

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

ORIGINAL

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

MEETING

DAY ONE

Washington, D.C.

Wednesday, August 13, 2008

PARTICIPANTS:

Council Members:

KEM BENNETT, Chair

ROBERT GOUGELET, Vice Chair

DAVID BARRON

ANN BEAUCHESNE

JOSEPH BECKER

MAYOR MICHAEL BROWN

JOE BRUNO

CHRISTINE CATLETT

IRENE COLLINS

BOB CONNORS

RUSS DECKER

NANCY DRAGANI

CATHEY EIDE

ANGELINA ELGIN

LEE FELDMAN

JOANNE HAYES-WHITE

CHARLES KMET

KURT KRUMPERMAN

JOHN LANCASTER

MAJOR GENERAL JOHN WILLIAM "BILL" LIBBY

1 PARTICIPANTS (CONT'D):

2 Council Members (Cont'd):

3 SUE MENCER

4 KEN MILLER

5 KEN MURPHY

6 GERRY PARKER

7 JAMES PATURAS

8 PHILLIP REITINGER

9 JOHN STENSGAR

10 J.R. THOMAS

11 SUSY TORRIENTE

12 FEMA:

13 VADM HARVEY E. JOHNSON JR

Deputy Administrator

14

ALYSON PRICE

15 Designated Federal Officer

16 ROBERT SHEA

Associate Deputy Administrator

17

18 Speaker:

19 DENNIS SCHRADER

Deputy Administrator

20 National Preparedness Division

21

* * * * *

22

P R O C E E D I N G S

(10:43 a.m.)

1
2
3 MS. PRICE: Welcome, everybody. I'd
4 like to call the fourth official National
5 Advisory Council Meeting together, and turn this
6 over to Bob Shea for some remarks.

7 MR. SHEA: Let me add my welcome to
8 those that you've heard already this morning.
9 We did something quite unusual in Washington,
10 D.C. We ordered up actually nice weather for
11 you. It's been a remarkable week, and
12 apparently, it's going to stay that way for a
13 while. Having mid-80s and no humidity in the
14 air is pretty unusual for this place, I can tell
15 you.

16 Believe it or not, this is the
17 fourth meeting of the National Advisory
18 Council. Hard to believe as we've gone by,
19 that we've -- this is now our fourth meeting.
20 But in fact, it is.

21 We spent some time swearing in new
22 members this morning.

1 We -- I would say not on purpose,
2 gave a misdirection to John Stensgar. John
3 is our elected tribal representative. Raise
4 your hand, John. We didn't get him sworn in
5 this morning, but we'll do that at an
6 appropriate moment sometime tomorrow.

7 So John, welcome to this group. I
8 also wanted to recognize that -- and Joe, you
9 kind of raised this issue about the length of
10 appointments of people, et cetera -- this
11 last June, we went through a process to
12 review all of those folks that were on a
13 one-year appointment to the National Advisory
14 Council, and we had a number of new members
15 selected as a result of that. We recognized
16 some of them this morning.

17 We also have some people that were
18 reappointed to the Council. And I'm thinking
19 that maybe none of them are here right at the
20 moment, which is a little embarrassing. But
21 other than that, I want to recognize them.

22 Bob Connors is here. David Barron

1 and Ann Beauchesne and Steve Cassidy were
2 also reappointed to the Council as part of
3 this overall effort. Also, Russ Decker, Ken
4 Miller, and Susy Torriente. So welcome back.
5 All of these folks that were reappointed now
6 are on three-year appointment. So I don't
7 know how that works. I guess you were on a
8 one-year appointment, now a three-year
9 appointment. So literally you'll be with us
10 for about four years, which is pretty
11 remarkable, incredible.

12 But congratulations to all of you.
13 I think that's important.

14 Also, I wanted to spend a minute or
15 two acknowledging some of our outgoing
16 members. I'm not sure if any of them joined
17 us this morning, but we had a number of
18 people who served on this council for about a
19 year time frame and for a variety of reasons
20 will not continue. One is Albert Ashwood.

21 I know Albert was representing the
22 emergency management community, and was an

1 important of the National Emergency
2 Management Association. And of course, Ken
3 Murphy from Oregon is in his stead right at
4 the moment. But we're grateful for Albert
5 and his contributions. He was always
6 entertaining and exciting to be around.
7 That's for sure.

8 Hillary Styron, who represented the
9 disabilities community. Is Hillary here this
10 morning? I don't think so. Okay. We have
11 certificates for the service for each of
12 these people, and also a five-year pin
13 commemorating their service to the country.

14 And then, we also are without
15 Michael Marchand. Michael was our elected
16 tribal representative, and so John Stensgar
17 is actually replacing Michael on the Council.

18 And then finally, we had Mark
19 Malcolm. And Mark was not able to continue
20 in his role here as well. But I wanted to
21 thank all of them for sharing their time and
22 expertise, as all of you do, on a regular

1 basis.

2 We appreciate very much the fact
3 that many of you have left home and loved
4 ones and traveled long distances to be with
5 us and to contribute in this way. And so I
6 know the administrator and the deputy are
7 heartfelt in their thanks to you for what you
8 do for us on a regular basis.

9 It's not of course only in these
10 formal meetings that we have. We engage you
11 on conference calls on a regular basis. Many
12 of you, in addition to being councilmembers,
13 are also leading subcommittees or
14 participating in subcommittees, an important
15 part of how we do what we do on a regular
16 basis.

17 For the new members, one kind of
18 bit of advice, which is that most of the work
19 goes on in the subcommittee structures.
20 There's a fairly active set of subcommittees
21 that address issues for us. And so
22 councilmember participation in those

1 subcommittees is pretty critical.

2 But having said that, we'll be able
3 to I think address some fairly major issues
4 throughout the course of this council meeting
5 as a result of some very hard work that
6 subcommittees have done.

7 Subcommittee chairs are -- Nancy
8 Dragani is leading the effort on Stafford Act
9 regulatory and policy review. I think Irene
10 Collins is the chair on the Subcommittee for
11 Special Needs. Cathey Eide is leading our
12 NRF subcommittee. And I believe Russ Decker
13 is our subcommittee chair for NIMS.

14 So having said all of that, I'll
15 turn the dais over to the Chair. But again,
16 my thanks and welcome to Washington, D.C.

17 MR. BENNETT: Thank you, Bob. I would
18 remind everybody to -- and the Council will
19 recall we're now in public session. So all our
20 comments are -- and all our meetings for today
21 and tomorrow will be open. And so members of
22 the general public as well as the news media can

1 always be present in our meetings.

2 I would also let you know, we are
3 recording today's meeting. And so when you
4 begin to speak, if you would give your name
5 and then go into whatever you wish to say
6 until we get your voice identified with the
7 individual. So it'll help in the recordings
8 of our meeting today.

9 So guess I should set the example
10 and say I'm Kem Bennett, and I serve as the
11 Chair of the NAC.

12 And again, welcome. Delighted to
13 have you here. One of the things that has
14 already taken place this morning is we did
15 form -- did get some volunteers -- I
16 appreciate it -- on the annual report to work
17 with the writers that are putting that report
18 together.

19 We have Susy Torriente, Angelia
20 Elgin, and Bob Connors have all -- the three
21 of them have volunteered to work with this
22 group of writers in putting together an

1 annual report. I think it -- as I mentioned
2 earlier, that's going to be a very important
3 document for us.

4 And the process will be as this
5 thing is put together, they'll go through it.
6 When they get it into draft form, when we
7 look at it -- then it'll go out, obviously,
8 to all of us to look at. But appreciate
9 getting these three individuals volunteered
10 to put another set of eyes on this document
11 as it's being developed.

12 We have a full agenda the next
13 couple of days. And let me take just a few
14 moments now to review what will be taking
15 place today. Following tradition, tomorrow
16 when we start, I will summarize the meeting
17 from tomorrow. But -- yes. Chuck, did you
18 have a comment, Chuck Kmet?

19 MR. KMET: Let me do this
20 without -- there we go. Sorry. Yes. Chuck
21 Kmet. Real quick, on the annual report, do you
22 have a timeline for -- are we looking to have

1 this approved for the December --

2 MR. BENNETT: Absolutely. Yeah,
3 definitely want the final version for the
4 December meeting. Yes. So that's a critical
5 timeline for us. I think it's very critical we
6 have it by December. And that is the target.
7 So thanks for asking that question, it's a good
8 question.

9 As I mentioned, we have a full
10 agenda. And let me review some of that. I
11 don't see -- Harvey hasn't arrived yet. So
12 we'll go through it.

13 We're going to have -- Adm. Johnson
14 will be providing us with an update regarding
15 the transition and the national disaster
16 housing strategy. So we'll be hearing from
17 Harvey. Right after that, we'll go to lunch.
18 And during lunch, we'll have the deputy
19 administrator, Dennis Schrader, and he'll be
20 giving us an update on the National
21 Preparedness Month, and other activities that
22 will be associated with that coming up in

1 September.

2 And then we get Dennis back again
3 after lunch, and he will provide an update on
4 the NIMS target capabilities list, and where
5 we are on the implementation and the
6 integrated planning system will all take
7 place after lunch. So we'll be hearing on
8 that.

