorization is, because from
4 where we sit, they have what they need to get
5 started. They do.

6 So I'm sorry, I'm not sure I
7 understand what we want to do with this
8 language at this point.

9 Yes?

10 MR. STENSGAR: John Stensgar. You
11 know, I don't have an issue with the language
12 change. My only comment is what's the chances
13 of having HUD at our December meeting to have
14 them at the table? Because FEMA does have the
15 responsibility for sheltering, but the permanent
16 side -- I guess as a member of the committee,
17 I'd like to know what kind of plan is in place
18 or should be contemplated to be put in place to
19 address the issues that we're kind of
20 responsible for.

21 So I was just wondering what's the
22 chances of having one of those officials

1 there?

2 MR. BECKER: I think the path forward
3 that the housing strategy articulates is that
4 the task force creates the concept of
5 operations. And HUD is one of the three key
6 leaders of the task force. And that was
7 intentional. And so I think we might be anxious
8 to get them engaged, but I believe standing up
9 the task force and moving that to a concept of
10 operations will provide that engagement.

11 As to whether we want them here to
12 share their intentions, I guess I'd defer to
13 you, Dr. Bennett, if we want to take that up.
14 Do you want to consider that and come back?

15 REPORTER: Your microphone, sir.

16 DR. BENNETT: Let us not make a
17 decision right now, but consider that for the
18 next meeting. But I want to be clear, too. I
19 think these are good points. FEMA does have the
20 overall housing, right? So we could make the
21 language -- because we're a advisory group to
22 FEMA -- so we could couch it in -- I think

1 "authorization" might be a good word. It's not
2 clear to us that HUD has the authorization
3 or -- I'm not sure. But we've got to be careful
4 that we're not seen as telling HUD what to do.
5 But we are saying to FEMA that we're concerned
6 that this is not being addressed -- the
7 long-term housing.

8 Is that what I'm hearing from you?

9 MR. BECKER: That's what I'm hearing
10 the group saying, yes.

11 DR. BENNETT: I'm not sure how to
12 wordsmith that, but however we can couch that I
13 think would be a good thing. Because we don't
14 want to come out as being in the position of
15 beating up on HUD in any way, but we are saying
16 to FEMA we're concerned about the long-term
17 housing and where are we or something. I don't
18 know.

19 MR. BECKER: We'll take that, and we
20 will -- we won't express a sentiment to HUD;
21 we'll express a sentiment to FEMA that we have
22 this concern about HUD.

1 Dr. Bennett, is that what --

2 DR. BENNETT: That's kind of what I'm
3 hearing.

4 MR. BECKER: Great. Thank you. I'm
5 sorry, lights on. Angela?

6 MS. ELGIN: I'm having difficulty. I
7 understand that FEMA has to be the leadership
8 role in this, and I understand there needs to be
9 a partnership. I get all of that. What I have
10 an issue with is, if you ask this agency to help
11 us partner to get this accomplished, how do we
12 know -- they really haven't brought anything to
13 the table and said, well, here are our concerns
14 if we have a partnership.

15 I believe, at minimal as a
16 subcommittee, have someone from HUD to say
17 look, these are the ideas that we have. Here
18 are our concerns. Is this realistic for you
19 to partner with FEMA to help accomplish this
20 goal?

21 DR. BENNETT: I'll make a comment. I
22 think that's absolutely where we want to get to.

1 It seems like the vehicle, though, of something
2 coming from the committee to the administrator
3 of FEMA, since FEMA has the housing issue, makes
4 that happen.

5 Because then I think it's basically
6 saying to the administrator that this
7 long-term housing issue has got to be looked
8 at, which I think means that he has to have
9 exactly the type of conversations, and report
10 back to us, one way or the other, that you're
11 calling for.

12 I mean, maybe I'm wrong, but that's
13 kind of how I see it. It's sort of saying
14 this committee is concerned about long-term
15 housing. It's falling under FEMA. And then
16 he knows where to go, I think, to ask the
17 questions. But maybe I'm missing the point.

18 MR. BECKER: I think the other piece
19 here is to remember where we are in the process.
20 And I don't work in government, but I have
21 respect for how long some of these things take.
22 We're in the 60-day comment period in the

1 strategy. And at the end of the 60-day comment
2 period, the strategy will then be finalized and
3 released. And here we are beating up one of the
4 partners for not having moved quickly. You
5 know, so as frustrated as the sense is that
6 you're reading in that and we're all discussing,
7 we're in the top of the first inning in getting
8 this process going.

9 The next step is that you'd stand
10 up a task force. The next thing the task
11 force would do is create concepts of
12 operations. And then you start moving to the
13 tactical steps. So maybe by us just raising
14 a flag and saying we see this as a concern,
15 we're very early in raising that flag in the
16 process. So I don't think it's time for us
17 to be beating anybody up. I think there's a
18 recognition that this takes a while, and
19 we're just surfacing this as an issue.

20 To paraphrase Dr. Bennett, maybe
21 we'll change the language to say we recommend
22 to the administrator to be engaged in direct

1 conversation to make sure that expectations
2 are clear with the partners and HUD. Just
3 take the opportunity to clarify the role of
4 HUD in permanent long-term housing I think is
5 something we can just wordsmith now and move
6 on.

7 MS. EIDE: I kind of would like to see
8 HUD have the responsibility. Maybe use the term
9 responsibility for that long-term housing needs,
10 as identified in ASF-14.

11 MR. BECKER: I think that's presumed
12 because it's in the NRF.

13 MS. EIDE: Or even --

14 COURT REPORTER: Use your microphone.

15 MS. EIDE: Using strategy as well.

16 MR. BECKER: Yeah.

17 MS. EIDE: So I don't know if it's not
18 strong enough in there, but it is identified in
19 the strategy.

20 DR. BENNETT: Suggestions? What about
21 something like authorization and responsibility
22 to address long-term housing needs should be

1 clarified between HUD and FEMA?

