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MR. SHEA: Good morning, and thanks again for joining us here. The administrator is on his way. He'll be joining us here momentarily to make some remarks. In the interim, though, we thought that we should welcome you back. Hopefully you all got a reasonable night's sleep and maybe something to eat from a reasonable restaurant last night.

All that kind of thing.

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

MR. GOUGELET: Yes.

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

MR. CONNORS: I second the motion.

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

MR. PATURAS: I thought we did that last night.
MG LIBBY: Did we? Well, do you want to do it again?

(Chorus of Happy Birthday)

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

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

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

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

Do you want to speak with --

MR. PAULISON: Are you talking to me?

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

MR. PAULISON: How are you doing?

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

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

Can you hear me with that? All
right. This thing works.

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

I said you've got too much stuff up here.

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

What a difference a year makes.

Here this last year going through, picking out people we wanted to serve on the committee, asking you to do that, and here we are now a year later, a very vibrant body that's working hard. And I've been very proud of what you've done. You're a strong, robust committee. You're tackling real issues. You're giving us feedback that we need, and I appreciate that very much. You are going to make FEMA a stronger
organization, and I hope you recognize that.

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

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

Ken Murphy, you know very well.
NEMA president, one of the most respected emergency managers from around the country.

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

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

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

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

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

It's not designed to be a quick
fix. You need to hear that. The plan is in
place to get us through this year, as I said.
But the release of the strategy in July that
you have is going to give us additional
advice and input that we want to get from
you. And particularly as we work through the
annexes. Because I want this thing done by
the fall. We've distributed it on to you,
but the National Council for Disabilities has
Several federal agencies have it. The state and local emergency managers have it. We want to make sure that we get all the input we can to make that document as deliberate as we can. I want a deliberate course. I want to make sure that we set the vision of goals for this organization as we move into this.

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

We have to elevate the issue of safety, security, and access to people with disabilities. Some of those things, we definitely learned during Katrina, where we
had over 140,000 families in travel trailers and mobile homes. And we definitely learned a lot of lessons. And we would be unconscionable if we did not learn from those lessons and put those in place. And that's what we're going to do.

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

The other is a grants program. Sue ran the grants program when she was here, and we've -- it's one of those issues -- it's probably one of the most key things we do with local communities. It provides dollars out there to states to really kind of run
their business and help this country become

This year we announced -- Secretary

Chertoff announced almost $1.7 billion in

grants that went out the door a couple of

weeks ago. They focus on tribes, states,

local communities, organizations, and help

individuals also prepare for national manmade

disasters, including acts of terrorism.

I think you can clearly see that

this administration, Department of Homeland

Security and FEMA are really committed to

providing the resources necessary to make

this country safer. And that money will go a

long way towards doing that.

We took over the grants just this

last year, and we worked very hard to make

that process as transparent as possible. We

want it efficient. We want it swift. In

fact, this year, the grants went out ahead of

schedule and ahead of our legal deadline.

And that's something that has not happened in
the past -- sorry, Sue. It's not her fault.

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

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

MR. SHEA: He is.

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

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

The next thing I want to talk about is you're going to have a lot of people coming in front of you asking for new subcommittees. One will be Urban Search and Rescue. I want you to listen to those people very carefully. They're a group of people -- we have 28 teams around the country. They're called on to do some very dangerous work at a moment's notice. They do an outstanding job.
But there are going to be others who come in front of you, and I would just ask as they do that that you give those people careful consideration. And I know that every time you add a subcommittee, that creates more work for you, so it takes views on both sides.

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

Actually, although you're going to be going into the next year, our winter meeting coming up will probably be my last one. And I have to tell you, I've been proud to be part of putting this organization together. You are going to be invaluable to
FEMA and to Homeland Security. And again, I appreciate your service and what you've done.

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

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

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

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

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

We as an advisory council advise you there's going to be a change in administration. We'll have somebody else that we're going to provide advice to. What
advice are you going to give to the next FEMA administrator?

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

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

You're going to be working on some very important issues -- you already are. And they're going to be key to FEMA. So I think establishing, Kem, that early communication piece. You know, Kem and I have had a relationship for a long time. But I don't know who the new person is going to be so you're going to have to develop that.

And I think you all should do the same, too, with the key committees. Just pick up the
phone and call them. And so it's going to take some work, because it's going to be a new person coming in, maybe not used to working with a committee like this. And maybe not understanding how valuable you can be to a new administrator. It's all about communication. Like everything else, it's all about communication. Yes?

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

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

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

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

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

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

I've committed that I'm going to make sure that whoever comes in is going to get everything, every bit of knowledge, all
those lessons learned that we've gathered
over the last 2-1/2 years and put it on their
plate. There is going to be no partisan
politics in this transition, and I'm going to
make sure of that.

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

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

What else? Is everybody awake?
Way in the back. You're going to have to
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 really are only for the NAC members. And so members of the public, any sort of comments during the meeting from the public need to be only for during the public comment period. And if you'd like, I can talk to you about this later, but the purposes of the Federal Advisory Committee are for the National Advisory Committee only. I can talk to you about it later if you'd like.

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

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

8      MS. DRAGANI: Administrator, I have kind of a philosophical question, I guess.
Oftentimes, years later, historians look back on significant events and come to a different conclusion than we might have come to in the heat of the battle. So I guess my suspicion, the more I read about FEMA's response to Katrina, the more that I personally believe there was a lot more response than we are even close to being aware of as the general public.

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

MR. PAULISON: I think they should have a different view. But because of the tag that FEMA got of being totally incompetent, I don't know that we're going to be able to shake that. I can tell you that over a million people were moved out of Louisiana and Mississippi and
were housed by FEMA people. And we found places
for everybody to stay.

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

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

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

A lot of bad things happened. And
everything bad that happened wasn't FEMA's
fault. There was very, very poor
decision-making at the local level, at the
state level. The parishes did not have -- I
don't want to say they didn't have good
communication -- they had no communication
with the state at all, so there was a major
breakdown. So you didn't know what the
issues were. We normally deal directly with the state. So lack of visibility of what was actually happening, was a big problem. Not even knowing what was going on at the Superdome or what was happening at the Convention Center or up on the bridges -- I mean big, big problems.

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

Sue?

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

MR. PAULISON: I'm sorry to hear that.
MS. MENCER: I know. And I will have James Leewed (?), and P.J. Crowley (?), and Stephen Flynn (?), and others on the panel. What question would you like me to ask these people?

MR. PAULISON: Oh, my goodness. Now you're really going to get me in trouble here.

I think --

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

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

That's what keeps me up at night.
And I would ask them what are their recommendations -- how do we get across to the American public that even if the local, the state, and the federal government are working perfectly in sync, you cannot take care of everybody if they don't take some responsibility themselves.

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

Joe will tell you -- they were down there, too. And you could not keep up with the lines of people that wanted an MRE and two bottles of water. There just was no reason for it. There was tap water. I mean, so that's what bothers me. If something really catastrophic happens in this country,
I'm concerned that with the lack of personal preparations, it's going to be very difficult to deal with it. So ask them how to fix that and let me know what they say.

Angela?

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

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

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

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

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

MR. MURPHY: No, I was just thinking. Probably more of a comment. One, number one, thank you from the emergency management community for working with us -- and that
transparency. And I hope that one thing you do
leave the transition team -- and I'm pretty sure
Nancy Ward will take this with her -- is just
that continued drive to rebuild and strengthen
and improve FEMA. I know the emergency
management directors, in talking to them,
they're seeing the results of the rebuild
program of the new FEMA.

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

MR. PAULISON: I appreciate that.

We've got a lot of work to do. I mean, we're
not done by any means. And there's logistics
issues we're still working on. Obviously, the
housing issues we're still working on. So a lot
of things we need to do.

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

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

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

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

I'd just like to commend you for
your leadership. In Indian country,
historically the federal government would ask
for input and leaders would get together and
really pinpoint what the issues are, bring
them forward to the government, and two or three months later, a decision comes out like they never even heard us.

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

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

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

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

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

What else? Yes, sir.

MR. DECKER: Chief, on behalf of the
local emergency managers, certainly I would want
to jump on Ken's comment and say that I know
from IM's perspective, we've really appreciated
the openness and the dialogue between
FEMA -- the new FEMA -- and local emergency
managers. We don't think we've had a
communication stream like that for a long, long
time. And we appreciate it.

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

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

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

We went back and looked at the
number of disaster declarations that have
been issued under President Bush, and he's
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
that we could learn from?

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

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

Some of those mobile homes -- in
fact, the bulk of them have an exterior door
for where the hot water heater is. It's a
fire safety issue. Instead of an interior door. So we normally don't open that up because it's sealed. It's mostly for the plumber, the electrician, or the gas person to get in there and fix it. So they opened one, and for some reason it had mold on the inside of the door. And so the lieutenant governor came back that night and said I want every one of them out of the state.

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

That's why working with Joe -- Joe's done a great job and come up with some alternative ideas for emergency housing. And we're taking some of those ideas, and that's what we want to incorporate
into our housing strategy. I'm not

convinced -- one, I'm not convinced FEMA

should be in the housing business at all. I
don't know how to get out of it.

And two, I'm surely not convinced

that the mobile homes or travel trailers are
the right answer. Right now, that's all we
have, so we'll keep using it until we can do
something else.

So this committee here can really

brainstorm and come up with some ideas. And

Joe, I appreciate you being here. Joe is one

of those very busy and very well-respected

emergency managers that takes the time to

serve on committees like this. I want to

thank you personally for that.

MR. THOMAS: Administrator, having

been a president of IAEM a few years ago and now

currently working with Save the Children, an

international organization, we've learned a lot

from the other countries that we deal with on

emergency response. Has there been much of an
international contingent, or have you really
reached out to other countries to see what
they're doing and how the responses take place?

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

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

So they really have a tough time if
they have to do some type of mass
evacuation -- and where to put people. It's
a struggle. So I think as far as emergency
management, I will put the United States'
local emergency managers and state emergency
managers up against anybody in the world.

I'll tell you right now, I don't think anybody does it better than we do. That doesn't mean we can't learn from them, because there are things that they do that we do learn from, but mostly they come here to learn.

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

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

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

Thank you very much.

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

MR. PAULISON: Okay.

MR. SHEA: We're going to try and use
just a brief agenda wrench right at the moment.
Yesterday -- I know this has never happened in
history -- I made a mistake. So we want to try
to correct it. John Stensgar is one of our new
councilmembers who was not sworn in yesterday,
so we want to spend just a moment to do that.
And then some of the other new members, we would also use this opportunity to take an individual photo with you if you don't mind.

MR. PAULISON: Okay.

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

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

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

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

John, congratulations.

(John Stensgar sworn in)

MR. PAULISON: Congratulations.

Welcome onboard.

(Appause)

MR. PAULISON: Thank you for being here.

MR. SHEA: I would also like to request that the other new members come on up and take a photo with the Administrator as well.
MR. STENSGAR: Those are almost the same words I used when I got sworn into the Army.

MR. PAULISON: Well, there you go.

(Group photographs)

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

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

SPEAKER: That's fine.

SPEAKER: Sorry, folks.

SPEAKER: John, you first? All right.

(Individual photographs)

MR. PAULISON: Kern, thanks a lot.

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

It's interesting. He was talking about the international people coming through his office and what they're doing in emergency management. I had the opportunity to be in Great Britain here just a while ago.
and met with the head of Great Britain's emergency management. And I asked him what is the topic that they're working on in Great Britain -- what are his top four or five things, and it sounded exactly like our subcommittee list. I mean, it really was. It was a one-to-one mapping of the same issues we're looking at here. So he's been out looking at our websites and seeing what's going on.

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

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

And I believe we're moving there.

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

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

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

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

So when we were adopting individual assistance or public assistance to go forward, they're really recommendations of what we think are things to keep in mind and
to look at. There'll be plenty of time for the final review of the documents, and public comments and so forth will come later. I think there might have been a little confusion there. I just wanted to make that particular comment.

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

Then we'll have the reports from the Post-Disaster and NIMS Subcommittees will also take place today. So with that, let's move into our agenda. I would like to ask Pauline Campbell if she could come forward and give us her report.
MS. CAMPBELL: Good morning. I'm going to try to make this as brief as possible because I understand your agenda is a little bit behind schedule. So if there's something of interest and I'm moving too quickly, just ask me to pause and I'll go back and respond to it.