9 We're going to have four
10 subcommittee report outs. Again, I think the
11 subcommittees are really doing well, and a
12 lot of work is going on there and a lot of
13 good discussion. So we'll have report outs
14 from the progress they've made. There's been
15 a little bit of change there due to travel,
16 but we will hear today from the NRF, the
17 Stafford Act, and the Special Needs will be
18 done today. We're going to move NIMS until
19 tomorrow.

20 So the Stafford Act, followed by
21 Special Needs, and then the Private Sector
22 Partnerships will be today. So to be clear

1 there, we'll have NRF, Stafford Act, Special
2 Needs, and private sector partnerships, I
3 believe is how we have that set up.

4 One final sort of housekeeping
5 comment is, tonight, there's going to be an
6 informal dinner at Clyde's, located just a
7 few blocks down in Chinatown. And so please
8 let Alyson or Jennifer know if you're
9 planning to attend that so they can know
10 accordingly how many to have.

11 Rob?

12 MR. GOUGELET: Rob Gougelet. I was
13 just wondering, after the subcommittee reports,
14 what kind of information we would have access to
15 to go back and get comments back from other
16 stakeholders or people that we work with.

17 MR. BENNETT: You mean to take -- I
18 guess --

19 MR. GOUGELET: Well --

20 MR. BENNETT: Explain a little more
21 what you mean.

22 MR. GOUGELET: What's available for

1 release. Because I think that we're just a
2 collective group, but we -- you know, like I
3 would go back to the College of Emergency
4 Physicians, say, or the state and say --

5 MR. BENNETT: Oh, okay --

6 MR. GOUGELET: You know, what is your
7 input. Because the NAC is one group, but we
8 also reach out to a lot of our partners to get
9 feedback.

10 MR. BENNETT: Yeah.

11 MR. GOUGELET: So when can we have
12 access to information so we can start that
13 process?

14 MR. BENNETT: I think once -- at least
15 my feeling about this is, once we -- I mean,
16 obviously the subcommittees, we know there'll be
17 at least two. Maybe there's others, that will
18 bring forward and ask for a form of a motion.
19 Do we wish to as a NAC put this forward as our
20 recommendations to the administrator? I think
21 if we pass that motion to go forward with it, at
22 that point -- I mean, discussion with other

1 groups is fine -- but I think until we -- well,
2 of course, discussion with other groups always
3 is good. But I don't think what we want to do
4 is send that out for discussion and then send it
5 forward. I mean, once we take action as a NAC,
6 I think it goes forward. And there can be other
7 inputs in it, too. But our input has to come
8 from us straight into the administrators, is my
9 read. Unless there's any other thoughts on
10 that.

11 But any discussions that we have on
12 that would take place here. And of course,
13 if it's -- I would assume if something is not
14 going to be moved forward and we have
15 discussion, there'll be dialogue with the
16 subcommittee. It may go back to the
17 subcommittee and -- or what? But however it
18 goes. But if we can push it forward, I think
19 we should posthaste get it up there.

20 And the subcommittees, from what I
21 can tell, have really worked on these topics
22 diligently.

1 And those members have been on and
2 understand that statement, I think.

3 Okay. Is Harvey here yet?

4 MS. PRICE: He is. I just need to
5 fill in his --

6 MR. BENNETT: He's here?

7 MS. PRICE: Yes.

8 MR. BENNETT: Where?

9 MS. PRICE: He may be right outside.
10 He's supposed to go on at 11:15.

11 MR. BENNETT: We can try pushing to
12 11:00.

13 MS. PRICE: Sure. So we can bring him
14 in. Amy can bring him in, I just need to upload
15 his PowerPoint. Usually a little folder pops
16 right up, but it's not reading it.

17 I'm trying to pull it up. I can't
18 get it to read the -- it's not reading it.

19 Hold on.

20 VADM JOHNSON: I take it I'm on.

21 MR. BENNETT: Yeah. I think so,
22 Harvey. But your PowerPoints aren't.

1 VADM JOHNSON: We can't do a thing in
2 D.C. without a PowerPoint slideshow. This is
3 only 95 slides long, so I know you'll appreciate
4 its brevity.

5 We'll see. While they get these
6 things on, let me again on the behalf of
7 the -- I guess you saw the administrator this
8 morning? So I know he specifically wanted to
9 come over before he got into his day and to
10 make sure that he did the swearing in and to
11 have a chance to see you all.

12 So I wanted to say again that we're
13 awful glad to have you here. We mean that
14 genuinely. You did a lot of work yesterday,
15 and we're waiting for the report out on some
16 of those key issues.

17 I think we're beginning to learn a
18 little bit better of how to work with the
19 National Advisory Council. Our timeline
20 still isn't quite exactly what it needs to
21 be. We don't think quite far enough ahead,
22 but we're getting closer to that. But I

1 think that you'll see -- and these two
2 products, both in terms of the regulation
3 package and the national disaster housing
4 strategy -- those are things that we're
5 keenly interested in. Not that we're not in
6 everything else, but those are things that
7 are really moving ahead, and we really want
8 the input from the National Advisory Council.

9 I appreciate the chance to come
10 today and talk in this session about where
11 we're really going and what's on our plate.
12 And so I did this at the last couple, and
13 we'll do it a little bit different this way
14 in terms of what our focus is, just because
15 of the timing in the sense -- almost to the
16 end of the administration is -- what do Dave
17 and I think about every day, and literally
18 every day -- and probably multiple times a
19 day -- is we try to lead FEMA towards the end
20 of our tenure.

21 And so the approach I want to take
22 is -- if we go to the next slide -- we had a

1 senior leader conference not long ago with
2 all of the SESS in FEMA. And we went beyond
3 what we typically do, and we invited -- it
4 was a focus on regions, and we brought in
5 director of ops, director of assistance in
6 the regions. We had our FCOs there. And it
7 really was a focus to talk about transition
8 summary guards, as well as what are we doing,
9 and what are our priorities? And where are
10 we going?

11 What we talked about was how should
12 we be thinking over the next six months. And
13 anybody who thinks in terms of the strategic
14 plan, every step you take is a tactical step,
15 and it should be taken in the direction of
16 your strategic plan. So everything that we
17 do should be going towards our strategic
18 plan, what we want to accomplish.

19 And at the end, this is pretty much
20 where we thought we should focus and think
21 about almost every day. And so on all of the
22 activities that we do: Short-term, mid-term,

1 long-term -- how do they reinforce the vision
2 of new FEMA? How do we collectively
3 contribute to building the capabilities --
4 new capabilities that we need in the field?
5 How do we strengthen the foundations upon
6 which we're building new FEMA, and those
7 foundations we think are going to survive and
8 be exemplified through the transition period.

9 How do we solidify the structure,
10 which maybe Bob has talked about that a
11 little bit. We always talk about change and
12 nurturing the culture of new FEMA, which is
13 different than our prior culture. And the
14 bottom line and the focus of our whole
15 conference was on how to achieve continuity,
16 unity, and excellence. That's three things
17 we want to aspire to inside FEMA.

18 So I want to talk sort of around
19 these issues as I sort of give you a quick
20 panorama of what is on Dave Paulison's plate
21 every day, and what issues he and I grapple
22 with with Bob and our senior leaders.

1 Let me talk just a little bit about
2 this slide a little bit more. In terms of
3 the vision for new FEMA, we've talked -- you
4 all have our strategic plan. And we think
5 that this is a vision to become the nation's
6 premier emergency management preparedness
7 agency. It's supported by an ethos: lean
8 further forward to deliver more effective
9 service to disaster victims and communities.

10 And we think it goes beyond those
11 simple words. And so our intent is that our
12 strategic plan ought to be a dog-eared copy,
13 not a pristine copy on our coffee table. And
14 everything we do in terms of budgets and
15 operations and plans ought to support that
16 strategic plan. And we ought to emphasize
17 the ethos of leaning further forward. And I
18 think if you watched FEMA in disasters in the
19 last year and a half, two years, you've seen
20 that we've honed to that vision and to that
21 ethos.

22 And so we talk about that in terms

1 of how we do it in the budget, how we look
2 inside FEMA, look external of FEMA, how we
3 work in the budget, how we approach
4 disasters. Often, we can do all this nice
5 work -- when a disaster occurs -- set that
6 aside and let's just go do the way we've done
7 disasters in the past. And we're definitely
8 not doing that. And there are a bunch of
9 examples recently where we've changed course
10 and adhered to how we want to exemplify our
11 values and the way we respond and recover
12 from disasters. And I'll talk a little bit
13 more about that.

14 We'll talk about some new
15 capabilities. We've done a great job, as
16 I've talked before, in the '08 budget. The
17 '09 budget is on the Hill, and we know that
18 we likely will not see that on our tenure.
19 We'll likely have a continuing resolution.

20 But even with that, we're thinking
21 pretty hard about what are the rules of a
22 continuing resolution. And in a continuing

1 resolution, you can't do new starts. And so
2 how can we begin to start things in Fiscal
3 Year '08 with some of our funds so we can
4 continue initiatives and not lose all that
5 time of the whole first quarter from October
6 to January on being prevented from doing new
7 starts. So we're thinking about a CR, and
8 it's not going to surprise us, so how do we
9 think now about living under a CR for an
10 extended period of time and still get the
11 value that we want, and not be hedged in by
12 some of those business rules.