2 MR. BECKER: Heads are nodding.

3 DR. BENNETT: And it's not clear.

4 Something of that nature?

5 MR. BECKER: So when we vote on this
6 set, that's the language that we would be voting
7 on for that bullet point? Can you read that
8 again, please?

9 DR. BENNETT: I said authorization and
10 responsibility to address long-term housing
11 should be clarified between HUD and FEMA.

12 That takes the pointy end of the
13 spear off one person.

14 MR. BECKER: Great.

15 MR. BRUNO: Joe, it's always hard to
16 write these things with this large a group.

17 The recommendation says "for
18 additional clarification" up on top. Each of
19 those things were asking for clarification.
20 We can use clarification again if you want,
21 but I think it's silly to try to write it
22 here. If you want us to look at the language

1 in the committee, we should do that, but I
2 don't know. I think it's pretty clear. It
3 seems pretty clear.

4 MR. BECKER: Dr. Bennett, should I
5 move on?

6 DR. BENNETT: Is there any other
7 discussion? I get the point on the
8 clarification being used twice, but I still like
9 the way I worded it. But I'm opening it to the
10 committee.

11 Okay, move on.

12 MR. BECKER: Thank you. There was a
13 lot of language in the housing strategy about
14 non-governmental organizations and the role that
15 they play in each phase of post-disaster
16 housing. And we appreciated that perspective.
17 The only thing that we would add is, recognizing
18 that in the emergency phase of the disaster and
19 the sheltering phase, the primary provider is
20 the non-profit sector -- it's the voluntary
21 organizations -- we want a stronger recognition
22 of the interdependence between the voluntary

1 organizations and local, state, tribal,
2 government on larger-scale disasters in
3 particular.

4 If something big happens in this
5 city tonight, a shelter is typically a high
6 school gym or some public building. And
7 you're going to put a couple of hundred
8 people in a shelter. Before you open the
9 13th, 14th, or 15th shelter and spread your
10 resources, you need the convention center.
11 You need the big buildings. And there's a
12 lot of coordination to make that happen on
13 larger-scale events.

14 So what we're looking for is a
15 stronger recognition that you can't just say,
16 okay voluntary sector, you've got that.
17 There's a real key tie-in with particularly
18 local government for an interdependence there
19 that we don't think the strategy recognizes.

20 And then the second bullet here is
21 probably one of the most complex. And I
22 think this might be where we spend most of

1 our time for the rest of our presentation.
2 This has to do with who are the clients and
3 what are the appropriate facilities to put
4 those clients in. And there's no shortage of
5 opinions on what a special need definition
6 is. There's no shortage of documents about
7 what those types of facilities ought to be.
8 And the housing strategy weighed in with yet
9 another version of the world as they saw it
10 in the housing strategy.

11 And what we spent our time on in
12 the subcommittee was saying I think we need
13 to be very clear and very simple in our
14 approach. Before we start talking about all
15 these different categories of shelters and
16 naming large numbers of types of shelters,
17 let's start with the clients. Let's start
18 with the people that we're trying to serve,
19 and let's recognize that there's really three
20 groups of clients.

21 There's what we call congregate
22 shelters, or people who open up the doors and

1 provide what they need and they can take care
2 of themselves.

3 Then there are people with
4 functional needs. I need assistance -- I can
5 stay in this congregate shelter perhaps, or
6 maybe not. It depends on what my functional
7 needs are. And they might need a particular
8 facility or they might be able to stay in the
9 congregate shelter. And then lastly, there's
10 clearly people with medical needs that cannot
11 be served in a congregate shelter.

12 And I can tell you my organization,
13 ONE, the big change we made in the last
14 couple of years is our strategy is how do we
15 get to yes to serve the widest range of needs
16 in the congregate shelter? I can tell you,
17 we were too quick to say you belong in a
18 special needs shelter, and we've had to be a
19 lot more aggressive about how do we keep you
20 in this congregate shelter.

21 And we think when you're talking
22 about housing strategies in the emergency

1 phase of the event, what we should be all
2 about -- or a lot of what we should be
3 about -- is how do we accommodate the
4 broadest range of needs in a congregate
5 shelter. And make that the premise. Call
6 the building what you want. Call the shelter
7 type what you want. But how do we
8 accommodate the broadest range of needs?

9 And then clearly we have the
10 medical needs that belong in -- most locals
11 still call it a special needs shelter.
12 There's different names for it. But I think
13 what concerns us about the housing strategy
14 and what concerns us about the NRF is we're
15 getting into all kinds of nuances about what
16 the buildings are called. And what we wanted
17 to bring it back to was, no, what we're
18 trying to do is take care of everybody we can
19 in a congregate shelter who requires public
20 shelter.

21 We need more work between our
22 subcommittee and your subcommittee on pulling

1 this thought together. Before we ask the
2 NAC, I want to make sure that we would be
3 comfortable with this slice of it. The
4 special needs subcommittee -- we have
5 opinions on other aspects of this. But from
6 a housing strategy, what we're saying here is
7 let's not get so wrapped up in what we're
8 calling the buildings and how this differs
9 from the NRF, and how this differs from my
10 county's plan, and how that differs from my
11 state's plan. Let's develop strategies
12 around serving these three groups of clients.

13 So maybe we should stop and ask for
14 discussion there.

15 MR. LANCASTER: Joe, actually, I'd say
16 that's a wise approach -- to take the approach
17 that you've just outlined. I think that's the
18 way to go rather than to try and set up these
19 different special shelters -- at least in the
20 framework of this.

21 I think what you need is to have a
22 housing mix that is going to be responsive

1 to, as you're saying there in that last
2 sentence, the greatest range of needs and
3 populations that you can in the congregate
4 shelters. And then to the extent that you
5 have to deal with someone who's got some real
6 acute or intricate need, that you've got a
7 team or somebody that can react to that.

8 MR. GOUGELET: And Joe, actually, I
9 couldn't agree more. I think there's some
10 important medical issues here that come up as
11 well. And I think the more we can stabilize
12 victims -- many victims have minor medical
13 problems that just need like routine medicines
14 and things -- and if we can provide for that in
15 a shelter, then they don't become patients
16 within the medical surge system which can be
17 overwhelmed and not really be able to take care
18 of them.