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

So with that, we're looking at a permanent full-time workforce authorized ceiling right now of 4007. Within the next category, we have disaster assistance employees. Within that group we have what we...
call reservists as well as local hires.

Reservists are individuals that work for us on an on-call basis. Basically, they make themselves available whenever they feel like working and we call them up for whatever disaster we need them on -- versus local hires who are hired within the disaster area to support the operations that are going on.

They generally work for us for about 120 days.

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

Just to give you a historical perspective of the agency, from 1996 to July of this year -- you'll notice from the
permanent full-time workforce that there was no real increase until 2008. We're roughly,
I'd say -- between 1996 and 2000, you'll notice it went down. Between 2000 and 2007, we went up a couple of hundred employees.
And now we are at 3100.

Now, our temporary workforce, if you'll look at that, this includes the disaster assistance employees, the local hires, reservists, as well as CORE employees.

Now, COREs didn't exist back in 1996. We had some other category. I won't even go into that. But we had a reduction in 2000 from that number. In 2007, our temporary workforce was actually about 24,000. We had the National Disaster Medical System, which was a part of FEMA -- left the agency I want to say like April or May. I can't remember the time frame. So that was 10,000 employees that we lost. Our current number of temporary employees, 13,000.

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

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

Just to give you an idea -- between 2007 and 2008, by race and national origin of the PFT and the CORE workforce -- I've noted by each one of the categories what the civilian labor force percentage is. And that's basically how we measure. Right now,
you will note that the agency exceeds the
civilian labor force in African-American.
We're almost meeting Hispanic -- we're not
quite there. American-Indian, and we're not
quite there in Asian. So where we are short
or do not compare exactly is in our Caucasian
race.

We can skip that. For hiring. So
far in 2008, we've had 312 new hires for
permanent full-time employees, with
31 percent of them being minority, and 920
temporaries at 28 percent. And so here's a
perspective. In comparison on the percent of
totals, it was very interesting for me to
note that our hiring percentages are very
complicable to the percentage of who's onboard
right now. So Caucasian was about
64 percent -- 68 percent is what was hired
this year; 27 percent African-American, where
we stand at 24 percent. So these slides are
in your packets. As I said, I'm not going to
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, the agency is looking at recruitment opportunities for those categories, especially in our permanent full-time workforce.

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

3 Questions I can respond to?

4 MR. LANCASTER: Yes, John Lancaster with National Council on Independent Living. Do
you have any statistics, or are you tracking any way -- or what are your efforts in terms of outreach to people with disabilities?

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes, I do. Right now, our workforce for disabled employees -- in our permanent full-time workforce, we have 21. However, in our disaster workforce, we have another 63, excuse me. We have decreased because we have lost a few people through retirements. Our numbers were a little better. I'm a little disappointed right now, but we are doing some outreach, through some job fairs, that are focused on hiring disabled. We recently, through a partnership with our human resources office, are establishing a specific recruitment activity for disabled employees. So we are working through that right now. We also are trying to get some of our organizations looking at the workforce recruitment program, which is for disabled students. So we doing a number of things in that area. We're not quite
there yet, but we are working on those.

Yes?

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

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

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

MS. CAMPBELL: I would not say that there is a specific program. I would say that our agency is using training opportunities. I
I know that individuals go through details. The 13 through 15 numbers actually look very good in comparison to the civilian labor force, as well as to many other federal agencies. So yes, there is effort working there. I will tell you that just the number of African-Americans and Hispanics in the SES right now is much improved from where we were.

Other questions?

MR. SHEA: Thank you very much, Pauline.

MS. CAMPBELL: Sure.

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

MR. SHEA: Regional Assistance Committee, RAC.

DR. BENNETT: The RAC, excuse me.

MR. SARUBBI: Good morning. Can 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.
Our Regional Advisory Council first met almost about a year ago, October 25th of last year.

We have about 20 members of our committee, and they have staggered appointments from one to three years so that they all aren't leaving at the same time.

Our group has decided to have quarterly meetings, so we've had now four meetings.

Our first meeting being, as I said, in October of last year, and our most recent meeting being in Richmond, Virginia, in the middle of July.

As you can see, we have a very diverse membership. Those 20 members represent a broad spectrum of disciplines.

We have two state emergency management directors, two deputy state management directors. We have law enforcement, health, local county emergency managers represented.

You can see, Special Needs, we have Joanne Knapp, who is the preparedness
disabilities coordinator for the state of Maryland. At least one of our local emergency managers is a woman from Chesapeake, Virginia, is also the president of the Virginia Emergency Managers Association, so we have reached back into all of the folks in that group as well.

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

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

And our next meeting is in November in Chester County EOC in Chester County.
Pennsylvania. It gives the members an opportunity to get to know the region -- get out to see the different entities within the region, as well as to pick up the local issues in the particular states or counties as well.

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

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

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

After we chose those priorities, we set up -- we call them advisory teams. For some reason, the group didn't like the term "subcommittees," so we changed it to "advisory teams," and they were okay with that. So we've got three advisory teams set up on those first three initiatives. We haven't really gotten into private sector integration as yet, but that will be something we'll probably start to move into at our next meeting in Chester County.
These groups -- in between meetings, they will have telephone conference calls. We haven't done any VTCs yet but we may do that as well, just to keep the momentum going. Each of the advisory teams has a subject matter expert assigned to them.

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

Go ahead. Let's see. I think I've covered most of that. But just in terms of some of the issues -- I'll go a little bit into some of the issues that they've addressed. As far as situational awareness goes, as the chief indicated earlier, with our new posture of leading forward, it's really important that we have good, timely situational awareness. And as part of that, each of the regions are standing up their RRCC watch -- 24 by 7 eventually. We've
stood up ours 12 by 7 to give us conductivity in situational awareness of what's going on throughout the region.

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

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

So there's a lot of different constituencies that we have to satisfy. So we're using the advisory team to help us
identify what information we need to be collecting, how we need to correlate and analyze that information, and then how do we share that information. We've gotten a lot of positive feedback from our state EOCs, for example, on a regional daily situational report that we put together -- that kind of gives a summary of what's going on in the region.

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

Again, a lot of information is coming in. We don't want to provide just another report that people are just going to delete in their e-mail and so forth. So we
got some good advice from them on that.

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

But there's issues there as well.

What information do we want that consequence
managers and mercy managers want? And then
what do we do with that information?

Obviously, we're not policemen. We're not
going to go out and investigate cases of
white powder incidents or other kinds of
things, but we do want to know what the
intelligence says. What's going on in terms
of trends and analysis so that we can
anticipate what the need might be at the
federal level, should there be some terrorist
incident or something that might overwhelm state and local law enforcement and so forth. So we're working closely with our advisory team members. As I said, we have law enforcement, and with the state directors, and some of the others, in figuring out what kind of information we need and how we can share that information in a way that's useful to the leadership within FEMA and DHS, and also our state and local partners.

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

One of the things that we're getting back from our advisory team is there's too many exercises. And they're overwhelmed with the number of exercises. So we're trying to provide some
leadership at least within the region to
identify exercises and share that information
with everyone so we make sure we're all aware
of what exercises are going on and we're
doing the right exercises without
overburdening people.

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

There's an exercise, for example,
that's coming up here shortly that's going to
deal with power outages, which is something
our states wanted to deal with -- as opposed
to some of these other things that get thrown
on them. It comes from the bottom up, and I
think it's going to be a good exercise. And we've asked the advisory team to help us to communicate on that.

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

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

We had a great discussion during
the last meeting, for example, on trying to educate families through the children through the schools.

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

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

So we've kind of had some
discussions on that. A lot of different opinions on that subject just within our region. And then the messaging. How do you get the messaging out there?

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

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

Also, I failed to mention, in your notebook, I think you have a summary of all the activities of all the RAC committees for various regions and what they do. I think you'll see there's some commonality in some of the activities they're looking at. For example, I think training and exercise is something that many of the committees are
looking at as well. And then citizen preparedness, I believe, is another one. So I'll ask you to take a look at that. If you have any particular questions, I think you can ask Alyson on those. But subject to any questions -- yes?

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

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

MR. STENSGAR: I can't speak for what the other regions are doing. I can tell you from a Region III perspective, we've been
putting out a daily report now for probably a little over a year. And it keeps growing in terms of the number of people that are interested in participating in it.

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

It's mostly a summary of what's going on in each of the states. We'd certainly be amenable to do that. Now, if later on we get to a point where we include intelligence or law enforcement information, then we have to be somewhat careful because some of that stuff is sensitive, but certainly that could be edited out in a report.
I mentioned, one of my fourth priorities is integrating the private sector. And that's something I think we really need to build on. Prior to my coming into FEMA, I was in the Coast Guard. I was at a Coast Guard port in Philadelphia, and we worked very closely with the private sector. So I'm anxious to reconnect with the private sector. Long answer, but to answer your question, we'd be happy to add the private sector.

Yes?

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

MR. STENSGAR: Our primary coordination is through our defense coordinating element. We have -- each of the FEMA regions have an active duty contingent. We actually belong to Army North -- within the regions. They're headed up by an active duty Army colonel. In my case, it's Jim Mathis. And they're out gateway into the
DoD. They coordinate a lot of the base commanders within Region III and a lot -- we have JTF NCR here -- General Rowe, and others through the National Guard.

So that's primarily how we do that.

Jim attends all of his meetings. We attend his meetings. He attends our exercises, so we're pretty well linked up with the DoD folks.

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

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

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

MS. CATLETT: Go ahead, General, please.

MG LIBBY: The decision by FEMA to put...
a full-time DCO and DCE element in each region

was a real stroke of genius.

MR. STENSGAR: Absolutely.

MG LIBBY: It has been a breath of
fresh air in the coordination -- I can only

speak for Region I. Colonel Gary Stanley, the

new guy on board, has come to us, I think,

from --

MR. MURPHY: You stole him from us.

MG LIBBY: No, we didn't steal him.

He owns property in New Hampshire, so he's come

home. It's been a stroke of genius. And I

would tell you I wear all three hats in the

state of Maine, but I can tell you my fellow

tags in the area who aren't involved in

emergency management and aren't the homeland

security advisors have a direct and daily

relationship with the Gary Stanleys of the

world. And it makes a real difference during

exercise scenarios, and it makes a real

difference during response and recovery

operations. A stroke of genius on someone's
part.

MR. STENSGAR: Yes.

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

MR. STENSGAR: Well, most of our states within Region III use Web EOC. West Virginia uses E-Team. FEMA is developing its own system called E-MIMS, which is just now being rolled out to the regions. So we've undergone some training in it. I don't think it's fully operational yet. But we do have access to each of our state's Web EOC. It's web-based, so they give us a password and we log in every day. But it's individual states.

There's nothing that connects all of our states together.

I think one of our goals -- I'm not the expert on E-MIMS, but one of the goals is
to try to bring connectivity to all of the
different state software packages.

Yes?

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

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

MR. STENSGAR: Stacey Irving represents --

SPEAKER: Center City District.

MR. STENSGAR: Center City District.

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

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

I know some of our states are further ahead than others. Like, for example, down in Virginia -- Virginia has a table in their EOC just for the big box
stores -- the Lowes and the Home Depots and those kinds of things. So what I'd like to do is bring our states together and start sharing best practices and see how we can further integrate those folks into what we do on the government side of the house.

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

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

MR. STENSGAR: Absolutely. We have within the region -- all of our states are very
active in citizen CORE and CERT programs. And there's a plethora of examples of that. And we're continuing to try to promote that, because I think volunteers are a key part of the equation.

Again, getting back to my Coast Guard Days, we had a group of folks called the Coast Guard Auxiliary which were volunteers, and they worked for us in a variety of things, whether it was sitting at the front desk or going out on the water doing patrols for us. And I really appreciate what they bring to the table. We're using this opportunity within the RAC to try to continue to promote that and promote citizen preparedness to try to get families more prepared to deal with disasters -- as the chief was talking about this morning -- and also get them more involved with the professionals in supporting them to do their job.

MR. BRUNO: Hi, John. Joe Bruno from
New York City. How you doing?

MR. STENSGAR: Good morning.

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

MR. STENSGAR: Yeah, absolutely. Actually, that's been a large part of what I've been doing for the last seven or eight months. We're hiring like crazy. In Fiscal Year '08 we've hired 24 Folks, and I've got 41 more folks to hire this year, including these CORE positions that Pauline talked about. We're hiring them in the national preparedness area,
which includes exercise and training folks,
planning folks. In fact, we just hired three
this week. Yesterday being the most recent
hire, or selected -- they still have to go
through the hiring or finish the hiring process.