13 The foundations -- it's again about
14 business processes, both at headquarters and
15 the regions. In terms of the structure, what
16 we now have for the first time is a
17 consistent structure that all of FEMA -- the
18 regions have an organizational wire
19 diagram (?) that the RAs help build. And now
20 when you go to any region of FEMA and you
21 walk into that office, it's no longer a
22 smorgasbord of 10 different ways to organize.

1 It's one way to organize. And that way
2 mirrors headquarters. So it's very clear now
3 what the lines of authority are.

4 Programmatic authority, budget
5 authority, from headquarters to the field.
6 And they know how they're connected back and
7 forth. And we've not had that before. And
8 so the structure becomes very, very
9 important. And those are the kinds of things
10 that won't change because of transition.

11 So most of our investment are in
12 areas that we think will have less chance of
13 a mid-course correction here come the end of
14 January, beginning of February.

15 And then in looking at the nature
16 of the culture, we can talk about that
17 forever, so won't talk very much more about
18 it. But it is looking for continuity, for
19 unity, and for excellence in everything that
20 we do.

21 Let me march through a set of
22 slides, and then hope to leave time at the

1 end for some questions about this. If we zip
2 through this slide and go to the next
3 one -- when we look, we're very conscious of
4 who our external partners are. And I hope
5 that some of you in this room know that we
6 probably have reached out more to you
7 individually and collectively than is FEMA's
8 typical culture. And so we want to look at
9 who our partners are, understand them better,
10 have them understand us better, and really
11 work more collaboratively together.

12 Now, that's our ideal. It doesn't
13 always happen that way. And there are a lot
14 of examples. We wrote the National Disaster
15 Housing Strategy inside FEMA. We did not get
16 a room like this together to help write that
17 document. But we've gone out since we've put
18 it on the street and we've engaged a lot of
19 people asking for comment. We could very
20 well have decided to bring everybody in to
21 write that strategy, but we chose not to.

22 It was a conscious choice to write

1 the document -- what we thought the vision
2 was -- and have people review it and
3 criticize it, affirm it, whatever. That's
4 the kind of thing that people wish they'd
5 have been around the table writing with us.
6 So we think about some of those things, and
7 some we do accidentally. But sometimes we do
8 think about who are the partners, how do we
9 engage them, when do we engage them for
10 productive activity.

11 So at the top, disaster victims.
12 And we can never lose sight of who our real
13 customers are as disaster victims and
14 disaster communities. And by and large, what
15 we find is that those who only know the story
16 of Katrina have a jaundiced eye towards this
17 phrase of "new FEMA." But I ask you go to
18 California, go to Washington and Oregon or
19 Arkansas, Tennessee. Go to any of the five
20 Midwest flood states, and I think you'll find
21 a lot of stories about how they've been
22 surprised by what they've seen in FEMA's

1 response.

2 And more importantly now, what
3 they're seeing in FEMA's recovery. And I
4 have a slide later to talk about that in
5 Midwest floods. But we got a lot of comments
6 on how we responded to the Midwest floods.
7 And the last sentence was something
8 like: But that was the response and we'll
9 see how long they're really here. And we'll
10 talk more about that as we get to that.

11 In the media -- media by nature and
12 by value to America always has a jaundiced
13 eye. And I think they look at things
14 critically, and sometimes we think too
15 critically. But we're beginning to get some
16 credibility again with the media, which we
17 lost a couple years ago. And that's through
18 Dave Paulison's effort, and through more than
19 that -- through our RAs and people who engage
20 with the media, I think there's beginning to
21 build -- rebuild a level of trust in what
22 we're saying, but I think there are always

1 going to always be those who ask the second
2 questions, look at us again.

3 But if you look at the clips -- and
4 we'll have another slide here in a
5 minute -- by and large, I think we're
6 seeing -- I wouldn't call it more favorable.
7 I'd call it more objective media coverage of
8 FEMA. And that means they cover the things
9 that we do well, and they cover the things
10 that we don't do so well.

11 And in terms of Congress, I have
12 been amazed at almost everyone I meet,
13 whether it's a member or staff, they all want
14 a strong FEMA. Our objectives are the same.
15 It's just sometimes a meandering course on
16 how we might want to get there. In our
17 budget support, we couldn't ask for more from
18 Congress. No complaints here.

19 In terms of authorization support,
20 we've done pretty well. And that comes with
21 a process, which means you don't get exactly
22 what you asked for, exactly the form you want

1 it in, or the amount you want it, but we did
2 pretty good. And so I think by and large,
3 even our hearings -- which I'll talk about in
4 a minute -- have changed in nature. And so I
5 think we're doing well up on the Hill.

6 With our federal, state, and local
7 partners, you might better be a judge than I.
8 But again, I think we're focused on being
9 stronger partners. It's part of our vision.
10 And I think you'll find across the board from
11 all you'll hear this week, from Dennis
12 Schrader at lunch today, and this afternoon
13 and hear from tomorrow, we really are
14 reaching out more to our federal partners.

15 Something that didn't come
16 naturally to me coming to FEMA is our
17 volunteer organizations. That wasn't part of
18 my background in my Coast Guard days, but
19 I've learned an awful lot about the value the
20 volunteer organizations bring to FEMA, both
21 those who are affiliated volunteers and those
22 who are not.

1 And I think that you'll see us talk
2 about that inside the National Disaster
3 Housing Strategy and inside the NRF. I think
4 we did a much better job of addressing
5 volunteers, and we're finding ways to look at
6 the value that they bring and I -- again, I
7 hope that -- you can never make everybody
8 totally happy. But I think there's more
9 people in the tent than are outside the tent.

10 And private sector, I don't think I
11 can ever -- if I was here another year, I
12 don't think I could ever give you a brief and
13 tell you we were really happy with where we
14 are with the private sector. It is still a
15 challenge. But I think we're doing much,
16 much better. I think that we've engaged
17 private sector in the meeting with Joe Bruno
18 and looking at New York -- we work with the
19 Chamber of Commerce on how to bring private
20 sectors into some of our logistics
21 discussions.

22 We have a private sector person,

1 Cindy Taylor, who focuses on private sector.
2 Didn't have that office before. And so I
3 think that we've recognized the need to
4 engage with private sector, and yet we still
5 sort of struggle a little bit with how to do
6 that.

7 I'll talk in a minute about how
8 we're meeting with NORTHCOM and we're
9 learning about how they deal with private
10 sector. We're looking at Texas and how they
11 dealt with private sector during Hurricane
12 Dolly.

13 And so there's a lot of examples
14 out there. So I think you'll at least find
15 us more open and engaging than perhaps we
16 were before.

17 And in the middle of that is just
18 our FEMA external affairs, which just reminds
19 you again about who they are, and we're
20 really trying to use them to work this spoke
21 and hub here to facilitate these kinds of
22 engagements.

1 On the next slide, this really is
2 sort of a -- if we had a snapshot. And I
3 know that you may not be able to read that
4 all that well, but it's an attempt to tell
5 you on a typical day, what are we seeing in
6 the clips about FEMA? And interestingly, the
7 floods of course is topical. Flood maps,
8 it's always a challenge. And so I'm learning
9 a lot more about flood maps and map mod and
10 how you work with communities on these flood
11 map issues, which everyone acknowledges you
12 need to do -- but it's almost a painstaking
13 process. Every community, as they look at
14 the impact, these new digital maps and new
15 hydraulic studies and where we draw the line
16 for -- which impacts flood insurance and all
17 the investments.

18 Tornados, wildfires, all those are
19 topical in terms of our operational response.
20 Preparedness -- and I'm really glad to see
21 16 percent towards preparedness. Because
22 when we think about FEMA, we still think

1 about legacy FEMA of response, recovery,
2 mitigation. But there's huge value in the
3 preparedness piece, and Dennis Schrader is a
4 dynamo and has done a very good job, as
5 you'll hear today, about looking at what is
6 preparedness, staffing out his organization,
7 integrating them into FEMA, and finding ways
8 to make them not just a stovepipe, but to
9 reach into disaster assistance, disaster ops
10 to logistics and mitigation, and find those
11 linkages of preparedness across FEMA.

12 That's harder. That's almost
13 intuitive to you, but harder than you might
14 think to make that actually happen the way we
15 do business every day.

16 Grants -- Katrina. Hurricanes and
17 housing. Just sort of a general sense of
18 what we see. We review the clips every day,
19 and we take some action in what we're reading
20 there. We want to review that as one way to
21 communicate to FEMA is how we're seeing
22 quotes and issues and what's popped up in

1 some areas of the country. By the time it
2 pops up there, usually it's a problem that we
3 wish we could have solved sooner. But I
4 think that's -- I think you all would agree
5 the same thing in your own business line,
6 that you deal with much the same issues.

7 On the next slide, interactions
8 with Congress. We have a couple Co-Dels that
9 are to be going out here in the next month,
10 out to Hawaii, Guam, and Arizona. Down to
11 the Gulf Coast, it's the third anniversary,
12 as you know, the 28th of August.

13 There'll be a Co-Del down there
14 looking at what we're doing. Dave Paulison
15 will likely be down there. So will I. We're
16 going to Louisiana together, by the way.