19 And it's the same with special
20 functional needs things, that if we can keep
21 family members together to support whatever
22 their needs are at that time, that prevents

1 them from coming into the medical system as
2 well. So I think the logic is strong, and I
3 would strongly support those efforts.

4 The other comment I have is, do we
5 need the word "mega" in the first bullet or
6 can we just say shelters in general?

7 MR. BECKER: I was going to say in the
8 industry -- in the shelter group of
9 organizations, mega-shelter has very specific
10 connotations. And it's not in the high school
11 gym. It's not in the church hall. It's in the
12 civic center. It's in the arena -- which have
13 come to be called mega-shelters. I don't
14 remember if the NRF calls it that or specializes
15 it or not.

16 SPEAKER: Yeah, I don't think so.

17 MR. BECKER: What we want -- there's a
18 host of issues why those buildings aren't
19 available to be used. Not the least of which is
20 a lot of them are revenue-generating buildings
21 and FEMA doesn't reimburse the lost revenue if
22 it becomes a shelter. But there's a lot of

1 reasons to no on those buildings, and we need to
2 figure a way to yes to put everybody -- like we
3 put everybody in the Astrodome in Houston during
4 Katrina. We need to be able to do that in large
5 scale events.

6 MR. GOUGELET: My question was don't
7 some of those same issues come up with the
8 schools and other buildings as well? And this
9 would support both of those efforts.

10 MR. BECKER: Christina, did you
11 have -- yeah.

12 MS. CATLETT: Joe, I know you probably
13 know this. I don't know that everybody's aware
14 that on Tuesday, the special needs subcommittee
15 was given a new document, called Interim
16 Emergency Management Planning Guide for Special
17 Needs Populations. Unfortunately, we haven't
18 had time to review it, but one thing that we did
19 notice is that there's only 2-1/2 pages that
20 describe FEMA's expectations for -- and I
21 haven't quite figured out whether it's for
22 special needs shelters in general or for

1 congregate shelters accommodating some of the
2 easier special needs.

3 So I think that we need -- we
4 realize that there was some overlap with
5 y'all's committee and our committee. So once
6 we review this document -- and we've got a
7 conference call coming up on the 25th -- we
8 will probably need to get back with you all
9 and figure out -- making sure that our
10 recommendations are congruent with your
11 recommendations and what not.

12 MR. BECKER: Thank you.

13 DR. BENNETT: Any additional comments?
14 Nancy?

15 MS. DRAGANI: I have a question that
16 really goes to whether or not you discussed
17 types of shelters and encouraged FEMA and the
18 housing task forces to look beyond congregate
19 care mega-shelters like the Astrodome to more
20 appropriate shelters, more appropriate for
21 families. And I guess I know there was some
22 discussion about using military bases that have

1 housing available, using colleges and
2 universities on the off-season. I think that
3 Astrodomes and mega-shelters as a congregate
4 care should really be the very, very last resort
5 if there's anything else out there. And I don't
6 know -- I know that's probably off the strategy,
7 but as soon as we start assuming that the only
8 place we can house large numbers of people is an
9 Astrodome-type facility, I think we're headed
10 down the same path we went years ago.

11 MR. BECKER: One of the tools that was
12 not in anybody's toolbox that we created on
13 Day 3 of Katrina was to declare the nation's
14 motels as shelters. And I know we worked
15 closely with our partners at FEMA. We put
16 400,000 people in motel rooms for 10 weeks, at a
17 cost of about a quarter of a billion dollars.
18 Our concern was they were all going to come back
19 into the affected area and sleep on the side of
20 the road, or on their cars, or whatever. So we
21 stood that program up. And then FEMA took it
22 after 10 weeks.

1 FEMA now has that in their toolbox.
2 They've got the contract. They're able to do
3 that.

4 To me, there's a lot of answers
5 before the mega-shelter, but we need the
6 mega-shelter, too. We needed Qualcomm during
7 the California wildfires to put the people in
8 because there were no motels and there was
9 nothing anywhere close to there. Where do
10 you put the next 10,000 people? It had to be
11 Qualcomm. So I think we need it as a tool.
12 But those things don't happen on the fly very
13 well. They need to be done ahead of time.

14 MR. BRUNO: Joe, can I ask just a
15 question? Nancy, you read that word congregate
16 shelter as meaning mega-shelter? Do you read it
17 that way? You don't read it as that, do you?

18 SPEAKER: (inaudible)

19 REPORTER: Use your microphone.

20 MR. BRUNO: I know it doesn't mean
21 that. I just wonder why --

22 MS. DRAGANI: It was more --

1 MR. BRUNO: I don't think -- I hope
2 we're not endorsing that we need to have
3 mega-shelters. You know, most people are trying
4 to avoid that. And certainly we are. I mean,
5 they may be necessary, but is there something in
6 the language that seems to be implying we should
7 be going that direction?

8 MS. DRAGANI: I guess because -- and I
9 think this has already come up -- because the
10 example used is mega-shelters. And the reality
11 is the interdependence of the voluntary sector
12 with tribal, state, and local government really
13 has to occur regardless of whether it's a
14 mega-shelter or not.

15 MR. BRUNO: So you would suggest we
16 take that example out? Someone else suggested
17 that, right?

18 SPEAKER: We can do that.

19 SPEAKER: Take mega out and put
20 (inaudible).

21 MR. BRUNO: And then probably that's
22 the right thing to do.

1 MR. BECKER: Yeah.

2 MR. BRUNO: I tend to agree. I think
3 that -- it's been haunting me, that word,
4 because it seems like we're pushing towards
5 that, and we don't want to push towards that.

6 MS. DRAGANI: Yeah.

7 MR. BECKER: So is there consensus in
8 the room to strike mega-shelter -- that example?

9 J.R.?

10 MR. THOMAS: I think one of the
11 reasons we put "mega" in was because of the lack
12 of acknowledgement within the housing strategy
13 that that might take place. Because there was
14 only like a sentence or two on one page that
15 talk about mega-shelters. And in reality, they
16 may occur. So I know I thought it was an
17 important issue to put it in, just as an
18 acknowledgement that they have not really
19 addressed that issue.