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

And just to give an example of some
of the planning that they did that we weren't
able to do in the past is we had the National
Governors Association meeting in
Philadelphia. And as a result of having
those additional planners, we were able to
start -- actually planned with the
Pennsylvania State Police, as well as the
Philadelphia Police, and actually put people in the JOC.

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

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

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

MR. BRUNO: Thank you.

MR. STENSGAR: It's all good.

MR. BRUNO: Thank you.
MR. STENSGAR: Yes?

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

MR. STENSGAR: Certainly. I think that's one of our biggest concerns, not only in the preparedness issue, but dealing with folks with special medical needs in a disaster. And one of our biggest concerns in Region III is the Hampton Roads area, and how we're going to evacuate that area. There's a new Army Corps study that's going to be finalized here shortly that's going to show that that particular area is going to have greater inundation than was suspected because of some new studies and new techniques -- and there's a lot of hospitals there. There's a lot of nursing homes. There's
a lot of assisted care facilities. And we've
had an ongoing working group with federal,
state, and local folks and the private sector in
dealing with those issues -- each group has
their own process of how they're going to deal
with it. And it wasn't very well-coordinated.
So it's a big issue.

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

DR. BENNETT: Any additional
questions?

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

DR. BENNETT: I appreciate it, John.

Thank you so much.

We're going to go ahead -- I'm
going to adjust the agenda here a little bit.
We do have Chief Endikrat with us today from the City of Philadelphia, on the National Urban Search and Rescue presentation. And he has graciously consented to come a little early. And we'll do that, and then we should be close to our break time by then. We'll see. But if not, we'll go ahead with some of our subcommittees. So we're moving along.

So Chief, we welcome you.

There should be two handouts. Has everybody received those?

CHIEF ENDIKRAT: Dr. Bennett?

DR. BENNETT: Okay, Chief.

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

Chief Carr extends his apologies.

He had a last-minute scheduling conflict.

Chief Carr is the sponsoring agency chief for
Maryland Task Force I, chief of Montgomery County Fire and Rescue, and he was going to be here to represent the sponsoring agency chiefs in the executive side of this discussion.

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

I know that many of you are familiar with the system, and how it was originally chartered, and what we've done. And I know that some of you are not so -- if you would allow me, I'll just go over a quick background summary of that. And you can follow along in the text if you so desire.
1990, in the federal government response to the disasters of Hurricane Hugo and the Loma Prieta earthquake, we realized we had some gaps in the federal system on how we respond. And Congress at that point in time tasked FEMA to develop a national civilian urban search and rescue capability. And to this day, FEMA is still the primary agency that deals with urban search and rescue, and search and rescue on a broader scale, since the reorganization of the National Response Framework. And that's under Emergency Support Function 9.

The primary purpose of the system is to provide a nationwide network of heavy search and rescue teams. And that's on the civilian side. The teams can be rapidly deployed to disaster incidents. They're established at the local jurisdiction level, and they are federalized and deployed by FEMA as needed for nationwide response. They provide an organized system.
of resources to locate, extricate, provide
immediate medical treatment to victims
trapped in collapsed structures and to
conduct other lifesaving operations.
Currently, there are 28 FEMA US&R
task forces. They're the fundamental
operational or tactical units that respond
for the nation. They're strategically
located throughout the country.
If you would refer to page 3 of the
handout, there's a graphic there that
illustrates the locations of the 28 task
forces, and also the corresponding
relationship they have with the 10 FEMA
regions.
Just as a note, and as you look at
the sponsoring agencies and their
designations on that handout on the third
page, you'll see that the majority are
sponsored by state or local government
jurisdictions. They deploy with technical
specialists who are divided into management
and operational elements. Again, you can
look at that chart and see that a significant
number of the sponsoring agencies are
municipal fire departments, and firefighters
comprise the largest percentage of rostered
members within the system.

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

The fifth page of the referenced
document provides a current overview of the
system, and that's more of a narrative. It
speaks to the essential role that our system
has played in the federal response to the
terrorist attacks in Oklahoma City, the
Pentagon, the World Trade Center, and specifically speaks to the response to the Louisiana and Mississippi theatres of operation during Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, and the rescue of almost 6600 civilians by federal US&R task forces. Consistent with the new FEMA, it also speaks to the foundation of an all-hazard preparedness and response that our system is built on, and it references operational accomplishments and best practices, administrative and training initiatives with state and local US&R assets.

If you would go to the chart on page 7 following right behind that narrative two pages there, in the reference document, that summarizes the event response history of the federal US&R system. Just to give you a point of reference, from the system's inception after Congress tasked FEMA with this, to most recently last month. To give you a point of reference, I
I wanted to put some slides on, and this was done at the suggestion of Mr. Shea, just to give you an overview of the types of responses and the level of engagement that the federal US&R task forces are involved with. This is an aerial shot from a section of the Mississippi theatre of operations from Hurricane Katrina. I had the honor of serving as the operations chief for that, and I will tell you that there were 11 federal task forces deployed, while simultaneously the rest of the federal task forces were deployed to New Orleans. But we basically were tasked with the search and rescue operations for a 1000 square mile area. And the system, as federal task forces come into place and as the Incident Support Team begins to engage with state and local officials, the goal is that there is a seamless transition in tactical operations. To give you an idea of some of the
technology the task forces currently have and
have been really at the forefront of
developing for the fire service across the
nation, this is a search operation conducted
by Utah Task Force 1 on the western side of
the operations at Hurricane Katrina in
Mississippi.

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

You can see the member on the left
has the camera getting ready to go into
service. The camera goes down into that
voided space that has been expanded by the
rescue operations team. And there's a
small -- almost like a small television
screen that transmits video image back to the operator. And as they work through there, the search camera eventually comes across a victim and how he's been -- and you can see that his watch is there, and the time the watch stopped, and the time of the incident.

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

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

So local responders eventually train with the same doctrine, the same equipment, the same policies and operational procedures, so we can do the most good for the greatest number of people.
The Trade Center, certainly an extreme example of our engagement. As Mr. Bruno, knows the City of New York initially requested eight federal task forces and an Incident Support Team. And again, as robust as emergency operations capabilities are in New York City, this is not the type of incident that any city or any municipality or any state can do alone. And that's the whole purpose of the fourth tier or our level of response with the federal US&R program.

Again, to give you an idea of the level of training and some of the capabilities, this is a shot -- it happens to be from Pennsylvania Task Force 1, but one of our search canine that was put in that basket and sent on a rope pylon system 110 foot from the base of the North Tower to the top of the North Tower, the debris there. And that animal ended up finding seven New York City firefighters that were buried in that collapse.
So again, this is not the type of resource that exists in any significant amount at the local level. And certainly our first response and engagement in the world of terrorism, and the system primarily as I mentioned to you before was set up with the idea that we were going to be responding to earthquakes and natural disasters. And Oklahoma City was our first foray into terrorism and terrorism response.

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

They're using coring tools and
power-actuated fastening devices to secure that overhanging slab.

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

In 2008, a significant financial commitment on the part of the agency is demonstrated not only by the number amount or the dollar amount that you saw on the last page there, but by the significant commitment...
from a staff of full-time employees. And I believe with contractors now, the program office is about approximately 20 full-time employees. And there's also a dedicated appropriate budget that comes from the Office of Management and Budget, and then eventually works its way through the Senate and House Appropriations.

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

The advisory committee -- and that's the reason I'm here today at Dr. Bennett's request, to talk to you about a
little bit of historical perspective -- the advisory committee that was in place before for the Federal Urban Search and Rescue Response System was a standalone committee. It was solely focused on national urban search and rescue response. And because of a number of different reasons, that committee has not been rechartered.

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

As I mentioned to you, the system has been functioning for approximately five years now without an advisory committee. And the purpose of the advisory committee was to bring the diverse views of all levels of the
stakeholders, and get the input that we needed to make strategic recommendations to the agency to make sure that the system continued to move forward and be able to serve the public.

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

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

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

We would also like to explore the
linkages between national, state, and local
use of our assets. As most of you know,
there are some parallel funding streams going
on here through urban area security
initiative grants and state homeland security
grants -- states have been developing their
own resources. Sometimes very robust state
systems have come out of that funding, but
there's really no linkage. And I know that
the agency has begun to discuss that to try
to get -- again, the most comprehensive,
effective response framework when it comes to
our specific world of urban search and
rescue, and how we interact with state and
local government.

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

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

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

It's extremely important to the chiefs and the executives whose agencies sponsor FEMA task forces. Administrator Paulison and Division for a New FEMA speak to a shared responsibility approach for emergency management. The cornerstone of this shared responsibility is partnerships between federal, state, and local government.

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

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

DR. BENNETT: Joe?

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

CHIEF ENDIKRAT: Mr. Bruno.

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

The one thing I have no hesitation about saying is that the US&R program as a response capability is a tremendous program. I don't think you're coming here saying you need to build that program. That's a great program. It's well-schooled. It's well-trained. It's got the best people, for example, in New York. The very best. The most elite people we have in PD and Fire are the people who work in that. So we have a 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
direct answer to your question, is the
strategic level -- the sponsoring agency
chiefs, the one like yourself and
Dr. Bennett -- who make the commitment for
people and who send them out as federalized
assets, that's what's been lacking. The
chiefs have no role and no voice since the
unchartering of the advisory committee.

MR. BRUNO: Thank you.

DR. BENNETT: Any other questions?

Nancy.

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

CHIEF ENDIKRAT: A few sides to that,
Nancy. The Office of Management and Budget
historically in years past would come out with a
recommendation of 7.5 million. Bob, I think
you're pretty familiar with that. That in the last three years has changed. Between 20 and 25 million is the recommendation from OMB. Congress and the Senate Appropriations Committees have looked at the program in detail, and they've recommended more. So right now, it's not really a dedicated funded line item. It's almost negotiated every year. You can see actually the year after Katrina, it went down $5 million. While all of our task forces were engaged the funding actually was reduced by 5 million, which caused us some concern. But 25 to 30 million seems to be where we're at right now. The agency did a study, I believe in '04, looking through the true costs of administering this program and trying to take some of that burden off the local sponsoring agencies, the number was more like 52 million. So you know, we're certainly grateful for 32.5 million last year. But again, that year to year does shift. But somewhere in that ballpark is an
Mr. Becker: Maybe a question for Bob. Could you please describe how FEMA is set up with the professional staff to support this work? Where does this report and who leads it?

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

Chief Endikrat: Sir, in the past, the program office staff was roughly around six or seven people. And I think as the funding increased, certainly after terrorist attacks. And as Nancy mentioned, that spike in funding gave our task forces a one-time infusion for weapons of mass destruction capability response. As more money came and more accountability came with that money, the program office realized that they didn't have adequate staffing. And they did a business case and over the past two years, they've hired
full-time employees and contractors up to about 20. So they all have assigned roles and responsibilities on different sections of the program. They help the 28 task forces manage, but it's still a work in progress, but it's been getting better.

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

DR. BENNETT: Nancy?

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

DR. BENNETT: Okay.

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

CHIEF ENDIKRAT: It was recharted shortly after the 2001 attack, Susy, and then it
sunsetted again. It was pretty much -- I believe, Bob, you could correct me if I'm wrong -- it was an annual renewal and it was rechartered every year. And there were some changes, I guess, in philosophy at the higher levels of DHS and FEMA as they looked at the whole Federal Advisory Commission Act and how we would possibly engage. And I think they thought that maybe it was too narrow a focus. It was just urban search and rescue. So it's been the last four or five years. We've had some starts, but it really hasn't been seated in about that time.

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

DR. BENNETT: That's a very good question. I think if you recall back to -- I believe it was our first meeting that we had of...
the Council, where we were trying to determine what were the issues we needed to look at and form subcommittees and so forth, and how we were going to organize ourselves -- FEMA did come before us recommending that we look at forming a subcommittee to look at the US&R issue and have a voice forward.

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

And so I think options are to form a subcommittee if there's interest in that, to work on these issues and have a voice for interfacing with FEMA. Not in the day-to-day operations, but on the strategic level and
the kind of issues we do. Another one is to
perhaps look at forming a working group to
flush out which directions we may wish to go
if it's not the subcommittee. But I think
those are the type of options before us.