17 Together, for example -- while
18 we're here today, Jim Stark, who's the
19 director of our transition recovery office in
20 the Gulf Coast, is at the Washington Post
21 Editorial Board with Paul Rainwater, who's
22 the state's director of Louisiana Recovery

1 Authority. We've never gone to them before
2 with the state and FEMA together. They were
3 on the Hill yesterday. Usually it's let's
4 get with the state, let's get with FEMA and
5 drive down the middle. But Paul was up
6 yesterday and today dealing with editorial
7 boards on the Hill about what are we doing in
8 the Gulf Coast recovery. And we'll talk more
9 about that at the end of the presentation.

10 Give you a sense of the hearings,
11 which we have quite a few of -- we have a
12 broad range of oversight in the House and the
13 Senate. That's an issue that you may be
14 aware of in terms of homeland security. It's
15 not a simple one or two committees on each
16 side of the aisle in each house. It's
17 multiple committees. We get caught up
18 sometimes in some of those jurisdictional
19 issues.

20 But here's a -- just in the last
21 month, five hearings. I was a witness at
22 three of those, looking at disaster -- at two

1 of those, disaster housing, just general
2 recovery. Interesting: look where Dave
3 Paulison spoke. Nuclear terrorism aftermath
4 preparedness. Why would a FEMA director be
5 there for nuclear terrorism aftermath
6 preparedness? It's part of our mission set.

7 When we get out of that -- I showed
8 you a slide on my first briefing to you that
9 had us locked in the corner of natural
10 disasters, and I said to you we were dragging
11 FEMA down the rest of that threat spectrum.
12 And at the other opposite threat spectrum is
13 nuclear attack. FEMA's got a role in nuclear
14 attack.

15 And so I think -- it was a good
16 testament that the Senate specifically wanted
17 Dave Paulison there to talk about nuclear
18 attack. He was there with -- Assistant
19 Secretary McHale from DoD. And I don't know
20 who the other witness was.

21 SPEAKER: Craig Vanderwagen.

22 VADM JOHNSON: Craig Vanderwagen.

1 Thanks, Gerry.

2 So the three there were together,
3 and they asked them each what's your
4 scorecard. Where are we now in terms of
5 preparedness? I think Dave gave the higher
6 score of the three. But it was interesting
7 to have him there along with DoD and HHS to
8 talk about preparedness for a nuclear attack.
9 That's what we're thinking about. So we're
10 engaged on that threat spectrum. That's a
11 good sign that they wanted us at that
12 hearing.

13 On the next slide? What about
14 these new capabilities? And I've talked to
15 you about them before, so I won't belabor
16 concepts that you're already familiar with.
17 But IMATs -- the last time I've talked to
18 you, we probably had a concept, but we now
19 have them in reality. The national IMAT,
20 here, headquarters in Washington D.C.

21 Regional IMATs that exist today and
22 participated in Hurricane Dolly from Region 4

1 in Atlanta, Region 5 in Chicago, and from
2 Region 6 there in Denton. All three
3 participated between the Midwest floods and
4 the -- and Hurricane Dolly.

5 Midwest floods. You have a JFO set
6 up in Des Moines, and you have a huge area of
7 disaster impact in Cedar Rapids. By having
8 the IMAT, we split the IMAT apart and sent an
9 area command -- if you know those
10 terms -- out to Cedar Rapids, and you had a
11 good leader with a core team of qualified,
12 experienced people providing insight, help to
13 the local disaster area, but also inside back
14 to the JFO, to the governor, to Dave
15 Paulison, on what was really going on across
16 all of Iowa, and specifically in Cedar
17 Rapids. And with an area command that we
18 could do with an IMAT.

19 And Hurricane Dolly -- and actually
20 Tropical Storm -- what was his name?
21 Edouardo. We had a national VTC, and part of
22 the situation awareness was the IMAT there

1 with live video from Galveston and across the
2 impact area from the hurricane. We never had
3 that before. So it's not just a bunch of
4 PowerPoint slides and people telling you I've
5 got these numbers and shelters and this and
6 this, here's what the damage was.

7 You have a live video there being
8 narrated by an IMAT member who says I've been
9 to the hospital, I've been to the grocery
10 stores, by the way. Gas stations are up and
11 operating. And we're getting a live report,
12 we can see what's there and hear by an expert
13 person going through the area -- to get a
14 sense for what the response and recovery
15 issues are, what assistance might be
16 required.

17 It's about situational awareness.
18 We learned that lesson well for the lack of
19 it in Katrina. We're able to solve
20 it -- begin to solve it now with these
21 regional IMATs. So they show up as
22 qualified, trained, credentialed people with

1 an aggressive training and continuing
2 education program. They're experts in their
3 fields from disaster -- from IAPA,
4 mitigation, logistics. Just management,
5 administrative finance. They're set up like
6 an ICS structure, with an FCO as the leader.

7 And the states have learned to
8 value the IMAT. They want them there,
9 because they want to get that live video as
10 well to find out what's going on on scene.
11 They don't always have that kind of a
12 situation awareness. So the IMATs have been
13 a good hit.

14 We've got -- we'll stand up in
15 Region 2 this fiscal year, and then next year
16 we've got the resources for two more regions,
17 and then we'll fill out again in the FY '10
18 budget. And ideally we'll finish the IMAT
19 build-out of three national teams and ten
20 regional teams in the 2011 budget. But all
21 of our key regions have them now, and they're
22 fully-deployable by C-130 to any region in

1 the country. And so they're virtually all
2 basically national capability.

3 Just as a point of interest,
4 remember the space re-entry vehicle, when
5 that popped up several months ago? We
6 thought this space thing might drop and rain
7 all kind of stuff on the United States. It
8 was the National IMAT that engaged with DoD,
9 and they broke all kinds of new ground with
10 DoD.

11 Everything from almost the word
12 "space re-entry vehicle" was top-secret when
13 this thing first started -- as we went
14 throughout that sequence to deal with that,
15 different things became unclassified. In
16 FEMA, I can almost count on two hands the
17 number of STU (?) phones we have. We found
18 ourselves inhibited by dealing with
19 everything classified, top-secret with DoD on
20 space re-entry vehicle.

21 But our IMAT sort of bridged the
22 difference there. And they were our

1 liaisons. They would have gone out to areas
2 around the country that were identified as
3 potential impact areas had that space vehicle
4 actually come into the atmosphere and landed
5 somewhere in the United States, or multiple
6 places in the United States.

7 The National Response Coordination
8 Center, again -- when we first met with the
9 NAC at the very beginning last year, it was
10 lights out at the NRCC -- and the RRCCs, I
11 might add, on any given day. And now that's
12 a fully-functional, staffed up, 7 by 24
13 National Response Coordination Center.

14 Reaching out to the regions,
15 reaching out to states, to fusion centers, to
16 JTTFs, to all federal agencies, NORTHCOM,
17 SOUTHCOM, reaching out to wherever they need
18 to do to have total situation awareness.

19 Dave Paulison -- I get a briefing
20 every morning about what's happened the night
21 before, what the forecast is for the weather
22 coming up, what operations are going on or

1 are expected to come up. We are almost
2 running, as we should -- as you would expect
3 us to do, from a situational awareness
4 perspective. That's all changed in one year.

5 The regions are hiring people right
6 now to stand their RRCCs up at more than
7 a -- maybe not a 7 by 24, they don't have
8 enough people yet. But lights on during the
9 larger parts of the working day. And so
10 FEMA's beginning to march down that road of
11 all hazards, and to be much more aware every
12 day of what's going on around us and what the
13 potential threats are and potential
14 responses.

15 Same in operational planning. You
16 will be briefed about integrative planning
17 systems. Some of you have been part of a
18 work group on that. And we're hiring
19 operational planners in the regions and at
20 headquarters. And our goal, as it says, is
21 to have 30 planners at headquarters and 53
22 among the 10 regions. And we're almost

1 halfway there: 25 in headquarters and
2 33 -- well, more than halfway there in the
3 regions -- by the end of this fiscal year.

4 We've never had people there where
5 their job descriptions are "operational
6 planner." That's a key skill set that we
7 have to have inside FEMA. You'll hear more
8 about that by the presentations over the next
9 day or so.

10 And the next slide? Logistics.
11 Work group heard from Eric Smith yesterday,
12 and this really is a new capability in FEMA.
13 We've talked about it before, so I won't
14 belabor it, except to say that as we continue
15 to figure out what the balance is between
16 organic FEMA capability and relying on our
17 partners, what the balance is between a right
18 business solution versus what might be a
19 pragmatic solution -- we might not send water
20 and MREs to a state given the disaster
21 situation. We might not pre-position water
22 and MREs in a particular state given our

1 planning purposes.

2 But pragmatically, sending water
3 and MREs to a state after a disaster is a
4 good thing to do whether you end up using
5 them or not.

6 Pragmatically, making governors
7 satisfied with this new logistics
8 concept -- and we met with Governor Barbour
9 and Governor Riley, Alabama,
10 Mississippi -- about our plan for this coming
11 hurricane season. Pragmatically having
12 pre-positioned supplies in their state,
13 though less than they originally wanted,
14 helps them familiarize with what our new
15 logistics concept is.

16 So I think this is a key to FEMA's
17 future success. Engaging private sector,
18 becoming a better partner with all of our
19 federal capabilities, being a good steward of
20 the taxpayers' dollar, thinking and acting
21 about the way we should approach disasters
22 from a logistics -- not just building a big

1 man-mountain of supplies to which we can
2 overwhelm anything. That's the old way of
3 doing it. That's not the right way to do it.
4 And I think we're on the right road, but it's
5 not a straight road and not a smooth road.
6 So you're going to watch us meander a little
7 bit, but I hope that through your work
8 groups, you'll keep an eye where we're going
9 in logistics.