20 MS. EIDE: I agree with J.R., because
21 that is something that we wanted to address and
22 make sure that it's identified in there that you

1 may have to use a mega-type shelter as an ad hoc
2 type of shelter in the interim as you stage
3 people to get to these other places while we try
4 to figure out where we're going to put
5 everybody. But maybe we can take out the
6 example or put additional examples in.

7 MR. BECKER: I wonder just to
8 wordsmith, if we could have it say state and
9 local governments in large-scale events. What
10 we're talking about is how do they work together
11 in a large-scale event, and take out the
12 mega-shelter words. But what we're talking
13 about is how do you take care of the people in
14 something as big as that. Would that work?

15 MS. DRAGANI: Interdependence needs to
16 occur no matter what size the event if there are
17 shelters.

18 MR. BRUNO: Right.

19 MS. DRAGANI: So I think that's a
20 separate bullet. And what I heard J.R. say was
21 the housing strategy as it exists today doesn't
22 go into enough detail or reflection about the

1 fact that mega-shelters may in fact need to
2 occur. So I'm almost thinking it's a different
3 bullet if that's in fact, J.R., your concern.

4 MR. THOMAS: Yes.

5 MR. BECKER: We'll tweak the language.
6 What she just said -- we would have the first
7 bullet say we need the interdependence. It
8 doesn't matter how big the event is. It needs
9 to be in place. And then the second bullet is a
10 different thought, which is the housing strategy
11 does not call out as specifically as we would
12 want mega-shelters and provide that enough
13 detail. Does that work for the group? We'll
14 get the exact language, but that would be the
15 sentiment.

16 Heads are nodding, okay.

17 DR. BENNETT: But does that take us
18 where you said you didn't want to go earlier?
19 Does that put emphasis that mega-shelters now
20 are extremely important?

21 MR. GOUGELET: I think all they're
22 saying is it's only dedicated two lines in the

1 strategy. So if that warrants an extra bullet,
2 I think that's good. Is that right?

3 MR. BECKER: So the bullet would not
4 stress it as a cornerstone part of the tools,
5 but it needs to be there and it needs to be
6 given more thought?

7 MR. GOUGELET: That's what the
8 subcommittee felt.

9 MR. BECKER: Did you get all that?

10 MS. PRICE: Yes.

11 MR. BECKER: You got all that, Amy?
12 Okay. Great. Move on? Yes. Okay.

13 Frankly, I thought there'd be a lot
14 more conversation around special needs and
15 all that. If we're comfortable with that,
16 we'll move -- because then we've just got a
17 couple of more housekeeping things.

18 Private sector. It's too easy to
19 say you have to do a better job of working
20 with the private sector. Everybody knows you
21 have to do a better job of working with the
22 private sector. The piece here is go back to

1 the idea of FEMA as the think-tank or the
2 incubator of ideas. Where do the great ideas
3 come from that we can present in that menu of
4 options? And it's not just the business
5 sector. We need the universities. We need
6 the -- you know, we need everybody who's got
7 good thinking around that, and beyond the
8 idea of a contractor, we would say that FEMA
9 doesn't have a good way to develop that
10 relationship with the sector.

11 So as it relates to housing -- I
12 mean, there's a larger issue with FEMA with
13 the private sector. But as it relates to
14 housing, what we're saying is we need
15 particular ways to develop that linkage, not
16 just to be a contractor but to be the source
17 of ideas. We need the sector to be able to
18 provide that, and FEMA to recognize that
19 that's where the best thinking might be
20 taking place.

21 MR. PATURAS: Joe.

22 MR. BECKER: Yeah, Jim.

1 MR. PATURAS: Jim Paturas. Just a
2 thought on that based on some of the parentheses
3 you've used before. Would there be value to
4 including some examples. You say they're beyond
5 contracting for housing options. I just throw
6 it out to the group.

7 Would there be consideration for
8 putting some examples in, if you will? Is
9 that -- this leaves it open for anything,
10 which is fine, but it can also be interpreted
11 as being a little vague.

12 MR. BECKER: Other thoughts on that?

13 DR. BENNETT: I support that. I had
14 the same thing. What are those options?

15 MR. BECKER: So what I was just
16 referring to in terms of idea origination and
17 bringing --

18 DR. BENNETT: Yeah.

19 MR. BECKER: Okay.

20 DR. BENNETT: That clarifies it.

21 MR. BECKER: We'll add that. Thank
22 you. Okay, and then lastly, next slide. Our

1 subcommittee had a meeting with Adm. Johnson on
2 where this is all heading when he briefed us on
3 the housing strategy. We had a good
4 conversation about the idea that the housing
5 task force, when it stands up, needs an
6 advisory -- we said committee -- group of
7 people.

8 I mean, I don't know what it would
9 end up being called. It needs one of those.
10 And our recommendation -- we had
11 conversations back and forth. Our
12 subcommittee can't be that body, or shouldn't
13 be that body, because it's not -- it really
14 wouldn't want to be another FACA group, from
15 what I can understand. It would really want
16 to be a group that can work directly with
17 them.

18 Yet, we don't want -- this goes
19 back to your reporting question quite a while
20 ago. We want a linkage between our
21 subcommittee and the housing task force. We
22 think that's the best way for us to be

1 constructive going forward. And our thought
2 is that we would like members from the NAC
3 who are willing, particularly members from
4 the housing subcommittee, but members from
5 the NAC, to be willing to serve on whatever
6 that body becomes, which is the advisory body
7 to the task force. We'd like that
8 cross-pollination.

9 And then what we'd like the NAC
10 subcommittee to be is on the receiving end of
11 reporting from the task group. We would like
12 to receive the work of the task group and
13 have the NAC opine on the work of the task
14 group. We would like our subcommittee to
15 come back to the full NAC with our thinking
16 on what the task group is doing going
17 forward. It would have its own advisory body
18 but the NAC should still be weighing in, we
19 would suggest, with opinions about what that
20 task group is doing.