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

MR. BRUNO: Kem, it would seem to me
that -- I'm familiar with the arguments that
have been made -- that our job here at the NAC
is to advise FEMA.
I'm not so sure that we need to have a subcommittee. What I think we need to do is see how best we can assist this group in this very important program to reconnect in a way which they will advise. There are a number of things -- obviously they had a subcommittee that had an advisory committee. That may not have been sufficient. I don't know. I think it may have been deficient in certain ways -- in connecting with sponsoring agencies, for example. My view would be -- at least I heard Dave Paulison say he'd like us to look at this -- some type of working group that takes a look at this and gives FEMA some advice on what we think should be their permanent connection to the US&R program. They have a connection already. They have staff. But I think we would look for FEMA to connect with other entities involved and create a mechanism by which either the NAC, if it's ultimately going to be, or some other
similar group that existed previous to the advisory committee, that can start relating back to the sponsoring agencies, to FEMA, and the other agencies involved so that there's a connection. It looks like the connection has been lost. Maybe we can help FEMA reconnect.

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

DR. BENNETT: Kurt?

MR. KRUMPERMAN: I just want to make an observation. I think this is an issue. I'm working with an advisory committee with HHS related to NDMS and the DMATs. And there seems to be a similar issue in that how does it fit into the overall -- at the strategic level, how does it fit into the overall response plan that we have in the national response framework? And so I think there's a similar -- I'm just
observing that there's a similar issue for US&R as there is for NDMS, in my opinion.

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

DR. BENNETT: Good point. Chief?

MS. HAYES-WHITE: Yes, I'd like to say, first of all, Chief, thank you for your presentation. And I'd also like to participate in whatever we deem is appropriate, probably not a subcommittee, but a work group. San Francisco does not have a US&R team, but our neighbors in the Bay area, Oakland and Menlo Park, do. My observation is, like Mr. Bruno said, the elite and very dedicated committed groups of people,
but I do hear very clearly, and I would concur,
that there is a huge lack of coordination at the
highest levels, or support for these teams. And
so whatever we can do to assist with linking
that back in I think is important, and I'm happy
to participate in.

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

So that is one of the key issues
that they had had. They needed a steady
stream, and I think Nancy pointed out it
looks like it's kind of settled now around
30 million, and that may not be enough. I
don't think they think it's enough, but
whatever.
I don't think we're capable of
making that decision. But we certainly need
to have that regularized. And the kind of
interface with FEMA through the sponsoring
organizations as well, along with the
response groups that make up the US&R teams,
will probably help to stabilize that or give
these guys a better chance to understand what
they're going to be able to work with.
So I think those are very important
areas that we can help out with. There is a
bigger issue, sure. There are lots of other
teams out there. This is a real standalone
program -- I think quite different than IMATs
and other teams that are put out there. I
would suggest we look at US&R separately and
find the lessons learned in our relationship
here in the study of this to try to fix other
things as well, rather than take on too many
areas.
MR. PATURAS: Jim Paturas, Chief --

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

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

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

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

And it would be nice at some point
to see some collaboration and integration at
a strategic level. I mean, clearly it's
happening on the ground in different
instances.

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

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

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

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

MR. GOUGELET: Right, specifically
from the subcommittees.

CHIEF ENDIKRAT: No.
MR. COUGELET: So I think I'm certainly in favor of a work group, and I think most of us are. Whether that's a transition to a subcommittee or continues to be a work group, but I think the important thing is that you get involved in the workings of what's going on at some of the subcommittees.

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

CHIEF ENDIKRAT: Thank you. Angela?

MS. ELGIN: Angela Elgin. Thank you, Chief, for your presentation today. I'm very familiar with the US&R group. I'm from St. Louis, a battalion chief from St. Louis, so very familiar with Missouri Task Force I. And I
would want to just say for the record,

Dr. Bennett, anything that I can do to assist
with either a work group or a subcommittee -- I
think it's very important that at least they can
at least starting hearing, and maybe look at a
broader picture of if there's any other issues
with groups such as US&R and other groups that
are deployed by FEMA. If there's other issues
there, maybe we should also explore those as
well.

CHIEF ENDIKRAT: Thank you, Chief.

DR. BENNETT: Any final comments here?

Nancy.

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

DR. BENNETT: I think what I would
like to do would be to have it in the form of a
motion that we form a US&R working group. And
I'll need to establish a chair and members. So I've heard lots of volunteers, which is good. So I think we will have an active committee. So if I could have a motion that we form a working group to review the US&R -- I'm not sure exactly how to do their charge. We're going to have to work on the words there, but I think we do need to form a working group. Kem?

MR. MILLER: I'll make that motion.

MS. ELGIN: And I'll second.

MS. DRAGANI: I'll second it.

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

CHIEF ENDIKRAT: Thank you very much.

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

All those in favor say aye.

SPEAKERS: Aye.

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
17 MS. TORRIENTE: I'd like to volunteer
18 as well.
19
20 DR. BENNETT: Okay. Okay, Chief.
21
22 CHIEF ENDIKRAT: Thank you.
23
24 DR. BENNETT: We are at break time, so
25 why don't we break for 15 minutes, and we'll
26 come back with our subcommittee discussion.
Thank you very much.

(Recess)

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

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

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

Depending on time, we will most likely be at the point where we'll break and come back and do the housing, but the housing may -- if we have time, we might get started on some of it. But we'll see where we are at.
that point. Maybe we can go to lunch a
little early or whatever.

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

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

During our committee meeting, one
of the things we did -- we spent a lot of
time actually receiving the feedback from
FEMA and the administrator on the five
recommendations that we put forward from the
NAC. And of course, Dennis Schrader briefed
the entire NAC on that yesterday. We were
pretty pleased, in fact, that all five
recommendations put forward were concurred
with, and that they were all accepted in one
form or another.

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

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

One of those being the next bullet
point, which is the new intelligence and
investigations function guide which will be
coming out. We'd been asked if we'd be
willing to take a look at that, again, and
give some recommendations on that new
document as it comes out. And we certainly
said that we thought that was exactly the
type of project that the committee should
continue to look at.

We were also briefed on a new NIMS
national strategy. Although the NIMS
document has been out for a while, there's
actually not been a strategy document for the
NIMS system and the NIMS process. And so
they are in the process right now of
drafting. It's still in the drafting phase
of creating a NIMS national strategy. And
we've asked FEMA staff to share that with the
subcommittee as they get into maybe a first
draft or second draft, so we can kind of take
a look at where they are heading -- where
they're heading with the national strategy
for NIMS, and maybe some input that we could
offer them on ways to tweak that or maybe
make some recommendations if we see
opportunities to do so.
On our next meeting in Dallas, it's our hope that we move into the implementation side of NIMS a little bit more. We want to talk and get into a little bit about compliance. What does it mean to be NIMS-compliant? Who's setting those goals about compliance? What kind of outreach programs are there to assist people in becoming compliant? Talk about the training courses that are out there and whether they're adequate -- whether we have too many courses or not enough courses or who's required to take what courses.

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

And then the last thing that we talked about was a connection that we think to Ann's committee on the private/public partnership. We've actually had some private sector folks -- chemical companies and some others -- that have talked about being
NIMS-complaint and what does that mean in the private sector. And again, who's establishing what does it mean for a private sector company to be NIMS-compliant?

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

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

So that's really where we are. The two things that we would expect certainly to
work next on our plate would be this intelligence and investigation function guide, the NIMS national strategy, and then our discussions about implementation. That's kind of where we see our next course of action.

Any questions?

MR. FELDMAN: Russ?

MR. DECKER: Lee?

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

MR. SHEA: I don't have the exact statistics in front of me, Lee, but this has been in our grant guidance for a couple of years now. So I think there's a fairly high level of compliance out there. There's a voluntary process they go through, and there's actually a system set up now called NIMS Cast that helps people walk through this process on a step-by-step basis.
So the compliance level is pretty high, at least in terms of that kind of a measure. How well it's been tested from an exercise or real world, that may be a different issue. But there's a lot of attention paid to it on a regular basis. Let me put it that way.

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

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

MR. FELDMAN: So nothing punitive if you're not NIMS-compliant?
MR. SHEA: I've been doing this for a little over 30 years. Punitive doesn't work.

MS. DRAGANI: Bob, this is Nancy.

Right now, the preparedness grants are tied to NIMS compliance, which I think is appropriate, but I think FEMA has been very careful to separate response and mitigation from the preparedness side of the house.

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

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

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

MR. DECKER: Sure.

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

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

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

MS. EIDE: I know that some of the funding that we're looking at, including private agencies, some of our UASI funding allows for us to give private agencies funding.
MS. BEAUCHESNE: Agencies or companies?

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

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

MS. EIDE: Okay.

MR. SHEA: Go ahead, Susan.

MS. MENCER: The buffer zone protection plan grants can give money to private sector companies to shore up their perimeter security -- lights, cameras, fencing, stuff like that. UASI and the State Homeland Security grant program generally is not intended for the private sector. That's first responders state kind of funding. So I'm not quite sure what that is.
I just handed Bob some legislation that passed in the state of Colorado this year by the legislature to require that schools -- every school in the state of Colorado be NIMS-compliant so that they will know how to respond in the time of a disaster. Of course, we had Columbine in Colorado, and Platt Canyon, so we're very sensitive to that issue.

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

MS. EIDE: Thank you.

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

MS. EIDE: Yes, exactly.

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

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

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

MS. EIDE: Okay, thank you.

MR. MURPHY: I'll just validate that.

I'm a SSA, too, and you've got to be NIMS-complaint. The only money that I'm aware of specifically for the private sector -- there's specific grants for private non-profits. And so as Sue mentioned, we have the buffer zone protection, but yeah, if you want the money, you've got to hit that NIMS qualification.

DR. BENNETT: Yeah.

MR. KRUMPERSMAN: And I guess just to
reiterate, I think that is true. I know I'm from the ambulance sector and the ambulance association, the association is that if you want to participate as a subgrantee or benefit from any of the grant programs, you need to be NIMS-compliant. And I think some states actually in the EMS world require that as well, just as a general principle, that you need to be NIMS-compliant just to operate in the state.

DR. BENNETT: Any additional comments?

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

SPEAKER: I'm sorry, what were those dates again?
MR. DECKER: October 27th and 28th.

MR. CONNORS: Just one more quick one.

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

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

DR. BENNETT: Ross, thank you very much.

MR. DECKER: Thanks.

DR. BENNETT: Nancy, you have the floor.
MS. DRAGANI: Thank you, Alyson. I think that we can get through this fairly quickly.

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

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

And again, this was a reflection that perhaps the system currently works in most cases, and let's allow it to work as intended, keeping face-to-face as an option.
as needed. Any discussion? Comments?

Yes, Susy?

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

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

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

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

MR. GOUGELET: I was just going to say
that we're just sending this off to FEMA for
them to consider the issues so we don't have to
get to that level of detail, because there may
be some administrative considerations that come
in. And they know the process of what goes on
now better than we do. So my real concern was
that if the victim really requests --

COURT REPORTER: Sir, turn your
microphone on.

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

DR. BENNETT: Christina?

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

MS. DRAGANI: That will be covered in
the face-to-face visit. And I think we
discussed that -- in fact, that the elimination
of the personal housing plan, which has proved
problematic, quite frankly, for most of the
applicants, is not necessarily a bad thing. But
if they eliminate it, they have to include in
the face-to-face discussion some discussion
about how are you moving to a permanent solution.

Any other questions? Comments?

Okay, Dr. Bennett.

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

MR. BECKER: So moved.

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

MR. FELDMAN: Second.


All right. All those in favor of the motion say aye. All those opposed, like sign. It passes unanimously to go forward.

MS. DRAGANI: Thank you. The next issue is -- I apologize for Alyson and I. This is IA Issue 2, part 2. Okay? So it says IA Issue 3, but this is really IA Issue 2, and this is the Individual Assistance rental repair pilot. A lot of discussion about this. At the end of the discussion, there seemed to be
consensus that the first eight bullets were okay, but we needed to add some bullets that reflected concern.

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

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

And then the final bullet I think
is the one that really addresses our concerns about are we rewarding poor personal behavior or poor public policy. So we're encouraging FEMA-HUD to develop a mechanism -- I'm sorry, I'm getting off on the transportation. I apologize for that. This one was ensuring that the properties are appropriately insured; that they're appropriately maintained if they take advantage of the pilot project; and that they're available for future emergency housing situations.