10 In the next slide, I want to talk a
11 little bit about the Midwest floods. Not
12 from the flood perspective, but just what
13 we're doing changing the culture and thinking
14 of FEMA. When we have a disaster that
15 occurs, we have VTCs that bring in all of the
16 right leaders -- federally, state, and
17 local -- to focus on the response to a
18 disaster.

19 Our VTCs right now, you can
20 almost -- too many people want to get on
21 them. They're a good, solid information
22 exchange, decisions are being made, and we're

1 able to affect operations on the spot in our
2 VTCs. All of our key partners -- and some of
3 them are around this table -- participate in
4 a VTC. But when that response is done -- in
5 FEMA culture, it's done.

6 Now you turn over to the recovery,
7 disaster assistance, and I'm on to something
8 else. I don't pay attention to the recovery.
9 Is that really the way we should run
10 operations in FEMA? I don't think so.

11 When we look at problems we
12 have -- not that many problems in response,
13 we all respond fairly well. All of our
14 problems come from recovery. It becomes a
15 bureaucratic thing. It slows down. An
16 example: We need to provide up to 900 mobile
17 homes in Iowa. If we left our hand off the
18 tiller, we were at a pace that would have
19 gotten until the middle to late October to
20 put all those people in a mobile home in
21 Iowa -- we now put metrics in place,
22 accountability in place. We asked a simple

1 question like what day does school start?
2 Should we have families with school age in
3 their school district before school starts?
4 Pretty basic question.

5 We've not asked ourselves or the
6 state that question before. So in Iowa, we
7 now have a graph -- that I didn't bring with
8 me -- but it shows a graph at 15 families per
9 day, and when will we finish. And that
10 graph, it says at 25 a day, when will we
11 finish.

12 Starting last Friday, we put 15
13 families a day into mobile homes, 85 between
14 Friday and Monday.

15 And we'll get 15 today and 15
16 tomorrow, because we now have a program plan
17 to finish by about the middle of September.
18 And if we get good discussions today with
19 state of Iowa and get some issues solved, we
20 can jack that thing up to the 25 a day and
21 almost the first day of September be finished
22 housing families in Iowa.

1 We've never looked at it that way
2 before. Every Monday, we now have a VTC
3 focused on recovery of an event that occurred
4 six weeks ago. And the task is, each of the
5 five states -- what are the -- how is the
6 state organized for recovery? They have
7 offices and task forces. What are the
8 governor's top three priorities? And what
9 are we doing about them? And we focus on
10 recovery from a D.C. perspective every
11 Monday, knowing that that drives the system
12 to do it more often every day.

13 So we're trying to find issues now
14 that become problems tomorrow, and solve them
15 as issues.

16 And we're standing engaged from the
17 senior leadership -- and by the way, we
18 report our results to the Secretary about
19 once every other week. So he's engaged in
20 recovery where we weren't before. It's
21 changing the culture of FEMA. It's focused
22 across the mission perspective -- the whole

1 mission perspective, not just the beginning.
2 And we're bringing about the vision of new
3 FEMA. And this is just one very graphic
4 example.

5 Let's go to the next slide. FEMA's
6 foundation. Okay? We've talked about
7 business practices before, and we really do
8 need to upgrade our business practices in
9 FEMA. You haven't met Al Sligh yet, but Al
10 is -- was with FEMA before. He left to
11 become the chief acquisition officer at the
12 Department of Commerce, and now has come back
13 into FEMA as our assistant administrator for
14 the Office of Management.

15 And we're focused on our business
16 practices. The CIO, the chief procurement
17 officer, the CFO, facilities -- IT, and in
18 HR. And we're focused every day on fixing
19 some longstanding problems about buying
20 upgraded business systems, about having these
21 systems communicate with each other.

22 And we've been seeing a lot of

1 results -- a lot of payoff as a result of
2 that.

3 We set a goal to be at 95 percent
4 hiring by the end of this fiscal year. We're
5 probably going to get in the low 90s, but
6 that's been a weakness of FEMA for decades:
7 We just can't seem to hire.

8 Every Thursday morning at a senior
9 staff meeting, we focus on the metrics -- new
10 term to FEMA -- of hiring. We can identify,
11 as I think I told you last time -- I can tell
12 you whether the problem is at the program,
13 whether the problem is at the region, or the
14 problem is at the HR -- who owns every
15 segment of the hiring process.

16 And we focus on that every
17 Thursday, along with focusing on how we're
18 spending our money. Same kind of thing. Who
19 is the problem in the money? Is it the
20 program? Is it acquisitions or is it budget?
21 And we solve these issues by hammering on it
22 every single week. And these metrics are

1 changing the way that we focus and prioritize
2 our tasks and hire the right people inside
3 FEMA.

4 So I think our focus on business
5 processes isn't what you'd see or read about
6 every day. But we're finding recognition in
7 all quarters about how we're changing the way
8 we actually manage FEMA's business on the
9 inside. And I think that's a key that we
10 can't lose sight of as we move into the
11 transition.

12 On the next slide, focus on people.
13 Had a VTC yesterday, which was our first VTC
14 where we had three regions provide a regional
15 status report to the administrator. We've
16 worked since our last off-site to develop how
17 should we link to the regions? And there's a
18 set format now, and we go through this
19 format -- every region reports back to the
20 administrator in an about a 20-minute brief
21 across what we're successful at. What are
22 the issues -- and what our challenges are.

1 And most often, it's challenges.

2 One of the issues that popped up
3 was hiring -- that we just don't have enough
4 people in all the right places and we aren't
5 investing in training. We spend less than
6 \$200 a person in professional development
7 inside FEMA every year. It ought to be about
8 \$1,000 a person. And so what we've done is
9 we've focused on training and hiring.

10 Disaster Reserve Work Force, our
11 DAEs. We focus on PFTs, but in FEMA, it's
12 reversed. It's the example in the Midwest
13 floods -- 54 permanent full-time. That's
14 what PFT is. Our temporary local hires, 193
15 and 2,016 reserve workforce. Our DAEs,
16 89 percent of all of our DAEs were at one
17 point or other in those five states.

18 And so we're focused on disaster
19 reserve workforce. We've set up a brand-new
20 office called the Office of Disaster Reserve
21 Workforce, which we've never had before. And
22 now we're looking at how to organize,

1 systemize, train, credential, develop all of
2 our DAE force, which again is three times the
3 size of our permanent force that we've never
4 invested in in the past. And so that's
5 something I'll want you to know more about as
6 we maybe get to the next NAC meeting.

7 On the next slide? We went to
8 Gallup -- and some of you may be familiar
9 with the Gallup organization. You think
10 about them as the poll-takers. Well, they
11 also have a program about -- that they've
12 learned from working in workforces, and they
13 have a 12 question test, and they use that 12
14 questions to work throughout the entire
15 workforce column from the senior leaders to
16 the workers about how do we develop the
17 strengths -- they focus on strengths, not
18 weaknesses of our workforce.

19 And so we just signed a contract
20 with Gallup to lead us through a multi-year
21 focus on professional development of our
22 workforce.

1 It comes with -- we've got a
2 10-person Gallup team inside FEMA. It's the
3 same 10 people. I'm not job-sharing them
4 with some other agency, some other contract
5 they have. They're focused on FEMA. They're
6 going to reach across all of our regions and
7 headquarters units. They're going to include
8 DAEs as well as PFTs. And we're going to
9 train low-level managers and high-level
10 managers.

11 Typically, when we want to do
12 workforce training, we train just the worker
13 and forget about the manager. But all of us
14 know it's your first-line supervisor, the
15 most important person in having an effect on
16 the workforce. And they're a focus of this
17 Best Program with Gallup. And so again,
18 we're going to start that and it's going to
19 roll out here within the next month. Bad
20 timing, hurricane season.

21 A lot of reasons to push it off,
22 but you always push these things off to the

1 edge of the table. There's never a good
2 time. And so I'm hoping that at the next NAC
3 meeting, we can bring people back in and talk
4 to you about the Best Program and how well
5 that's going to be working us out our
6 workforce, reinvesting for the first time in
7 FEMA's history, I think, in working on our
8 workforce.

9 We have a minority intern program
10 we're going to launch here soon. We've not
11 had that before. We actually -- we're pretty
12 good in our hiring. We knew at the beginning
13 of our hiring process what we want our
14 workforce to look like. And when you talk to
15 Pauline Campbell, you'll find that the
16 numbers are pretty good in terms of how we're
17 beginning to look like those whom we serve.

18 One way to improve that is to have
19 an intern program with our Historically Black
20 Colleges and Universities, with our Hispanic
21 Colleges and Universities, and bring them in
22 as interns, hopefully to fill a job inside

1 FEMA. We've not done a minority intern
2 program before. We're going to start that
3 here this fiscal year.

4 And then I would want to look at
5 SESs for a minute. Again, that's how we
6 begin to effect the longstanding nature of
7 holding on to our directions and strategic
8 plan -- by having senior career leaders adopt
9 our -- what we're working on and to carry
10 that forward in the next administration.