21 So going forward, we presume that
22 body would stand up. We'd like some of the

1 folks in this room to perhaps be on that
2 body, but we can't be that body. We can't be
3 the advisory group to the housing task force.

4 DR. BENNETT: Let me say the same
5 thing. I think it would be -- we should have a
6 recommendation that they do form an advisory
7 committee, and that members of this committee be
8 asked to be possible members of that, but it
9 wouldn't be as being members from this committee
10 representing this committee. That needs to be
11 clear.

12 MR. BECKER: Right.

13 DR. BENNETT: We're advisory to FEMA.
14 This is a task force that's being set up, so I
15 think our role is that -- for coordination
16 purposes and everything, we recommend that
17 members from this committee -- or one or two, or
18 some number, I don't know -- be appointed to an
19 advisory board for the task force. Then they,
20 in their capacities as members of that group,
21 would be able to report out what activities are
22 taking place to our subcommittee and to us. But

1 we've got to stay separate.

2 That would be -- that would not be
3 as a member representing this committee, but
4 it would be an interface kind of situation.
5 I think that's what you were saying, but I
6 just --

7 MR. BECKER: You said it much better.

8 DR. BENNETT: No, I just want to be
9 sure --

10 MR. BECKER: Just lastly, we still
11 have a piece of unfinished work, and that's on
12 the wraparound services -- the task group that
13 J.R. is heading up that's reporting back to our
14 subcommittee. We really want to get clarity
15 around what services we want to make sure are
16 available to people in whatever housing they end
17 up in post-disaster. So we would come back with
18 that.

19 So I think we need a motion, sir,
20 on the second half of this.

21 DR. BENNETT: I believe the second
22 half was four -- all parts of four and there

1 were three parts; right?

2 MR. BECKER: Four and five.

3 DR. BENNETT: And five, correct?

4 MR. BECKER: Correct.

5 DR. BENNETT: Five was relative to the
6 membership. And we're recommending that they
7 have an advisory committee, and then we're going
8 to recommend that somebody be chosen from this
9 committee, too, for interface purposes. Is that
10 how it would be worded?

11 I'm talking about number five.

12 MR. BECKER: Yeah, back on five. We
13 would tweak that language to make it clear that
14 they're not serving -- what you said.

15 DR. BENNETT: As official members,
16 because we can't -- I'll entertain a motion that
17 we adopt all parts of recommendation four, as
18 well as recommendation five.

19 Do I have a motion?

20 MR. KRUMPERMAN: So moved.

21 MR. STENSGAR: Second.

22 DR. BENNETT: Was that John that

1 moved? Kurt? Okay, who second?

2 MR. STENSGAR: John.

3 DR. BENNETT: John. Okay, John

4 second. All those in favor, say aye to the

5 motion.

6 SPEAKERS: Aye.

7 DR. BENNETT: All opposed? It

8 carries. Thank you.

9 We're going to -- Joe's going to

10 give us a brief -- no, that's okay. I'll

11 take it.

12 As part of the housing issue, Joe

13 is going to give us a little update here

14 on -- a few-minute presentation regarding the

15 housing in New York City, and the contest

16 they had and what they looked at. So he's

17 going to make a brief presentation to us.

18 MR. CONNORS: Mr. Chair, I need to

19 catch a plane. Is there any chance I might be

20 able to throw a couple of recommendations out

21 before I leave?

22 DR. BENNETT: Sure, since you have to

1 leave, let's do it.

2 MR. CONNORS: The first recommendation
3 I mentioned at our last council meeting, and
4 that was the possibility of having NAC members
5 invited by the regional administrator --

6 MS. PRICE: Izola.

7 MR. CONNORS: During a disaster
8 allowing us to be side-by-side with the FEMA
9 folks to see them in action so we could
10 understand a little bit more. So I envision
11 that when an event happens, the FEMA
12 administrator of our particular region knows who
13 we are, the members, and they would reach out to
14 us and offer any of the members within their
15 region the opportunity to come to that event
16 with them to watch what's happening.

17 The second thing I would like to
18 ask for a recommendation is to have FEMA
19 brief us on the COOP plan. Unclassified in
20 this particular setting, but also a potential
21 for some of us to have a classified briefing
22 on the COOP plan if that's possible, as well.

1 Maybe at the next meeting -- the next NAC
2 meeting -- we can have an overview of the
3 COOP plan for FEMA.

4 MR. SHEA: It's possible to do that,
5 Bob. I guess a couple of things. One, the COOP
6 plans, per se, are not classified. That's not
7 an area. There is a thing called continuity of
8 government, which is classified, which is a
9 whole different ballgame. And if that's what
10 you're asking for, the only other proviso I'll
11 give you is you have to hold a top secret
12 security clearance in order for this to happen.
13 I don't know what our membership has in terms of
14 security clearances at this point.

15 MR. CONNORS: But at least I think
16 we've learned a whole lot about FEMA in our time
17 together over the past year, and one of the
18 things that we probably should know about is how
19 prepared is FEMA's headquarters -- the
20 operational aspect at the headquarters -- how
21 ready are they to --

22 MR. SHEA: That's easy to do. We can

1 certainly give you a full briefing on that.

2 That's not classified at all.

3 MR. CONNORS: Good.

4 DR. BENNETT: I will also bring
5 forward next time -- I'll talk to FEMA about the
6 inclusion.

7 I have discussed this before with
8 Bob, and I think that's a good
9 recommendation. We'll report back on that.

10 MR. SHEA: Let me just point out, we
11 have about 18 open disaster joint field offices
12 right now. So what I'm saying to the Council at
13 large is if any of you have an interest in going
14 out, you just need to identify what times or
15 days you want to go, and I can arrange for you
16 to visit a joint field office.