And then I thought an interesting idea that came up that Joe brought up was one of the ways FEMA-HUD could do that is place a lien on the property commensurate with the amount of repair dollars that they got to ensure accountability for those activities. And again, devil's in the details. That would be FEMA's issue to work out. But that is certainly one way that they could ensure that accountability.
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
the transportation assistance to individuals
in households that were relocated by FEMA
during an incident of significance or a
catastrophic incident.

We had the additional subcommittee
discussion. This will go right up front at
the very beginning of our response back to
FEMA. And this is the discussion, that we're
cconcerned that the regulatory change will
create the appearance of rewarding poor
public policy and leadership, as well as a
lack of personal responsibility. Also
cconcern that by doing this, FEMA may be
setting a precedent for assistance that may
be difficult for them to manage.

Where do you draw the line? Is it
for every evacuation or just federally
mandated or federally supported evacuations?

And to that end, believe that it's critical
that FEMA develop very, very clear guidance
that determines the conditions under which
this assistance is provided.
The second then is -- second bullet revises bullet No. 1 to add an example to help understand what we're talking about here. Examples include the mass evacuation of New Orleans residents post-Hurricane Katrina, or transportation efforts initiated by a FEMA mission assignment. Discussion? Questions? Clarification? Does that first bullet capture our concerns?

MR. BECKER: I think you nailed it.

MS. DRAGANI: Dr. Bennett?

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

GEN. LIBBY: So moved.

DR. BENNETT: Moved by General Libby.

Second?

MS. EIDE: Second.

DR. BENNETT: Second by Cathey Eide.

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

Carries unanimously. Thank you.

MS. DRAGANI: Thank you.
DR. BENNETT: Way to go.

(Applause)

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

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

MR. BECKER: While we're teeing the slides up maybe I can take a side comment here. You know, when we spend a lot of time with each other, we learn a lot about each other, some of which we can even share in a public meeting. But in honor of the Olympics, I would like to share that one of the members...
of the Post-disaster Housing subcommittee is
a former state champion in gymnastics. Our
very own Cathey Eide. Amazing. Facts you
didn't know about the people in the room.

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

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

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

And I would say now that we're this
far into our work, we would in our
subcommittee recommend to you that our
original charge might have been a bit naïve.
I'm not sure we fully understood all of the
work that was in progress -- in particular
some of what FEMA had afoot that we didn't
understand at the beginning of this process.
And in fact, our key work of everything we've
done ended up being reacting to the housing
strategy that FEMA has put together that we
all received copies of.

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

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

The strategy was released the week
of July 17th. That was the first look our
subcommittee got of the strategy. We were
not involved in the writing. We did not have
input into the writing. So our first receipt
of that strategy was the same day the whole
NAC got the e-mail with the strategy
documents.

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

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

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

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

I think that sells the strategy short, but I think that's been a lot of the reaction to the strategy. The national housing strategy names a full-time disaster
housing task force that would stand up. It's not folks like us that have full-time jobs and give of our time. These would be FTEs who would work on a task force to tackle some of the harder issues. And frankly, if these were easy, they'd have been solved a long time ago.

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

So what you see in the bullet point is, just like PKEMRA didn't create the right
expectations necessarily for the strategy, we believe that the strategy doesn't wind the task force up and give it a clear mission -- give it a narrow enough mission that they can actually be successful.

We don't think that the strategy told the task force what's most urgent and what's most important. What should you focus your work on in that concept of operations?

And then there were no timelines or expectations on what would be done by when.

So we are asking FEMA to consider those in the creation of a task force, which actually is anticipated standing up in the next couple of months, perhaps by September -- by next month.

And then lastly, if you look at the document, the task force -- the permanent members, the full-time members -- are called out to be from FEMA, HUD, and the Red Cross.

And our view on the subcommittee is that it needs to be more clearly articulated that
there are full-time permanent members that represent state, tribal, local government, private sector, and NGOs. It seems too national of a task force to be addressing very local issues.

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

Dr. Bennett, please. Yeah.

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

MR. BECKER: Thank you, yes.

Dr. Bennett, these are separate recommendations. They build on each other as we go forward. Do you want to vote each one or vote the package?
1 voted as a package.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yeah.

DR. BENNETT: Lee.

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

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

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

So the concept isn't permanent
full-time, employed by state and local,
detailed to this task force for three years,
MR. BECKER: The task force is envisioned to have six to eight members that would be full-time employees of FEMA paid for by FEMA.

MS. DRAGANI: Okay.

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

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

MR. GOUGELET: My question would be would that person at the state or local level be doing that job anyway? And would we supplant
their normal position? So I imagine people in
Louisiana now are still working on housing for
that area. So if they become part of the team,
then we're actually helping them out
significantly in supporting their salary that
way. Is that right?

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

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

DR. BENNETT: Cathey?

MS. EIDE: I just want to make a point
about the reporting of the task force. Our
recommendation No. 5 was to have an advisory
committee formed.
MR. BECKER: Yeah.

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

DR. BENNETT: Nancy?

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

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

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

MS. DRAGANI: Right. Right.

MR. BRUNO: Can I just --

MR. BECKER: We'll make that change.

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

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

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

And I think you could look at that from two sides. Did the local leadership step up to its role and its responsibility, and if not, did FEMA have to step in and make decisions that really should have been made
by local officials? Or did FEMA do something to a community? And I think opinions would vary on that. If you see a seismic shift in the housing strategy, what FEMA is saying is this is a collaborative process. Decisions need to be made at the lowest level, at the community level, and it's a collaborative process all the way through. And I think that's something we in the subcommittee were looking for, had talked a lot about over the last months, and perhaps of the strategy, we appreciate that the most. It's a FEMA-led initiative, FEMA-led problem that needs to be solved. But it's a very collaborative process.

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

MR. PATURAS: Jim Paturas. A question on that second -- go back to it -- on that first bullet -- not having the strategy in front of me
and also not remembering it -- where does the
other federal agencies' involvement come in in
terms of collaboration? We've heard about HUD.
We heard clearly from the administrator more
than once. I believe he said even as long ago
as a year ago that he doesn't believe FEMA
should be in that business, but they are. So my
question is as it relates to that bullet which
is well-put, where do the other federal agencies
come in in terms of collaboration?
Is it in the strategy already?

MR. BECKER: Yes, it is.

MR. PATURAS: So then would you
mind --

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

MR. PATURAS: Sure.

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

This is where it gets a little
harder. This is the meat of what we're
proposing, or in essence, here's how we think
this ought to work. Here's how our

subcommittee thinks the interim and long-term

housing, in particular, ought to work, and

what we're commending to you in that regard.

Housing -- and I know you know

can, but I'll just please remind you of

it -- housing solutions post-disaster in New

York City are very different from housing

solutions in Mississippi. Is there even land

to put a mobile home on in New York City?

No. The issues that people are
dealing with very dramatically, and in

today's world, FEMA has a very small toolbox

of operations that it can deploy for

post-disaster housing. And what we're saying

is we're not thinking broadly enough about

what should be in that toolbox -- what FEMA

should have.

And so what you read into these

bullets is we're calling FEMA to some very

specific roles. And we want to be clear

about it because we don't see a lot of this
1 in the strategy. The first thing we're
calling FEMA to be is an incubator. We want
FEMA to be working with the best ideas that
are out there.

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

We would suggest that's a great
model, and you need to have the same kind of
thinking applied to a very rural environment,
or unique environments around the country.

We want FEMA to be the incubator, that one
place that gathers the good ideas. What
problems there are in New York are problems
that probably never occur to somebody
somewhere else. And we've got to bring that
altogether into one place.
We then want FEMA to vet solutions with the right stakeholders. What should be in that toolbox? What dozen or two dozen options should we have that we can deploy once we -- to get you out of the shelter and to get you into some kind of interim housing, assuming that the local housing stock has been used up and there's no more motels, or travel trailers or mobile homes -- I didn't say travel trailers. Sorry. But the options are exhausted and you say now what? What's that toolbox that FEMA has?

Then we would want FEMA to have contracts in place and prototypes built of what those options would look like. Here's one of this. Come here and kick the tires and see what you think, local official, state official. We would want FEMA to literally build the prototypes and go through the contracting process, and have contracts in place for everything that would be in the toolbox that could be developed.
Once that's done, we're halfway there. So what we're really trying to say here is FEMA, your job is to be the bright idea folks. And your job is to bring everybody who's got a good thought to this process, and develop as wide an array of options as possible that could be considered. And not just develop them as good ideas, but develop them as finished products that we could pull the trigger on right away. So that's what we're saying through the first two bullets there.

And then this is what's not in the strategy where it gets a bit difficult. If you look at the housing strategy, FEMA says we'll have this full-time task force that works on this kind of stuff, and then when there's a disaster somewhere, we want them to stand up a housing task force as well. And they did that in the Midwest floods. And there was some good success there. What we're saying is no, the state
task force should be stood up now. What we want is pre-event, we want that thinking to happen. So we want to stand up state task forces that are going to take this menu and start to apply it locally.

If we can go to the next slide, please. I'll give an example. If there's a city on a river that floods repeatedly -- and you can define "repeatedly" every 100 years or every 50 years, or whatever it is -- we want the local officials to have the conversation before the disaster happens. Are we going to rebuild here next time? Not post-event. We want a local housing strategy. And what we're commending to the NAC to consider is we want a state task force that is receiving these great ideas from FEMA and its task force and helping local communities come up with their own post-disaster housing strategies.

And I know you've seen one disaster, you've seen one disaster. So our
housing plan -- at least it's what we all agree is our starting point we'll deviate from. But let's have a strategy in place, or our local options in place before the event happens. So what we're moving to here is FEMA-funded state task forces that are not stood up post-event, but exist to do the same thing -- to implement on a local level what we see FEMA doing on a federal level and creating the options.

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

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

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

task force. It can't be other duties as

assigned, or it can't be what I do between

events, because we're always in events. And so

the thinking here is that there would be a state
group that would have kind of the same kind of

flavor as the federal task force -- the FEMA
task force -- but more on a state level. It

would have different points of view, not just in

emergency management thinking, but different

points of view on what post-disaster housing

could look like and should look like. That's

half of the answer to your question.

The second half is, this can't just

be a good idea. There's got to be

expectations around it. And our thinking was

follow the money trail. And if the positions

are grant-funded with clear expectations and

timelines and all of that that we would

expect a state to have, and states could

implement locally, then we've got more

accountability in the system for something to
be done on the ground before FEMA shows up during the disaster.

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

MR. BECKER: Please.

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

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

MR. BECKER: I think FEMA could develop all the most wonderful options in the world and have contracts and prototypes and be
ready to go, but if the community hasn't thought through -- or at least at the state level looking at the vulnerable areas in the state, if we haven't thought through and put on paper what it is we think we would want to do, then it can move a lot quicker.

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

And the quicker we can move people through that or go straight to the long-term solution out of a shelter or out of my mother-in-law's house -- what we're trying to do is make the progression as quick as we can. And part of that is the decision-making on what the option is and which ones we're
MR. FELDMAN: Joe, I've got two questions, concerns. First, I think you're correct in we have to start posing the questions to local government. You know, what are you going to do after. My concern is, how far do you push that down to the decision-making level? For example, if you have housing that is within a floodplain currently, it would make sense not to build back in the floodplain if that is the result of the catastrophe. However, local government can't make that decision now without invoking takings and having to compensate property owners with dollars that the local government may not have at the current time.

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

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

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

And our thought was if the local community had that as one of its priorities, then it should be pushing local contractors
into that process, and to try to get them through the FEMA contracting process. That might not be the answer you're looking for, but that's as far as our subcommittee was able to take it.

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

MR. BECKER: J.R.?

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

MR. BECKER: I think we should trust FEMA to put a process in place, and the
overarching strategy here is we want this to be
locally driven.

We want this to be locally decided.

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

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

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

It's unlikely you could do it locally. But assuming you wanted to try to do it locally -- the question really would be, is it would it meet their standards -- FEMA's standards? Would they pay for that because it doesn't meet some of their standards?

There's a lot of pretty involved standards here, even if you did it just locally, of what you would want in that housing. You want to do that upfront.

You want FEMA to vet those entities that can build the menu of options that they're going to create. You want to get the ideas for the menu of options from people like us in New York City and other places around the world that are -- the things that they're doing. And then you want FEMA to start building some prototypes so that we know they work and we can also kick the tires. It's not that complicated.
I mean, obviously this is a big deal because it's the United States of America that we're talking about. But this is a big problem. So you're not going to solve it with travel trailers. You're not going to solve it with one solution. Not certainly in this country.