11 We've increased by 25 percent the
12 number of SESs inside FEMA. And most are
13 brought in from the outside, and I think
14 you'd be very, very impressed to read the
15 resumes of those who want to apply to work in
16 FEMA. This is a place that people want to
17 come to work. They see a opportunity to
18 provide value. They're coming from the
19 Defense Department, from private sector, from
20 college/universities. We have a very strong
21 and a strengthened SES corps.

22 And again, I hope that we have a

1 chance to meet some of those players.

2 On the next slide, let's take a
3 look at some of our structural issues. If
4 you're from a -- Gen. Libby, if you're
5 dealing with a DoD world, and you have senior
6 leadership talks, that's significant. If a
7 four-star comes in, like NORTHCOM -- which
8 has never before done this with FEMA -- has
9 senior leadership conference with FEMA,
10 that's significant. That shows that they
11 recognize the value of the organization,
12 they're willing to invest their senior
13 leaders' time in engaging in FEMA, and they
14 want us to be aligned.

15 We held our first senior leadership
16 conference with NORTHCOM, National Guard
17 Bureau, with DHS, about a month ago. And we
18 have our follow-up VTC next Tuesday with
19 action items that we laid out for ourselves.

20 It's a way to formalize the link
21 with DoD, with NORTHCOM. I think I view FEMA
22 nationally as the J-3, the operational arm of

1 the domestic side of our government.

2 And we should link and have
3 connections with NORTHCOM, the military side
4 of supporting homeland defense -- homeland
5 security. And so we're across all the
6 J-staffs; intel, operations, planning,
7 communications, strategic communications,
8 exercises. We've got people and initiatives
9 across all of that. It's not
10 personality-driven; it's driven by mission
11 requirements to support America from a
12 domestic and a DoD perspective. It's a
13 significant event to have SLC talks with
14 NORTHCOM.

15 Dave spent all day yesterday at the
16 Nuclear Regulatory Commission. They don't
17 meet very often, but they met yesterday, and
18 he was there on both sides of the table.
19 Testified on one side and he got on the other
20 side and got asked questions on that.

21 I think he preferred the other
22 side, asking questions, than to be on the

1 question-answering side.

2 But the administrator of FEMA sat
3 there alongside the commissioner from the
4 National Regulatory Commission acknowledging
5 our role at overseeing nuclear power plants.

6 One of the key changes is that
7 they've had the exact same exercise format
8 for years from the NRC. And everyone knows
9 it by heart. Let me ask you, if you're going
10 to do this exercise and you know the whole
11 thing by heart -- and you even know when
12 you're going to take a lunch break -- it
13 becomes -- you sort of go on through the
14 whole thing, and you didn't get a whole lot
15 of value.

16 They wanted to come up now and have
17 these new hostile action drills. They did
18 the first one in Southern Virginia about
19 three weeks ago, where Dave went to that as
20 well. And so they've changed the way they're
21 thinking about exercise to be more
22 challenging to the nuclear power plants, to

1 make sure that they're really ready in the
2 event of some sort of a release. And so
3 these hostile action drills brings a whole
4 new flavor of oversight and readiness and
5 preparedness at nuclear power plants, and
6 FEMA's a large part of that with the NRC.

7 And the Federal Communications
8 Commission? We didn't have a whole lot to do
9 with them, either. And we had this IPAWS
10 project, which is really becoming a much more
11 significant project than we had really
12 imagined, to be honest with you. And now we
13 have a long -- a formal role with the FCC
14 about how we do alert systems across the
15 nation. And we play a more formal role with
16 the FCC than we've done in the past.

17 So these linkages are also very,
18 very important to our standing among all of
19 our federal partners, and the buy-in that
20 they have to things that we're doing inside
21 new FEMA.

22 On the next slide? The

1 transition -- to talk about this just
2 briefly. And again, I went through a series
3 of slides with you the last time I met.
4 We're making good progress.

5 We're actually leading elements of
6 DHS and providing documents that we've never
7 had before in -- people appreciating FEMA.
8 We have a first draft of the transition
9 binder that -- it describes new FEMA and it
10 describes the organization. It has a tab for
11 every one of our major directorates.

12 It's in review right now. You'll
13 get a copy within the next month, Kem. I
14 think we'll be finished and get it out to
15 members of the National Advisory Council.

16 We've identified -- Nancy Ward, as
17 you know, is our senior career official.
18 We've identified Al Sligh as my double, her
19 deputy -- if we get to that point in the
20 transition. We have a survey out to all of
21 our people, so we can calm their fears about
22 transition. What do you want to know? How

1 best to get information to you? What are
2 your concerns in transition? So we've never
3 communicated with our own people before to
4 understand their concerns of a transition.

5 We have -- in terms of readiness,
6 we're supporting the Department from a
7 training and exercise perspective in how to
8 get the Department ready for transitions.
9 Our exercise guys, it'll be tasking and
10 training exercise and all the new people who
11 come in over the course of the next several
12 months, once we get a transition team in in
13 November, and work towards the actual
14 transition in January.

15 And then we have a good schedule
16 that's -- we have a staff focused on the
17 transition. It's not a part-time job; it's a
18 full-time job. It'll become more of a
19 full-time job almost with each week that
20 passes.

21 On the next slide? Gulf Coast
22 recovery. We briefed the President a week

1 ago. The anniversary of Katrina comes up on
2 the 28th of August. It's Governor Jindal's
3 first anniversary, and it's the President's
4 last.

5 And we've found a lot of
6 commonality with Governor Jindal and his
7 administration with -- well, Paul Rainwater,
8 the director of Louisiana Recovery Authority;
9 with Mark Cooper, the new leader of their
10 Homeland Security. It's a -- we have a good
11 relationship with this new administration,
12 and it's worked out very, very well for both
13 us and I think the citizens in Louisiana. Of
14 course, we've had a good relationship with
15 Governor Barbour.

16 These are things we pointed out to
17 the President. What we told him was that if
18 we don't plan -- now, this is like three
19 months in the making. We sat back three
20 months ago and said you know what? If we get
21 up and go to bed and do every single day, the
22 28th of August will arrive. It can arrive

1 one of two ways. Just because it occurs
2 naturally and when you wake up on the 28th
3 you have what you have, or you can plan
4 towards the 28th of August. And what do we
5 want that third anniversary to look like?
6 Where can we find successes now that will be
7 there by the 28th of August? And so we've
8 worked for the last three-plus months
9 thinking about the third anniversary. And
10 that's been an impetus. Everyone needs a
11 deadline and a date to drive by.

12 And so whether it's working with
13 the city or the state or other parishes to
14 fix firehouses and police stations and the
15 schools, we've used the third anniversary as
16 a driving point to make decisions, to
17 allocate funds, to award contracts, and find
18 successes by the third anniversary.

19 It's in all of our interests -- not
20 from a marketing perspective, from a reality
21 perspective -- to have greater successes by
22 the third anniversary. We've been at it for

1 three years. We need to show people that the
2 end is near, progress is being made. Yes, we
3 still have tough issues. Everything is not
4 going swimmingly, but these are the kinds of
5 things we can find some successes in.

6 Governor Leavitt -- Secretary
7 Leavitt is involved with the Governor to talk
8 about how to redesign the entire Louisiana
9 health care system. It's using the
10 opportunity by Katrina to bring long-lasting
11 systemic changes in how they provide health
12 care in the state of Louisiana -- that can
13 become a model for other urban areas and
14 other states around the nation.

15 Can't talk much more about that,
16 but I think Gerry knows, this is potentially
17 landmark. And they're working towards an MOU
18 that'll set a direction. It won't be done by
19 the third anniversary. It'll take maybe two
20 more years to build a hospital and to make
21 these changes. But we're going to line up
22 now, and this is an opportunity that we

1 thought we had and lost twice before that now
2 is in front of us again, in working with this
3 administration.

4 And Secretary Leavitt's been
5 personally engaged with the governor on that.

6 Education restoration? If you want
7 to have recovery from a catastrophe, if you
8 get the schools fixed and get the police
9 stations and the fire stations fixed and open
10 the stores again, recovery begins to happen.
11 There's been a huge focus on education. And
12 so I can give you the numbers later, but in
13 terms of number of schools that'll be open
14 this coming school year, number of school
15 buildings completed -- not just in design
16 phase -- it's been a transformation of the
17 schools.

18 The state has a new director. He
19 has a strategic plan for the schools that'll
20 be released within the next two weeks.

21 That'll be a very controversial plan, because
22 it's going to identify for the first time

1 formally which are the donor schools and
2 which are the recipient schools. When the
3 population of New Orleans shrinks as it has
4 and will post-Katrina, all those schools
5 won't be opened again.

6 And so the states, they had a lot
7 of public discussions, public meetings,
8 acrimonious meetings, as you would imagine.
9 No one wants the school they want to closed;
10 they want to keep them all going. But
11 they've got a good plan, and we've been a
12 partner with them in supporting that, and
13 that's going to come out. I think it'll
14 bring real change in the education system,
15 and people are seeing that change now.

16 The city has awarded contracts now
17 for architectural engineering firms for the
18 fire stations and police stations. Almost
19 all the police are back into their full-time
20 permanent structure.

21 They're not doing a part-time in a
22 FEMA trailer and walking over to a building.

1 When you see the police station now, it's a
2 building, no longer side-by-side FEMA
3 trailer. And the firehouses, it's almost the
4 same thing.