17 I'd be happy to do that.

18 MS. ELGIN: Dr. Bennett?

19 At our last meeting in Chicago, we
20 brought up the idea of possibly having Nancy
21 Ward to come to one of the Council meetings.
22 Is that still going to be possible maybe for

1 December?

2 MR. SHEA: The answer is yes. We're
3 working on that. I believe it's very possible.

4 SPEAKER: Joe just went off the air, I
5 guess.

6 MS. PRICE: We were hoping that AV
7 could be here real quick to help us make the
8 presentation a little larger on the screen. For
9 some reason -- we don't understand why --

10 DR. BENNETT: Chuck?

11 MR. KMET: Another thing it would be
12 nice to have a briefing on, probably not
13 December, but maybe in the springtime since it
14 is relatively new, is all the -- I know we've
15 gotten information on the IMATs and that they're
16 coming up, but now that they're actually -- some
17 of them are in place, I'm assuming some of them
18 are being used -- it'd be nice to get a briefing
19 on that, especially as we're talking about the
20 credentialing and the new big push of
21 all-hazards incident management teams.

22 DR. BENNETT: I think that's a good

1 topic to be briefed on. Are there any -- you
2 know, while we're kind of talking here about
3 what we'd like to be briefed on, are there any
4 other topics that we would like to recommend
5 that FEMA may consider? They're not necessarily
6 urgent that we have to have them next time, but
7 something that right now comes to mind.

8 The other thing I would tell the
9 Council is if there are -- if there are
10 special things that you wish to address on
11 the agenda, let us know about those so we can
12 consider them being agenda items. Always
13 feel that you can contact myself -- of
14 course, go through Alyson, and we'll try to
15 be as accommodating as we can.

16 So let us know. We do have to put
17 the agenda ahead of time. We do have to
18 advertise it, so forth and so on in the
19 Federal Register. But we want to make sure
20 that we do address the issues that we need
21 to.

22 Are we ready yet?

1 Lee? Oh, I'm sorry.

2 MR. FELDMAN: Just to follow up on
3 Bob's question before regarding security
4 clearances. Has there ever been consideration
5 about providing NAC members with security
6 clearances if classified information was
7 necessary?

8 MR. SHEA: Lee, we've considered a
9 couple of things. One is, it's not inexpensive
10 to do it. And given the range of issues that we
11 typically deal with, classified topics are
12 probably not the greatest focus that we can
13 have. I think it's certainly on the table. If
14 the Council feels it's important and has areas
15 of the classified world they'd like to hear
16 about or be involved in, we can attempt to do
17 it. But it's not a light undertaking.

18 Let me put it that way. Either for
19 ourselves or for you. I don't know if you've
20 ever had the joy of filling out a Standard
21 Form 86, but --

22 MR. FELDMAN: I've had the pleasure,

1 yes.

2 MR. SHEA: It's a challenging
3 environment. Thank God for my mother. She
4 remembered it all.

5 MS. PRICE: While we're waiting for AV
6 staff to come help us out with this, I wanted to
7 again ask the members of the public if they had
8 any public statements to make. Was there
9 anybody who cared to make a public statement
10 today?

11 All right. Can we just hold on for
12 five minutes while we wait for the AV staff
13 to get here?

14 MR. BRUNO: Another time. I don't
15 want to hold people. Are you ready to shut
16 down?

17 REPORTER: Can you use your mike, sir?

18 MR. BRUNO: This is not on the record.

19 (Laughter)

20 MS. PRICE: I'd like to give the
21 opportunity to follow up on this. I think he's
22 going to be here in just a second, and I'd like

1 to follow up on the very interesting -- here
2 they are -- the very interesting presentation
3 that Mr. Bruno provided back at the February
4 meeting. This is the follow-up. And here's the
5 AV staff. We're trying to make this
6 presentation a little bigger on the screen.

7 Everybody move up to the front of
8 the room, please. I'm kidding.

9 MR. BRUNO: Just to go over very
10 quickly what we did. This is the latest
11 iteration of our "what if" competition. We put
12 this out on September 27, 2007, internationally
13 to see who might have some ideas going forward
14 to try to build our post-disaster housing in New
15 York City. We got 117 submissions from 30
16 countries. We then had a jury -- after all were
17 received, the jury met on January 22, 2008. And
18 we selected 10 winners and 10 runners-up.
19 You're going to see, I think, just the 10
20 winners here.

21 We had architects, urban planners,
22 engineers, and some local people in

1 construction, along with city agencies.

2 When we did our selection, then we
3 provided technical reviews of all of the 10
4 winners from our Department of Design and
5 Construction on March 15, 2008, and we said
6 answer these questions and adjust your
7 submission to us.

8 To entice them to do that, we gave
9 them \$5,000 each to get going on it. We then
10 gave them another \$5,000 in August of 2008
11 when they had submitted the final plan. So
12 they received each a \$10,000 stipend from the
13 Rockefeller Foundation that funded this
14 program. They're interested because it has
15 international interest to them, and that's
16 why they're doing it.

17 On August 7, just a short while
18 ago, we had a technical review of the
19 enhanced submissions. And we've come down in
20 New York now to essentially two things that
21 we're interested -- two designs -- and I'll
22 point them out as we go through. And two

1 mechanisms -- one on barges and one on land.

2 So I thought you might be
3 interested. The only last point I want to
4 mention to you is the guy who narrates this
5 is a guy who walked into our office from our
6 office of volunteers. He's in excess of 80
7 years old. He's a volunteer with us, and
8 he's fallen in love with OEM. He's now paid
9 as an employee. He's got a terrific voice.
10 He's a retired actor, so you're going to -- I
11 hope this thing will work now.

12 VIDEO NARRATOR: New York City's
13 Office of Emergency Management initiated the
14 What-If New York City design competition to
15 address the unique challenges in providing
16 temporary urban housing after a major coastal
17 storm. Population density and a lack of open
18 land make typical provisional housing ill-suited
19 for New York City's needs.

20 In September of 2007, Mayor
21 Bloomberg announced OEM's international call
22 for architects and designers to submit

1 innovative ideas for solving the problem.
2 The call resulted in 117 entries from 30
3 countries. A panel of experts gathered at
4 OEM headquarters to review the field. Ten
5 winners and ten honorable mentions were
6 chosen by the competition jury on January 22,
7 2008.