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

DR. BENNETT: Nancy?

MS. DRAGANI: Wordsmith and then a
concern. I don't think bullet No. 1 says
"standing" to me. When I read that, I don't get
anything out of that that says pre-event
standing task forces at the state level. So
that's kind of a clarification.

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

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

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

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

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

MS. DRAGANI: Okay.

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

MR. KMET: To kind of satisfy -- this
is Chuck Kmet -- to kind of satisfy what Nancy
is talking about, can we maybe attach it to the
UASI cities? Tier 1 and Tier 2. Would that be
something to consider, just like some of the new
requirements that UASI has for some of their
catastrophic planning and whatnot? Could you do
it that way?

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

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

MR. KMET: Good point.

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

Okay to move on? The second
bullet -- no, I'm sorry, same slide. The
second bullet is only one sentence but it's a
big thought. And it's a big deal.

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

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

But what we're trying to really crystallize here is -- those are being called
wraparound services. What do we need to wrap around a client with beyond just the building? And let's articulate those.

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

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

Then the third bullet point here has to do with case management. And I know you know this, but a bit of history.

Pre-Katrina, recovery case management was pretty much the purview of local voluntary organizations, often faith-based, or my organization, or other organizations. And it's a local decision. Who helps these clients? Often, counties create unmet needs committees and various organizations come to the table. And that was case management.

And it was kind of a cottage industry.

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

When Katrina happened and the number of cases was so significantly large, FEMA stood up in a contractual form Katrina Aid Today and outsourced it to, including voluntary organizations, how that was done.

Well, there's been a lot of movement on case
management post-Katrina. And the view as we see it on our subcommittee is -- probably the best word to describe a strategy on case management today would be "confused." I think we used a more polite word up here, "diffused."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. BECKER: Thank you.

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

MR. BECKER: Yes, please.

DR. BENNETT: Do I have such a motion?

MR. PATURAS: Jim Paturas makes the motion.

DR. BENNETT: Do I hear a second?

MR. GOUGELET: Second.

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

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

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

MS. PRICE: Chuck Kmet has a question real quick.
MR. KMET: If I could, and I don't want to throw a whole lot into it, because from the travel standpoint, we definitely agree with all these things, but I would for the subcommittee ask if there's a possibility of doing like a task force or something to help address some of the issues that the tribes may have, just because you've got federal trust land and allotments and stuff. And I apologize if you covered some of this before. I was out on my phone call earlier. But there definitely would be some issues that may need to be considered at a little bit later time. And it could be like a task force kind of thing or something -- I know that I wouldn't be the best person to answer all of those questions. John would be pretty good at it, but I know that there are some other people that may be able to reach out to help the subcommittee with that because it's going to be a problem trying to solve some of these issues on lands that are
allotted lands or federal trust lands that you can't really do anything with.

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

DR. BENNETT: Okay.

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

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

With that, we're taking a break for lunch. Thank you.
(Whereupon, at 12:16 p.m., a luncheon recess was taken.)
AFTERNOON SESSION

(1:39 p.m.)

MS. PRICE: Hi, everybody. Excuse me.

I'm sorry.

Let's resume with Mr. Becker's presentation regarding the National Disaster Housing Strategy.

MR. BECKER: Thank you.

So what we did before lunch, we talked about the high-level reactions to the housing strategy itself and what our thoughts were on that. Then, to us what was really kind of the meat of what we wanted to bring today, we talked about what would this process look like if we did it right. That would be the operational side. And we spent our time on that this morning.

We tied in the whole idea of the wraparound services. It's not just the building; it's what we can provide the family as well. And then we tied in the idea of case management.
So what we're moving on to in the next slide would be roles. And one of the things that the housing strategy took great lengths to do was to articulate roles. And we applaud the idea that it started with the person. What's the responsibility of the person? And then all the way up to each level of state, local, tribal, federal government, other government agencies. And all we want to do is offer a couple of additions to the roles that were in the strategy. Otherwise, we support what was in the strategy.

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

And it's on two phases here. The
first one is FEMA needs to be very clear that
post-disaster housing is a FEMA issue to the
leader, be the convener, bring all the other
government agencies and bring government
at-large together and the voluntary and
for-profit sector together. FEMA needs to
say that's us. And I'm not sure we see FEMA
doing that. And we appreciate the fact that
it was probably stemming from an interest to
be very collaborative and very collegial in
the approach. So we ask for that.

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

And I think it was probably meant
to be implied in the document, but FEMA needs to say that. Everybody needs to know who's the lead here.

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

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

When we interface with HUD or we listen to the people from HUD, it sounds like they don't have the authorization. Give me
the authorization and give me the money, and
we'll go forward. And when you think those
things are articulated, there's just not a
lot of traction there. And we don't see HUD
moving in this process in a way that I think
our partners at FEMA would want that to
happen. That's the view from the advisory
committee standpoint. That's not a FEMA
staff view.

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

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

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

MR. BECKER: Frankly, not from the
subcommittee directly to HUD. It's more on
relationships that members of the subcommittee
have with HUD. We're a NAC -- we're FEMA's
subcommittee, frankly. And I think what we're trying to express is we want to see movement on all aspects of the housing strategy. And we can see a path from here to where we want to go, but HUD is out of our control. HUD is out of our purview.

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

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

MS. ELGIN: That's what I was looking
for. Thank you.

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

Yes, sir?

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

So it seems to me that FEMA has
feet in both camps, which makes it difficult
to take the lead. So to me, I still see that
in the way this is written right now. It's
confusing to me. So I just want to raise
that as a concern, is that you either are or
you aren't. And given your concerns about
HUD, at least the way it was just
articulated, it seems like this is something that could easily fall through and not -- and just stay in the current state, which no one sees as acceptable. So I have concerns on the way it's being formulated right now.

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

MR. BECKER: Yeah.

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

But I don't think there's any question that FEMA's got this responsibility.

It's going to have to be changed some other way. I don't think anyone is letting them
off the hook of this, nor do I really think
d they don't want to do it. I have heard Dave
Paulison say we shouldn't be in the housing
business, but that seems to have evolved into
we shouldn't be in the permanent housing
business.

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

They're not the service provider.

That's done by others. But FEMA owns that in
the NRF. That's OESF6 (?) under FEMA, but
they don't actually provide that service.

But they own the coordination.

And I would suggest long-term
housing would be the same construct, where
FEMA shouldn't be in the business of
providing long-term housing. HUD's got the
core expertise in that, but FEMA owns it, as
Joe said. FEMA needs to still be that
coordinating umbrella for post-disaster
housing. They need to lead the whole issue, but HUD needs to be the provider, with funding from FEMA and authority from Congress.

MR. KRUMPERMAN: Okay.

MR. BECKER: Susy.

MS. TORRIENTE: Perhaps you can rewrite it the way you just said it right now. It's more clear.

MR. BECKER: Can we back up, Alyson?

MS. PRICE: Yeah.

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

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

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

Okay, move on?

MR. BRUNO: Joe, the only comment I
have on that is, I don't know ultimately what HUD is going to be doing. We don't know. I don't know if we can say to FEMA this is what HUD should be doing. I think what we're saying here is they have to step up in the area of long-term housing. Exactly how that works out, I don't know. I have no problem with changing the language, as I said, but that may not be where it ends. It's hard to know at this stage, but I think the language change is fine. I don't think we know, nor are we in a position to tell FEMA that ultimately that's what it will be. Probably something like that.

MR. BECKER: You know, when you're in your subcommittee and you're wordsmithing and every word just becomes super-important, I can't tell you how much time we spent on the word "authorization." What is it we were saying HUD didn't have? You know, and we felt like, well, they have the money because FEMA funds them. And they have the authority. But for some reason, they don't feel like they have an
authorization or is there a want to. And so we
struggled with that. And I'm not sure what a
better word than authorization is, because from
where we sit, they have what they need to get
started. They do.

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

Yes?

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

So I was just wondering what's the
chances of having one of those officials
MR. BECKER: I think the path forward that the housing strategy articulates is that the task force creates the concept of operations. And HUD is one of the three key leaders of the task force. And that was intentional. And so I think we might be anxious to get them engaged, but I believe standing up the task force and moving that to a concept of operations will provide that engagement.

As to whether we want them here to share their intentions, I guess I'd defer to you, Dr. Bennett, if we want to take that up.

Do you want to consider that and come back?

REPORTER: Your microphone, sir.

DR. BENNETT: Let us not make a decision right now, but consider that for the next meeting. But I want to be clear, too. I think these are good points. FEMA does have the overall housing, right? So we could make the language -- because we're a advisory group to FEMA -- so we could couch it in -- I think
"authorization" might be a good word. It's not clear to us that HUD has the authorization or -- I'm not sure. But we've got to be careful that we're not seen as telling HUD what to do. But we are saying to FEMA that we're concerned that this is not being addressed -- the long-term housing.

Is that what I'm hearing from you?

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

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

MR. BECKER: We'll take that, and we will -- we won't express a sentiment to HUD; we'll express a sentiment to FEMA that we have this concern about HUD.
Dr. Bennett, is that what --

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

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

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

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

DR. BENNETT: I'll make a comment. I think that's absolutely where we want to get to.
It seems like the vehicle, though, of something coming from the committee to the administrator of FEMA, since FEMA has the housing issue, makes that happen.

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

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

MR. BECKER: I think the other piece here is to remember where we are in the process. And I don't work in government, but I have respect for how long some of these things take.

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

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

To paraphrase Dr. Bennett, maybe we'll change the language to say we recommend to the administrator to be engaged in direct
conversation to make sure that expectations are clear with the partners and HUD. Just take the opportunity to clarify the role of HUD in permanent long-term housing I think is something we can just wordsmith now and move on.

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

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

MS. EIDE: Or even --

COURT REPORTER: Use your microphone.

MS. EIDE: Using strategy as well.

MR. BECKER: Yeah.

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

DR. BENNETT: Suggestions? What about something like authorization and responsibility to address long-term housing needs should be
clarified between HUD and FEMA?

MR. BECKER: Heads are nodding.

DR. BENNETT: And it's not clear.

Something of that nature?

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

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

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

MR. BECKER: Great.

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

The recommendation says "for additional clarification" up on top. Each of those things were asking for clarification.

We can use clarification again if you want, but I think it's silly to try to write it here. If you want us to look at the language
in the committee, we should do that, but I
don't know. I think it's pretty clear. It
seems pretty clear.

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

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

Okay, move on.

MR. BECKER: Thank you. There was a
lot of language in the housing strategy about
non-governmental organizations and the role that
they play in each phase of post-disaster
housing. And we appreciated that perspective.
The only thing that we would add is, recognizing
that in the emergency phase of the disaster and
the sheltering phase, the primary provider is
the non-profit sector -- it's the voluntary
organizations -- we want a stronger recognition
of the interdependence between the voluntary
organizations and local, state, tribal, government on larger-scale disasters in particular.

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

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

And then the second bullet here is probably one of the most complex. And I think this might be where we spend most of
our time for the rest of our presentation.

This has to do with who are the clients and what are the appropriate facilities to put those clients in. And there's no shortage of opinions on what a special need definition is. There's no shortage of documents about what those types of facilities ought to be. And the housing strategy weighed in with yet another version of the world as they saw it in the housing strategy.

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

There's what we call congregate shelters, or people who open up the doors and
provide what they need and they can take care of themselves.

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

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

And we think when you're talking about housing strategies in the emergency
phase of the event, what we should be all about -- or a lot of what we should be about -- is how do we accommodate the broadest range of needs in a congregate shelter. And make that the premise. Call the building what you want. Call the shelter type what you want. But how do we accommodate the broadest range of needs? And then clearly we have the medical needs that belong in -- most locals still call it a special needs shelter. There's different names for it. But I think what concerns us about the housing strategy and what concerns us about the NRF is we're getting into all kinds of nuances about what the buildings are called. And what we wanted to bring it back to was, no, what we're trying to do is take care of everybody we can in a congregate shelter who requires public shelter.

We need more work between our subcommittee and your subcommittee on pulling...
this thought together. Before we ask the NAC, I want to make sure that we would be comfortable with this slice of it. The special needs subcommittee -- we have opinions on other aspects of this. But from a housing strategy, what we're saying here is let's not get so wrapped up in what we're calling the buildings and how this differs from the NRF, and how this differs from my county's plan, and how that differs from my state's plan. Let's develop strategies around serving these three groups of clients.