5 So when a community sees that we're
6 out of trailers into our permanent structure,
7 it's a physical sign -- a visible sign -- of
8 recovery. And that's our target by the end
9 of August, is to have more of those
10 completed.

11 Restoration of permanent housing is
12 probably one of the -- still one of the
13 biggest challenges in Louisiana and in
14 Mississippi. But I'll show a slide in a
15 minute. I think we're making some progress
16 there.

17 The levee system, which I won't
18 talk about very much, but a very -- a big,
19 expensive project by the Corps of Engineers.
20 A lot of collaboration, a key central
21 undergirding focus and credibility factor in
22 Louisiana, and New Orleans specifically, for

1 hurricane season.

2 From strategic policy -- so we've
3 looked at these initiatives, which we always
4 focused on before, but for the first time we
5 looked at what are the policy implications of
6 this? So how do you enhance accountability?
7 Governor -- Mayor Nagin, for the first time,
8 hired his own IG. And it was almost a
9 one-person office.

10 Imagine being the one-person IG in
11 the city of New Orleans, with hurricane
12 recovery. Across the federal government, we
13 work with government agencies, and we've all
14 volunteered our own IGs out of DHS and DoD
15 and DOJ. And we've augmented the staff of
16 the IG in the city of New Orleans.

17 We've provided equipment, supplies,
18 expertise to help him begin to bring
19 accountability to where this money is going
20 in the state of Louisiana and the city of New
21 Orleans. And I think if you've read the news
22 clips in the last three days, you'll see

1 actions taken by the state and by the city to
2 bring more accountability into spending
3 billions of dollars in recovery.

4 This week, we'll turn on a
5 transparency website. You'll link on this
6 website, and any project going on in the
7 state of Louisiana will be visible and
8 accessible by a web-based transparency
9 initiative. Whether it's schools, police,
10 fire, city parks, state buildings, any
11 project going on, you can access by this
12 website. It'll tell you what the project is,
13 who owns it, how much money's been allocated
14 for it, how much has been spent, and you'll
15 be able to see progress by linking into this
16 website. We've never done that before. And
17 we linked our website to the city's website.
18 Transparency is a wonderful thing.

19 About maybe a year ago, a constant
20 sniping between FEMA and the state -- the
21 state and the applicant. Three players here,
22 which makes it very, very hard. Get a

1 project worksheet approved, we take money and
2 we provide it to the state's account.

3 The state approves the applicant's
4 effort; they provide it to the applicant. As
5 a reimbursement, the applicant says, I need
6 money from the state to get my project going.
7 The problem is, I don't have any money. So
8 now I need money initially to get going so
9 that I can give you a project that you'll
10 give me more funds for, some seed money.
11 That wasn't happening a year ago. We were
12 all shooting at each other.

13 We gave billions of bucks to the
14 state and we could show -- and we actually
15 put in the Times-Picayune a chart that came
16 out, here's a column of billions of bucks
17 that FEMA has given to the state.

18 Here's about how much the state has
19 given out to the applicants. That clearly
20 drew fire to the state. Why are you holding
21 on to this much and the applicants only get
22 this much? What's the problem? The state

1 was not happy when we put that metric in the
2 newspaper. The applicants loved it. Hey,
3 there's the money in the state, now what's
4 going on?

5 Well, we found out when we gave the
6 applicant the money, they weren't equipped to
7 spend it very well.

8 A year later now, we're all joined
9 together in this transparency initiative.
10 Money's going to the state, it's going
11 efficiently now to the applicant. The
12 applicant now has hired -- by a change in
13 FEMA policy, we've actually allowed them to
14 hire more professional project managers to
15 run their projects. It's no longer the
16 sheriff who has a deputy sheriff running
17 projects that he was never trained to do.
18 It's a professional project manager now by
19 the way we've changed our policies.

20 So we've worked together for the
21 last year, and this initiative will come out
22 and everyone will be glad to see it.

1 Citizens now can track what's going on in
2 their neighborhood, ZIP code, Census zone,
3 however they want to divide the city, you can
4 keep a track on Gulf Coast recovery.

5 Conduct federal regulatory policy
6 reform. You're engaged with us on that.
7 We've got to institutionalize the lessons
8 learned from Katrina. We want to take
9 policies that we changed in Katrina and use
10 them in Iowa and Indiana and Wisconsin and
11 Illinois and Missouri. And we're not quite
12 there yet, but with the work of your
13 subcommittee, we're going to be able to look
14 at regulations and then policies and change
15 them now to institutionalize lessons learned.

16 What we gave the subcommittee was
17 focused just on recovery. It's called
18 3-3-10: 3 individual assistance regulations,
19 3 public assistance regulations, and 10
20 policies that we want to change in the very
21 near term that will change the way we do
22 recovery in FEMA. Is it the only ones we

1 need to change? No. But it's what we think
2 our top ones are. When that's done, I hope
3 the next team takes on mitigation with a
4 3-3-10 of mitigation and a 3-3-10 in
5 response.

6 Our view is that Stafford is a
7 wonderful piece of legislation, very
8 flexible. It's the quiltwork of regulations
9 and policies --restrictive all of
10 them -- that have been built over 20 years
11 that tie our hands right now. We're willing
12 to take those handcuffs off -- with your
13 help -- to pick the right regulations, the
14 right policies, redo those and become more
15 flexible again to serve -- again, to serve
16 disaster victims and communities.

17 And then the final thing is, we
18 did -- our vision doesn't terminate on the
19 20th of January. What we briefed the
20 President was, it's his job, too, to set up
21 the next administration for success, and to
22 follow through on his commitment -- Jackson

1 Square in Louisiana for Gulf Coast recovery.
2 So number of initiatives we have, we're going
3 to start them, we can't possibly finish them
4 on our watch. But we've not stopped there.

5 Now, it wasn't long ago that we did
6 that. We had a couple policies where these
7 dates terminate on February or something like
8 that. We're looking beyond that. We know
9 that our job doesn't end when our date ends.
10 We've got to set up the next team for
11 success. And that's something we want to
12 carry forward in all disasters.

13 On the next slide -- these are just
14 some numbers. I'll just go to the next
15 slide. This just gives you a sense that we
16 had 23,000 households in May of '08 in FEMA
17 temporary housing. We're now down to 15,000;
18 85 percent of those are private sites and 500
19 a week turn their travel trailer back into
20 FEMA. These are people who are fixing their
21 house. When it's fixed, they're going to
22 give back their travel trailer. So there's

1 only about less than 3,000 people still
2 living in a travel trailer or a mobile home.

3 And in fact, in a travel trailer at
4 a group site, there's less than 200. We had
5 80 group sites in January, we have three
6 group sites now in Louisiana, people living
7 in travel trailers. It's been a huge success
8 to get people out of these units and into
9 rental units, into their own homes and
10 houses.

11 So on the next slide, I wanted to
12 end where I began, and to say that through
13 this quick runthrough of what's on our plate,
14 we're focused not on what we need to do
15 today, but everything we do today has to
16 contribute to where we want to be tomorrow.
17 And tomorrow doesn't end on January 20.
18 Tomorrow ends at some point in the future.
19 And so it's our job to help to rebuild FEMA
20 and to pass that on to the next
21 administration.

22 When we had our senior leaders

1 conference, we said that we could approach
2 transition one of two ways. Maybe many ways,
3 but one of two ways. Now, we use sports
4 analogies, and we said we typically approach
5 a transition like a football game. And oddly
6 enough, it has four quarters. And every year
7 of the administration is just one quarter of
8 a football game. And what happens, you take
9 a break after every year. And don't we? We
10 always evaluate midterm elections and what
11 happens then and what you did a year before?

12 What are you going to do the next
13 year? We do it at the halfway point. Again,
14 midterm elections pop up, you take a longer
15 halftime at a football game. And when the
16 game is over, that game is over. You go
17 home, you forget about that game. You maybe
18 take rest on the weekend, you come back and
19 watch some films and plan for a play for the
20 next game. The coach comes in and tells you
21 what the new game plan is and you start it
22 that way.

1 If you approach it that way, then
2 we lose any momentum in a transition. We
3 accept up front that the new coach will come
4 in with a new game plan and we'll follow this
5 new game plan. And so you buy into the
6 mentality that slows us down and will inhibit
7 progress towards our -- what we think are the
8 right objectives for FEMA.

9 What we said was, it needs to be
10 viewed as a relay race. And in a relay race,
11 much different environment. You're going
12 around this track, you know the track, and
13 you're going to continue the course when a
14 new player comes in. And what happens when
15 you exchange relays at a relay race? You
16 probably don't even slow down as the runner.

17 It's the job of the new person to
18 speed up and catch up with you. And then you
19 have a baton and you pass it and how do you
20 pass it? You just toss it to the guy?
21 Not -- I don't think so. You have a firm
22 handshake of that baton. And you pass that

1 baton. And when you know that the receiver
2 has it permanently, then you drop back. And
3 the other person takes off around that course
4 again -- the same course, by the way, that
5 you just finished running.

6 So it was a very good analogy to
7 talk about what -- how should we view the
8 course, how do we view the runner's
9 responsibility, both the incoming and the
10 outgoing? And the outgoing runner, when you
11 fall away, what do you do? You don't just
12 run into the stands. You stand there and
13 watch the new team run around the track.