8 Ten winners moved into Phase II of
9 the competition. In this project development
10 period, the winners completed further work on
11 their design.

12 Phase II has resulted in the
13 following submissions: Submission No. 1
14 proposes a network of national stockpiles
15 that can be mobilized from any location in
16 the United States. Localities will have
17 their own community provisional residence
18 fleet ready to be deployed, constructed,
19 deconstructed, and eventually returned.

20 The panels of a typical 650 square
21 foot CPR are fabricated from lightweight
22 honeycomb composite resin panels and are

1 dismantled to fit into 6 high-impact pods for
2 efficient transport. The basic unit can be
3 modified to become a studio or larger family
4 unit, and can be stacked up to four stories.
5 Disassembling CPR units will create no waste
6 or landfill material. The unit is designed
7 to meet lead for homes platinum certification
8 and is powered by a four kilowatt residential
9 fuel cell.

10 The second submission suggests
11 prebuilt apartment units on barges that can
12 be towed to affected areas quickly. The
13 offshore location allows repair work to
14 continue on the devastated areas and greatly
15 reduces the project's carbon footprint. When
16 moored side-by-side, the barges create public
17 green spaces between the housing blocks.

18 Units are clad in fiberglass and
19 provide one- and two-bedroom arrangements.
20 Operating completely off the grid, the units
21 are powered by wind turbines, and the hull of
22 the barge contains a wastewater treatment

1 system.

2 Submission No. 3, living modular,
3 proposes hexagonal units grouped to create
4 courtyards, and can be used among varying
5 levels of remaining building fabric. The
6 units are flat packed, locally assembled, and
7 outfitted. Their unique shape allows for
8 greater unit variety and flexibility. The
9 courtyards organize community activities,
10 infrastructural services, and a postal
11 addressing system.

12 Units are constructed of a
13 fiberglass composite material that releases
14 no toxic fumes during production and is
15 warrantied for 20 years. Mechanical services
16 travel vertically in a central core from the
17 utility units that house tanks for
18 freshwater, wastewater, and generator fuel.

19 The fourth proposal, CLA, uses
20 modified shipping containers, with
21 preassembled sliding technology from the RV
22 industry, to maximize unit size and

1 flexibility. Units come in seven types, and
2 when stacked four high, are arranged to face
3 interior courtyards. CLA units arrive fully
4 stocked with a week's worth of food and
5 water, and make use of solar panels, gray
6 water recycling, and micro turbines.
7 Manufactured plug-ins are removed, and
8 containers are easily transported away from
9 the site.

10 Submission No. 5 is an ecological
11 model of manufacturing that uses automobile
12 industry technology to create lightweight,
13 reusable, and flexible structures.
14 Preassembled within the standards of global
15 shipping, the system uses scissor lifts
16 integrated with hinged wall panels to expand
17 into three-story housing. The strength and
18 precision of a manufactured car door is the
19 model used for creating exterior wall panels
20 that achieve a fully weather-sealed living
21 environment.

22 The system contains both standard

1 and EP systems and vertical circulation,
2 making it an all-inclusive design which is
3 rapidly deployable and easily maintained.
4 Using existing foundations, such as parking
5 lots, sidewalks, and highway underpasses as
6 the key sites for development, the system
7 will not interfere with redevelopment of
8 private lots.

9 The sixth proposal elevates units
10 above the streets, leaving adjacent sites
11 free for redevelopment, and streets open to
12 traffic. The scaffold system ships units on
13 hydraulic trailers that lift units to a new
14 living surface above the cleared roadways.

15 Like a matchbox, the units slide
16 out to expand, doubling their size and
17 increasing shipping efficiency. New land
18 created above the streets provides new public
19 space and a controlled environment for
20 residents.

21 Submission No. 7 proposes
22 manufactured container-like units that occupy

1 the space over the street to leave the
2 affected areas open for redevelopment. The
3 superstructure forms a linear city that
4 traces the border between affected and
5 unaffected areas. The system includes wind
6 turbines and photovoltaics for power
7 generation and a rainwater harvesting system.

8 The eighth proposal deploys
9 infrastructural threads into coastal wetlands
10 that tether barges of provisional housing and
11 accelerate the restoration of wetlands.

12 Units are manufactured offsite and can be
13 configured on barges at multiple densities.
14 Only two unique panels must be manufactured
15 to construct the unit, along with the wet
16 cores and a stair and ramp component.

17 Wind turbines, PV cells, and
18 hydroturbines allow the system to operate off
19 the grid, while the wetland barges provide
20 natural wastewater filtration. When
21 permanent housing is rebuilt on land, the
22 housing barges leave, but the threads remain

1 as a system of recreational pads through the
2 emerging salt marsh.

3 System No. 9, the patch system,
4 takes advantage of a local urban redundancy,
5 the ubiquitous construction scaffold as the
6 superstructure for provisional housing. The
7 cells' prefabricated panels are sized to
8 allow volunteers to assemble the units after
9 professionals have erected the scaffolding.

10 The standard, fully insulated
11 aluminum wall panel can be configured for a
12 seemingly endless variety of unit types. The
13 scaffolding becomes a readymade field
14 awaiting the receipt of modular housing
15 cells.

16 The tenth submission, RDIC, stems
17 from the analysis of two housing
18 alternatives -- rigid shipping containers and
19 inflatable architecture. The units are
20 self-supported up to nine units high and can
21 be single- or double-loaded to fit site
22 conditions. One side of these container-like

1 structures folds down to deploy an inflatable
2 section made of two-ply translucent
3 urethane-coated nylon. And that doubles the
4 size of the unit. Open units leave gaps on
5 the wall of the agglomeration, providing
6 natural ventilation and public space with
7 views into the neighborhood.

8 The results of the competition have
9 brought us one step closer to a provisional
10 housing prototype for urban areas like New
11 York City. For more information on the
12 winners' submissions, see our online gallery
13 at www.whatifNYC.net.