So maybe we should stop and ask for discussion there.

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

I think what you need is to have a housing mix that is going to be responsive
to, as you're saying there in that last sentence, the greatest range of needs and populations that you can in the congregate shelters. And then to the extent that you have to deal with someone who's got some real acute or intricate need, that you've got a team or somebody that can react to that.

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

And it's the same with special functional needs things, that if we can keep family members together to support whatever their needs are at that time, that prevents
them from coming into the medical system as
well. So I think the logic is strong, and I
would strongly support those efforts.
The other comment I have is, do we
need the word "mega" in the first bullet or
can we just say shelters in general?

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

SPEAKER: Yeah, I don't think so.

MR. BECKER: What we want -- there's a
host of issues why those buildings aren't
available to be used. Not the least of which is
a lot of them are revenue-generating buildings
and FEMA doesn't reimburse the lost revenue if
it becomes a shelter. But there's a lot of
reasons to no on those buildings, and we need to figure a way to yes to put everybody -- like we put everybody in the Astrodome in Houston during Katrina. We need to be able to do that in large scale events.

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

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

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

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

MR. BECKER: Thank you.

DR. BENNETT: Any additional comments?

Nancy?

MS. DRAGANI: I have a question that really goes to whether or not you discussed types of shelters and encouraged FEMA and the housing task forces to look beyond congregate care mega-shelters like the Astrodome to more appropriate shelters, more appropriate for families. And I guess I know there was some discussion about using military bases that have
housing available, using colleges and universities on the off-season. I think that Astrodomes and mega-shelters as a congregate care should really be the very, very last resort if there's anything else out there. And I don't know -- I know that's probably off the strategy, but as soon as we start assuming that the only place we can house large numbers of people is an Astrodome-type facility, I think we're headed down the same path we went years ago.

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

They've got the contract. They're able to do that.

To me, there's a lot of answers before the mega-shelter, but we need the mega-shelter, too. We needed Qualcomm during the California wildfires to put the people in because there were no motels and there was nothing anywhere close to there. Where do you put the next 10,000 people? It had to be Qualcomm. So I think we need it as a tool.

But those things don't happen on the fly very well. They need to be done ahead of time.

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

SPEAKER: (inaudible)

REPORTER: Use your microphone.

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

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

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

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

SPEAKER: We can do that.

SPEAKER: Take mega out and put (inaudible).

MR. BRUNO: And then probably that's the right thing to do.
MR. BECKER: Yeah.

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

MS. DRAGANI: Yeah.

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

J.R.?

MR. THOMAS: I think one of the reasons we put "mega" in was because of the lack of acknowledgement within the housing strategy that that might take place. Because there was only like a sentence or two on one page that talk about mega-shelters. And in reality, they may occur. So I know I thought it was an important issue to put it in, just as an acknowledgement that they have not really addressed that issue.

MS. EIDE: I agree with J.R., because that is something that we wanted to address and make sure that it's identified in there that you
may have to use a mega-type shelter as an ad hoc type of shelter in the interim as you stage people to get to these other places while we try to figure out where we're going to put everybody. But maybe we can take out the example or put additional examples in.

MR. BECKER: I wonder just to wordsmith, if we could have it say state and local governments in large-scale events. What we're talking about is how do they work together in a large-scale event, and take out the mega-shelter words. But what we're talking about is how do you take care of the people in something as big as that. Would that work?

MS. DRAGANI: Interdependence needs to occur no matter what size the event if there are shelters.

MR. BRUNO: Right.

MS. DRAGANI: So I think that's a separate bullet. And what I heard J.R. say was the housing strategy as it exists today doesn't go into enough detail or reflection about the
fact that mega-shelters may in fact need to occur. So I'm almost thinking it's a different bullet if that's in fact, J.R., your concern.

MR. THOMAS: Yes.

MR. BECKER: We'll tweak the language.

What she just said -- we would have the first bullet say we need the interdependence. It doesn't matter how big the event is. It needs to be in place. And then the second bullet is a different thought, which is the housing strategy does not call out as specifically as we would want mega-shelters and provide that enough detail. Does that work for the group? We'll get the exact language, but that would be the sentiment.

Heads are nodding, okay.

DR. BENNETT: But does that take us where you said you didn't want to go earlier?

Does that put emphasis that mega-shelters now are extremely important?

MR. GOUGELET: I think all they're saying is it's only dedicated two lines in the
strategy. So if that warrants an extra bullet,
I think that's good. Is that right?
MR. BECKER: So the bullet would not
stress it as a cornerstone part of the tools,
but it needs to be there and it needs to be
given more thought?
MR. GOUGELET: That's what the
subcommittee felt.
MR. BECKER: Did you get all that?
MS. PRICE: Yes.
MR. BECKER: You got all that, Amy?
Frankly, I thought there'd be a lot
more conversation around special needs and
all that. If we're comfortable with that,
we'll move -- because then we've just got a
couple of more housekeeping things.
Private sector. It's too easy to
say you have to do a better job of working
with the private sector. Everybody knows you
have to do a better job of working with the
private sector. The piece here is go back to
the idea of FEMA as the think-tank or the incubator of ideas. Where do the great ideas come from that we can present in that menu of options? And it's not just the business sector. We need the universities. We need the -- you know, we need everybody who's got good thinking around that, and beyond the idea of a contractor, we would say that FEMA doesn't have a good way to develop that relationship with the sector.

So as it relates to housing -- I mean, there's a larger issue with FEMA with the private sector. But as it relates to housing, what we're saying is we need particular ways to develop that linkage, not just to be a contractor but to be the source of ideas. We need the sector to be able to provide that, and FEMA to recognize that that's where the best thinking might be taking place.

MR. PATURAS: Joe.

MR. BECKER: Yeah, Jim.
MR. PATURAS: Jim Paturas. Just a thought on that based on some of the parentheses you've used before. Would there be value to including some examples. You say they're beyond contracting for housing options. I just throw it out to the group.

Would there be consideration for putting some examples in, if you will? Is that -- this leaves it open for anything, which is fine, but it can also be interpreted as being a little vague.

MR. BECKER: Other thoughts on that?

DR. BENNETT: I support that. I had the same thing. What are those options?

MR. BECKER: So what I was just referring to in terms of idea origination and bringing --

DR. BENNETT: Yeah.

MR. BECKER: Okay.

DR. BENNETT: That clarifies it.

MR. BECKER: We'll add that. Thank 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
constructive going forward. And our thought is that we would like members from the NAC who are willing, particularly members from the housing subcommittee, but members from the NAC, to be willing to serve on whatever body becomes, which is the advisory body to the task force. We'd like that cross-pollination.

And then what we'd like the NAC subcommittee to be is on the receiving end of reporting from the task group. We would like to receive the work of the task group and have the NAC opine on the work of the task group. We would like our subcommittee to come back to the full NAC with our thinking on what the task group is doing going forward. It would have its own advisory body but the NAC should still be weighing in, we would suggest, with opinions about what that task group is doing.

So going forward, we presume that body would stand up. We'd like some of the
folks in this room to perhaps be on that body, but we can't be that body. We can't be the advisory group to the housing task force.

DR. BENNETT: Let me say the same thing. I think it would be -- we should have a recommendation that they do form an advisory committee, and that members of this committee be asked to be possible members of that, but it wouldn't be as being members from this committee representing this committee. That needs to be clear.

MR. BECKER: Right.

DR. BENNETT: We're advisory to FEMA. This is a task force that's being set up, so I think our role is that -- for coordination purposes and everything, we recommend that members from this committee -- or one or two, or some number, I don't know -- be appointed to an advisory board for the task force. Then they, in their capacities as members of that group, would be able to report out what activities are taking place to our subcommittee and to us. But
we've got to stay separate.

That would be -- that would not be as a member representing this committee, but it would be an interface kind of situation.

I think that's what you were saying, but I just --

MR. BECKER: You said it much better.

DR. BENNETT: No, I just want to be sure --

MR. BECKER: Just lastly, we still have a piece of unfinished work, and that's on the wraparound services -- the task group that J.R. is heading up that's reporting back to our subcommittee. We really want to get clarity around what services we want to make sure are available to people in whatever housing they end up in post-disaster. So we would come back with that.

So I think we need a motion, sir, on the second half of this.

DR. BENNETT: I believe the second half was four -- all parts of four and there
were three parts; right?

MR. BECKER: Four and five.

DR. BENNETT: And five, correct?

MR. BECKER: Correct.

DR. BENNETT: Five was relative to the membership. And we're recommending that they have an advisory committee, and then we're going to recommend that somebody be chosen from this committee, too, for interface purposes. Is that how it would be worded?

I'm talking about number five.

MR. BECKER: Yeah, back on five. We would tweak that language to make it clear that they're not serving -- what you said.

DR. BENNETT: As official members, because we can't -- I'll entertain a motion that we adopt all parts of recommendation four, as well as recommendation five.

Do I have a motion?

MR. KRUPPERMAN: So moved.

MR. STENSGAR: Second.

DR. BENNETT: Was that John that
moved? Kurt? Okay, who second?

MR. STENSGAR: John.

DR. BENNETT: John. Okay, John second. All those in favor, say aye to the motion.

SPEAKERS: Aye.

DR. BENNETT: All opposed? It carries. Thank you.

We're going to -- Joe's going to give us a brief -- no, that's okay. I'll take it.

As part of the housing issue, Joe is going to give us a little update here on -- a few-minute presentation regarding the housing in New York City, and the contest they had and what they looked at. So he's going to make a brief presentation to us.

MR. CONNORS: Mr. Chair, I need to catch a plane. Is there any chance I might be able to throw a couple of recommendations out before I leave?

DR. BENNETT: Sure, since you have to
leave, let's do it.

MR. CONNORS: The first recommendation I mentioned at our last council meeting, and that was the possibility of having NAC members invited by the regional administrator --

MS. PRICE: Izola.

MR. CONNORS: During a disaster allowing us to be side-by-side with the FEMA folks to see them in action so we could understand a little bit more. So I envision that when an event happens, the FEMA administrator of our particular region knows who we are, the members, and they would reach out to us and offer any of the members within their region the opportunity to come to that event with them to watch what's happening.

The second thing I would like to ask for a recommendation is to have FEMA brief us on the COOP plan. Unclassified in this particular setting, but also a potential for some of us to have a classified briefing on the COOP plan if that's possible, as well.
Maybe at the next meeting -- the next NAC meeting -- we can have an overview of the COOP plan for FEMA.

MR. SHEA: It's possible to do that, Bob. I guess a couple of things. One, the COOP plans, per se, are not classified. That's not an area. There is a thing called continuity of government, which is classified, which is a whole different ballgame. And if that's what you're asking for, the only other proviso I'll give you is you have to hold a top secret security clearance in order for this to happen. I don't know what our membership has in terms of security clearances at this point.

MR. CONNORS: But at least I think we've learned a whole lot about FEMA in our time together over the past year, and one of the things that we probably should know about is how prepared is FEMA's headquarters -- the operational aspect at the headquarters -- how ready are they to --

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
December?

MR. SHEA: The answer is yes. We're working on that. I believe it's very possible.

SPEAKER: Joe just went off the air, I guess.

MS. PRICE: We were hoping that AV could be here real quick to help us make the presentation a little larger on the screen. For some reason -- we don't understand why --

DR. BENNETT: Chuck?

MR. KMET: Another thing it would be nice to have a briefing on, probably not December, but maybe in the springtime since it is relatively new, is all the -- I know we've gotten information on the IMATs and that they're coming up, but now that they're actually -- some of them are in place, I'm assuming some of them are being used -- it'd be nice to get a briefing on that, especially as we're talking about the credentialing and the new big push of all-hazards incident management teams.

DR. BENNETT: I think that's a good
topic to be briefed on. Are there any -- you know, while we're kind of talking here about what we'd like to be briefed on, are there any other topics that we would like to recommend that FEMA may consider? They're not necessarily urgent that we have to have them next time, but something that right now comes to mind.

The other thing I would tell the Council is if there are -- if there are special things that you wish to address on the agenda, let us know about those so we can consider them being agenda items. Always feel that you can contact myself -- of course, go through Alyson, and we'll try to be as accommodating as we can.

So let us know. We do have to put the agenda ahead of time. We do have to advertise it, so forth and so on in the Federal Register. But we want to make sure that we do address the issues that we need to.