14 MR. BRUNO: That's it. The two
15 that -- we have selected two that we kind of
16 like. And they are -- the first one you saw, we
17 like the design. It's a modular design. We
18 like the way it's laid out, but we probably will
19 use a container-based solution because
20 containers allow us -- one, they're inexpensive.
21 We can build them out fairly inexpensively, and
22 we can stack them as high as we want. We can go

1 up to eight stories. We don't think we'll ever
2 do that, but we might go up four, which will not
3 require then an elevator.

4 So the other two things, we kind of
5 decided -- we're not finished yet but this is
6 where we're leaning -- we like the barge
7 solution treading water. We'd like to put
8 units on that -- the container-based units on
9 that because we think we can bring those into
10 areas that would logically be hit. And the
11 other, of course, is a land-based solution.

12 So there are two we looked at. We
13 like the modular unit -- very hard to build.
14 It takes an awful lot of expertise and
15 they're hard to put together. The other ones
16 we looked at with the jury -- the technical
17 jury -- they all had some problems.

18 Some with stability. Others on
19 whether they were practical. Some the
20 scissor thing, which was really beautiful,
21 requires that car manufacturing industry do
22 all this work for us. Not going to happen.

1 When you come down to it, we want
2 something that we can build quickly and as
3 inexpensively as possible. But one thing
4 that's happening in the container industry,
5 they are building now luxury homes and
6 bringing containers as the base for that home
7 all over the world now. Even in Europe,
8 they're doing quite a bit of that. Even in
9 the United States, they're doing it. So
10 there's an awful big industry out there that
11 we're tapping into -- and we did tap into
12 with this. And in our technical jury.

13 So that's where we're going. I
14 thought you might find it interesting. We're
15 doing a lot of work. We're going to keep
16 going. I'm going to be presenting this to
17 Harvey and his entire housing solutions
18 group. He's invited me to come back as soon
19 as I'm ready to do it, which is very soon.
20 And we're going to give them a nice rundown
21 of where we're at and have them take these
22 solutions. We own these. New York City owns

1 each one of these. Anyone who came into this
2 competition, we have full rights to use all
3 117 that we have. And certainly any of the
4 winners.

5 We have an arrangement with the
6 owners. We will bring them in to assist as
7 part of the technical team when we start
8 building this stuff out. But in the end, is
9 New York City capable of doing this on a
10 major, major scale? I think this is a
11 solution in some ways for good parts of the
12 country -- not every part. And I think in
13 the end, that's what our housing subcommittee
14 is saying -- here's a beginning of a menu of
15 options, and FEMA has done a lot on its own.

16 So thank you very much.

17 MS. EIDE: Joe, I have a quick
18 question.

19 MR. BRUNO: Sure.

20 MS. EIDE: When you guys did this, did
21 you have anybody plot out the amount of land
22 that would need to be used for each different

1 type of model?

2 MR. BRUNO: Yeah. I mean, we have
3 worked out the schematics and the land base.
4 That's why we know we have to build density.

5 MS. EIDE: Yes, and so the clearing
6 that would have to take place prior to that and
7 stuff like that?

8 MR. BRUNO: Some of the solutions
9 would go in areas we would clear first, like
10 streets. But we are not necessarily in favor of
11 that. We don't think it creates the environment
12 we want. But we will be clearing land quickly,
13 and we'll build right on that land. We also
14 have done a lot of work on the legal side using
15 property during declared emergencies. These are
16 difficult things.

17 MS. EIDE: But that information would
18 be available in those prototype plans. You
19 could see each type would take?

20 MR. BRUNO: Oh, absolutely. Each of
21 these would have to have construction drawings.
22 We will have those. But it's a standard

1 shipping container.

2 It's an 8 by about 32, something
3 like that. Okay? Anything else?

4 DR. BENNETT: We have one more.

5 MR. STENSGAR: Just a quick comment.

6 I mean, we looked at this technology -- oh, it
7 must have been 2001, 2002 -- actually looking at
8 it to assist us with our housing shortages. I'm
9 just glad to see that it's being looked at for
10 uses in other avenues.

11 And I don't think getting the
12 infrastructure as we reviewed the material
13 back then was that difficult.

14 I mean, getting the plumbing and
15 the wiring and all of that in, I don't think
16 it's as tough as maybe you made it sound.
17 But yeah, it's definitely a viable option.
18 As you stated, you can go eight stories high
19 with those.

20 MR. BRUNO: A lot of these units on
21 the infrastructure for the units come preset
22 core capacity. So you could stack them in a

1 nice way and get pretty good use. Also, in New
2 York we have -- our water system runs on
3 gravity. We have water up to the sixth, seventh
4 floor of any building unless it becomes
5 nonpotable, which we could even deal with that.
6 We're always going to have water. We have a
7 very robust infrastructure for our electric
8 system. So we think we could get things back up
9 and running, but we'd have to do it -- most of
10 them have solutions that do not require
11 on-the-grid, but could be off-the-grid for a
12 while.

13 It's not simple. Not simple. We
14 know that. It's a difficult thing, but we're
15 taking those steps, and I hope the steps
16 we're taking will help FEMA out. Thank you.

17 DR. BENNETT: Thank you very much,
18 Joe. I'll remind everyone we will -- our next
19 meeting is planned in Dallas, Texas, on
20 December 9th through 11th. But keep in mind
21 that it is a possibility because of the
22 transition that they may shift the date. But

1 that's what we're going for. We're going to
2 plan for it. We believe that will occur, but
3 something could happen. You know, we don't know
4 with the transition going on.

5 And that closes my remarks.

6 Alyson, I'll go to you.

7 MS. PRICE: If there are no further
8 questions or items for discussion, thank you
9 very, very much for your time and all your hard
10 work. I hope you have a very safe trip home.

11 The meeting is adjourned. Thank
12 you.

13 (Whereupon, at approximately 2:50
14 p.m., the MEETING was adjourned.)

15 * * * * *

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