Are we ready yet?
Lee? Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. FELDMAN: Just to follow up on Bob's question before regarding security clearances. Has there ever been consideration about providing NAC members with security clearances if classified information was necessary?

MR. SHEA: Lee, we've considered a couple of things. One is, it's not inexpensive to do it. And given the range of issues that we typically deal with, classified topics are probably not the greatest focus that we can have. I think it's certainly on the table. If the Council feels it's important and has areas of the classified world they'd like to hear about or be involved in, we can attempt to do it. But it's not a light undertaking.

Let me put it that way. Either for ourselves or for you. I don't know if you've ever had the joy of filling out a Standard Form 86, but --

MR. FELDMAN: I've had the pleasure,
yes.

MR. SHEA: It's a challenging environment. Thank God for my mother. She remembered it all.

MS. PRICE: While we're waiting for AV staff to come help us out with this, I wanted to again ask the members of the public if they had any public statements to make. Was there anybody who cared to make a public statement today?

All right. Can we just hold on for five minutes while we wait for the AV staff to get here?

MR. BRUNO: Another time. I don't want to hold people. Are you ready to shut down?

REPORTER: Can you use your mike, sir?

MR. BRUNO: This is not on the record.

(Laughter)

MS. PRICE: I'd like to give the opportunity to follow up on this. I think he's going to be here in just a second, and I'd like
to follow up on the very interesting -- here they are -- the very interesting presentation that Mr. Bruno provided back at the February meeting. This is the follow-up. And here's the AV staff. We're trying to make this presentation a little bigger on the screen. Everybody move up to the front of the room, please. I'm kidding.

MR. BRUNO: Just to go over very quickly what we did. This is the latest iteration of our "what if" competition. We put this out on September 27, 2007, internationally to see who might have some ideas going forward to try to build our post-disaster housing in New York City. We got 117 submissions from 30 countries. We then had a jury -- after all were received, the jury met on January 22, 2008. And we selected 10 winners and 10 runners-up. You're going to see, I think, just the 10 winners here. We had architects, urban planners, engineers, and some local people in
construction, along with city agencies.

When we did our selection, then we provided technical reviews of all of the 10 winners from our Department of Design and Construction on March 15, 2008, and we said answer these questions and adjust your submission to us.

To entice them to do that, we gave them $5,000 each to get going on it. We then gave them another $5,000 in August of 2008 when they had submitted the final plan. So they received each a $10,000 stipend from the Rockefeller Foundation that funded this program. They're interested because it has international interest to them, and that's why they're doing it.

On August 7, just a short while ago, we had a technical review of the enhanced submissions. And we've come down in New York now to essentially two things that we're interested -- two designs -- and I'll point them out as we go through. And two
mechanisms -- one on barges and one on land.

So I thought you might be interested. The only last point I want to mention to you is the guy who narrates this is a guy who walked into our office from our office of volunteers. He's in excess of 80 years old. He's a volunteer with us, and he's fallen in love with OEM. He's now paid as an employee. He's got a terrific voice. He's a retired actor, so you're going to -- I hope this thing will work now.

VIDEO NARRATOR: New York City's Office of Emergency Management initiated the What-If New York City design competition to address the unique challenges in providing temporary urban housing after a major coastal storm. Population density and a lack of open land make typical provisional housing ill-suited for New York City's needs.

In September of 2007, Mayor Bloomberg announced OEM's international call for architects and designers to submit
innovative ideas for solving the problem.

The call resulted in 117 entries from 30 countries. A panel of experts gathered at OEM headquarters to review the field. Ten winners and ten honorable mentions were chosen by the competition jury on January 22, 2008.

Ten winners moved into Phase II of the competition. In this project development period, the winners completed further work on their design.

Phase II has resulted in the following submissions: Submission No. 1 proposes a network of national stockpiles that can be mobilized from any location in the United States. Localities will have their own community provisional residence fleet ready to be deployed, constructed, deconstructed, and eventually returned.

The panels of a typical 650 square foot CPR are fabricated from lightweight honeycomb composite resin panels and are
dismantled to fit into 6 high-impact pods for efficient transport. The basic unit can be modified to become a studio or larger family unit, and can be stacked up to four stories. Disassembling CPR units will create no waste or landfill material. The unit is designed to meet lead for homes platinum certification and is powered by a four kilowatt residential fuel cell.

The second submission suggests prebuilt apartment units on barges that can be towed to affected areas quickly. The offshore location allows repair work to continue on the devastated areas and greatly reduces the project's carbon footprint. When moored side-by-side, the barges create public green spaces between the housing blocks. Units are clad in fiberglass and provide one- and two-bedroom arrangements. Operating completely off the grid, the units are powered by wind turbines, and the hull of the barge contains a wastewater treatment...
Submission No. 3, living modular, proposes hexagonal units grouped to create courtyards, and can be used among varying levels of remaining building fabric. The units are flat packed, locally assembled, and outfitted. Their unique shape allows for greater unit variety and flexibility. The courtyards organize community activities, infrastructural services, and a postal addressing system.

Units are constructed of a fiberglass composite material that releases no toxic fumes during production and is warrantied for 20 years. Mechanical services travel vertically in a central core from the utility units that house tanks for freshwater, wastewater, and generator fuel.

The fourth proposal, CLA, uses modified shipping containers, with preassembled sliding technology from the RV industry, to maximize unit size and
flexibility. Units come in seven types, and when stacked four high, are arranged to face interior courtyards. CLA units arrive fully stocked with a week's worth of food and water, and make use of solar panels, gray water recycling, and micro turbines.

Manufactured plug-ins are removed, and containers are easily transported away from the site.

Submission No. 5 is an ecological model of manufacturing that uses automobile industry technology to create lightweight, reusable, and flexible structures.

Preassembled within the standards of global shipping, the system uses scissor lifts integrated with hinged wall panels to expand into three-story housing. The strength and precision of a manufactured car door is the model used for creating exterior wall panels that achieve a fully weather-sealed living environment.

The system contains both standard
and EP systems and vertical circulation,
making it an all-inclusive design which is
rapidly deployable and easily maintained.
Using existing foundations, such as parking
lots, sidewalks, and highway underpasses as
the key sites for development, the system
will not interfere with redevelopment of
private lots.

The sixth proposal elevates units
above the streets, leaving adjacent sites
free for redevelopment, and streets open to
traffic. The scaffold system ships units on
hydraulic trailers that lift units to a new
living surface above the cleared roadways.

Like a matchbox, the units slide
out to expand, doubling their size and
increasing shipping efficiency. New land
created above the streets provides new public
space and a controlled environment for
residents.

Submission No. 7 proposes
manufactured container-like units that occupy
the space over the street to leave the
affected areas open for redevelopment. The
superstructure forms a linear city that
traces the border between affected and
unaffected areas. The system includes wind
turbines and photovoltaics for power
generation and a rainwater harvesting system.
The eighth proposal deploys
infrastructural threads into coastal wetlands
that tether barges of provisional housing and
accelerate the restoration of wetlands.
Units are manufactured offsite and can be
configured on barges at multiple densities.
Only two unique panels must be manufactured
to construct the unit, along with the wet
cores and a stair and ramp component.
Wind turbines, PV cells, and
hydroturbines allow the system to operate off
the grid, while the wetland barges provide
natural wastewater filtration. When
permanent housing is rebuilt on land, the
housing barges leave, but the threads remain
as a system of recreational pads through the emerging salt marsh.

System No. 9, the patch system, takes advantage of a local urban redundancy, the ubiquitous construction scaffold as the superstructure for provisional housing. The cells' prefabricated panels are sized to allow volunteers to assemble the units after professionals have erected the scaffolding.

The standard, fully insulated aluminum wall panel can be configured for a seemingly endless variety of unit types. The scaffolding becomes a readymade field awaiting the receipt of modular housing cells.

The tenth submission, RDIC, stems from the analysis of two housing alternatives -- rigid shipping containers and inflatable architecture. The units are self-supported up to nine units high and can be single- or double-loaded to fit site conditions. One side of these container-like
structures folds down to deploy an inflatable section made of two-ply translucent urethane-coated nylon. And that doubles the size of the unit. Open units leave gaps on the wall of the agglomeration, providing natural ventilation and public space with views into the neighborhood.

The results of the competition have brought us one step closer to a provisional housing prototype for urban areas like New York City. For more information on the winners' submissions, see our online gallery at www.whatifNYC.net.

MR. BRUNO: That's it. The two that -- we have selected two that we kind of like. And they are -- the first one you saw, we like the design. It's a modular design. We like the way it's laid out, but we probably will use a container-based solution because containers allow us -- one, they're inexpensive. We can build them out fairly inexpensively, and we can stack them as high as we want. We can go
up to eight stories. We don't think we'll ever
do that, but we might go up four, which will not
require then an elevator.

So the other two things, we kind of
decided -- we're not finished yet but this is
where we're leaning -- we like the barge
solution treading water. We'd like to put
units on that -- the container-based units on
that because we think we can bring those into
areas that would logically be hit. And the
other, of course, is a land-based solution.

So there are two we looked at. We
like the modular unit -- very hard to build.
It takes an awful lot of expertise and
they're hard to put together. The other ones
we looked at with the jury -- the technical
jury -- they all had some problems.

Some with stability. Others on
whether they were practical. Some the
scissor thing, which was really beautiful,
requires that car manufacturing industry do
all this work for us. Not going to happen.
When you come down to it, we want something that we can build quickly and as inexpensively as possible. But one thing that's happening in the container industry, they are building now luxury homes and bringing containers as the base for that home all over the world now. Even in Europe, they're doing quite a bit of that. Even in the United States, they're doing it. So there's an awful big industry out there that we're tapping into -- and we did tap into with this. And in our technical jury.

So that's where we're going. I thought you might find it interesting. We're doing a lot of work. We're going to keep going. I'm going to be presenting this to Harvey and his entire housing solutions group. He's invited me to come back as soon as I'm ready to do it, which is very soon. And we're going to give them a nice rundown of where we're at and have them take these solutions. We own these. New York City owns
each one of these. Anyone who came into this
competition, we have full rights to use all
117 that we have. And certainly any of the
winners.

We have an arrangement with the
owners. We will bring them in to assist as
part of the technical team when we start
building this stuff out. But in the end, is
New York City capable of doing this on a
major, major scale? I think this is a
solution in some ways for good parts of the
country -- not every part. And I think in
the end, that's what our housing subcommittee
is saying -- here's a beginning of a menu of
options, and FEMA has done a lot on its own.

So thank you very much.

MS. EIDE: Joe, I have a quick
question.

MR. BRUNO: Sure.

MS. EIDE: When you guys did this, did
you have anybody plot out the amount of land
that would need to be used for each different
type of model?

MR. BRUNO: Yeah. I mean, we have worked out the schematics and the land base. That's why we know we have to build density.

MS. EIDE: Yes, and so the clearing that would have to take place prior to that and stuff like that?

MR. BRUNO: Some of the solutions would go in areas we would clear first, like streets. But we are not necessarily in favor of that. We don't think it creates the environment we want. But we will be clearing land quickly, and we'll build right on that land. We also have done a lot of work on the legal side using property during declared emergencies. These are difficult things.

MS. EIDE: But that information would be available in those prototype plans. You could see each type would take?

MR. BRUNO: Oh, absolutely. Each of these would have to have construction drawings. 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
nice way and get pretty good use. Also, in New York we have -- our water system runs on gravity. We have water up to the sixth, seventh floor of any building unless it becomes nonpotable, which we could even deal with that. We're always going to have water. We have a very robust infrastructure for our electric system. So we think we could get things back up and running, but we'd have to do it -- most of them have solutions that do not require on-the-grid, but could be off-the-grid for a while.

It's not simple. Not simple. We know that. It's a difficult thing, but we're taking those steps, and I hope the steps we're taking will help FEMA out. Thank you.

DR. BENNETT: Thank you very much, Joe. I'll remind everyone we will -- our next meeting is planned in Dallas, Texas, on December 9th through 11th. But keep in mind that it is a possibility because of the transition that they may shift the date. But
that's what we're going for. We're going to plan for it. We believe that will occur, but something could happen. You know, we don't know with the transition going on.

And that closes my remarks.

Alyson, I'll go to you.

MS. PRICE: If there are no further questions or items for discussion, thank you very, very much for your time and all your hard work. I hope you have a very safe trip home.

The meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at approximately 2:50 p.m., the MEETING was adjourned.)

* * * * *