14 That's what Dave and I hope to do.
15 Watch this new team run around the track with
16 interest, hoping that the team succeeds.

17 At the end of the session, Dave
18 gave every person, every senior leader, gave
19 them a baton. We actually went out and
20 bought aluminum batons that you use in a
21 relay race. And it was inscribed on there,
22 and it had three words on it: "Continuity,

1 Unity, and Excellence." And that's our theme
2 for the rest of our term.

3 So every one of our SESs now has in
4 his or her office a blue aluminum baton with
5 Continuity, Unity, and Excellence. And we
6 want them to see that baton and think about
7 that every day, that we're running a relay
8 race. We're not in a football game. And
9 it's a race that we want to continue beyond
10 our tenure. It has an endpoint, but it has a
11 direction -- a strategic plan -- that we want
12 to follow.

13 And all these things that I've
14 talked about, I think we do -- Bob and I, we
15 meet every morning and mull these things
16 over. And this is the direction we're taking
17 new FEMA.

18 So I hope it's useful to you just
19 to get a sense of what kind of issues we're
20 dealing with. But also the way that we're
21 dealing with them.

22 So with that, Kem, I'd be glad to

1 answer any questions.

2 MR. BENNETT: We'll open up the floor
3 to questions.

4 SPEAKER: You did a good job.

5 MS. PRICE: Bob had a question.

6 MR. CONNORS: Admiral, with respect to
7 transition, to what extent do you see the NAC
8 being able to help guide and work within the
9 transition plans that you seem to already be
10 drafted that we'll be receiving at some point, I
11 think you said? To what extent do you see this
12 body being able to actually help and influence
13 the transition going forward?

14 VADM JOHNSON: When the transition
15 gets going after the election, a transition team
16 is established -- there'll be a bunch of briefs
17 to the incoming transition team. The transition
18 team ought to be briefed about the National
19 Advisory Council.

20 The timing of the Council could
21 very well be that you meet during the
22 transition. And you should meet with

1 transition officials for DHS. And you should
2 provide -- I think Kem should provide some
3 input that can be provided to the transition
4 team. There'll be a team identifier for DHS.
5 That person is going to get all kinds of
6 input, ought to take some input from the
7 National Advisory Council. What directions
8 are you seeing? What direction do you think
9 you should be going in the transition.

10 Again, I would hope that Kem and
11 senior leaders of the Council actually meet
12 with the transition official. So I think
13 that's one thing, is to engage in the
14 process. And we can certainly work with Bob
15 and the team and make sure the avenue is
16 there to do that.

17 So I think that's with the
18 transition team. New people come in, they'll
19 be new to FEMA. Not all of you are new to
20 FEMA. And so I think you'll have a chance to
21 provide impressions to the transition team
22 that comes into FEMA. There'll be a team

1 just for FEMA.

2 And then when new transition
3 leaders are identified, again, I think this
4 is a very important body. How you've matured
5 as a National Advisory Council of the last
6 year I think is showing more the value that
7 you do bring. I would hope that you'll meet
8 with the new leadership of FEMA, and that
9 you'll be able to provide them your insights
10 and your observations, and how you would like
11 to engage with the new team when they come
12 in.

13 So I think there'll be a definite
14 role for National Advisory Council. I think
15 you'll all have -- some of you individually,
16 in your other jobs, will have an opportunity.
17 But as a council, I think there will be a
18 direct role.

19 MR. BENNETT: Any other questions?

20 MR. BRUNO: Just a couple of things
21 that you mentioned, so I know how they work.

22 The National -- I think it's

1 Response Coordinating Centers. These are
2 your 24/7 -- basically watch command, watch
3 centers. Are they going to be regional?

4 VADM JOHNSON: They are.

5 MR. BRUNO: So you'll have one in
6 every region? Is that your theory?

7 VADM JOHNSON: Right.

8 MR. BRUNO: Good.

9 VADM JOHNSON: Right now, they'll use
10 the NRCC in the region office. Every -- each of
11 two regions shares a MERS unit. And the MERS
12 usually has someone going for a watch, and they
13 basically cover the watch over the night hours.
14 But each region will have their own ROCC that
15 will be staffed up and better equipped than they
16 are today.

17 MR. BRUNO: Right. On the issue of
18 state and local outreach and partners that you
19 talked about -- my own personal view is that you
20 guys have reached out quite a bit, and I think
21 there's a lot going back and forth now that
22 probably didn't happen earlier. I think the one

1 thing for your level to worry about and the
2 permanent staff that remains and those people
3 that remain -- is not to get back with that fear
4 of dealing with the locals. You know that from
5 my point of view, from New York to you, we are
6 constantly pushing FEMA to get more engaged in
7 things that we think are important. And that's
8 my job.

9 But I don't -- what I'm fearful of
10 is that you're courageous in the way you
11 approach it. You know, you're willing to
12 reach out and say, so what do you think about
13 this? And we give you our very partisan view
14 of what we think from our area of the world.

15 I'm a little fearful, and I do see
16 it, that a number of the people coming out
17 toward the end are kind of slipping back to,
18 well, maybe we shouldn't step into this area.
19 Maybe we shouldn't engage in this; we
20 shouldn't see what you're doing because it
21 might somehow influence us.

22 It's that fear is starting to come

1 back. So you've got to kind of -- in fact,
2 my advice is to kind of empower these people
3 and tell them, look. You've got to get out
4 there. If you want this FEMA to go where
5 we're bringing it, what we've got it to, and
6 it's got to move on to the next
7 stage -- these people have to be prepared to
8 step out a little bit until that new team
9 comes on, gets their legs, and then hopefully
10 they'll move in the same direction.

11 I do think that the NAC could be a
12 great help on that. You're going to see some
13 stuff out of different committees here that
14 are going to be forward-thinking. You're
15 going to hear things like menus of options
16 and prototype developments in housing areas.
17 You might hear that.

18 So the people down below have to be
19 kind of pushed a bit to say this is where you
20 have to take this agency until such time as
21 the new leadership comes in. And then
22 hopefully they'll move along the same path.

1 I don't know if it's more of a
2 comment than a question. But what I did want
3 to say -- and we'll say it again when we see
4 you, I'm sure, in December -- but the way
5 you've operated has been tremendous.

6 I mean, you folks have really
7 opened up to local government. You've
8 allowed us to come in, give you information,
9 give you our thinking, and really come back
10 and try to work it out. And one particular
11 area is in logistics. We have done a lot of
12 work with your people now. And we have
13 unbelievable visibility into what you all
14 have here at the federal government. Not
15 only you, but DoD, DLA, others and others.
16 And we're really starting to work some great
17 stuff here.

18 I honestly think we're going to
19 have real capability that I certainly didn't
20 know we had in this United States. And I
21 credit you tremendously for that.

22 VADM JOHNSON: I think we're on the

1 right path. And I think we're all concerned
2 about transition and what will happen. And it
3 won't go away, but how much retrenchment will
4 occur. And it'll have to come back out again.
5 And part of the NAC, again, is to pull on that
6 and make sure that it stays.

7 MR. BENNETT: General?

8 MG LIBBY: Admiral, can you update us
9 on TFER, or would you just as soon defer that to
10 Dennis this afternoon?

11 VADM JOHNSON: I think Dennis will
12 talk this afternoon. And again, it's -- for
13 those who don't know the concept, Dennis will
14 talk about the integrative planning system that
15 I think some of you are a part of -- how do we
16 develop an integrated national planning system.
17 It'll be the IPS -- it will be drafted on the
18 federal side. It takes CPG-101 that's been
19 drafted working with state and local input. And
20 we're going to find a common chapter that'll be
21 almost the same worded chapter on both
22 documents, and tie federal, local, and state

1 planning together in a system. NEMA is part of
2 that group. IM is part of that group.
3 Gen. Libby is part of that group. It's real
4 progress towards a -- again, a system from Maine
5 to Florida to California to Washington. Same
6 terms of reference, same templates, same
7 approach to planning. So they become integral
8 and integratable in terms of a national plan.

9 So how do you boost ahead a state's
10 capability to do that planning? Most states
11 don't have a big planning staff. They can't
12 afford it. And so we have a TFER concept
13 that will leverage National Guardsmen hired
14 to be these planners working for the -- each
15 state a little bit different in the
16 organization -- the emergency management
17 organization.

18 But to bring that expertise to bear
19 now as we're beginning to develop some
20 specific Con Ops across the nation. It'll be
21 a good jump start.

22 And so you'll hear all about that

1 from Dennis this afternoon. But it really is
2 a good national capability, far beyond just
3 FEMA. But it'll engage, I think, in a very
4 collaborative way, again, state and local
5 planners.

6 MR. BENNETT: Additional comments?

7 REPORTER: Your mic, sir.

8 MR. BENNETT: Additional comments or
9 questions? Hearing none, let me thank you,
10 Harvey, once again for updating us on what's
11 taking place in FEMA. And also the transition,
12 because I know that weighs heavily on all our
13 minds that we continue the momentum that you all
14 have started.

15 At this point, we'll go ahead and
16 break for lunch.

17 It's in the Latrobe Room?

18 MS. PRICE: Correct.

19 MR. BENNETT: Where is the Latrobe
20 Room? Do we know?

21 MS. PRICE: If you go out of this room
22 and head towards the left, it's on the other

1 wing of this floor. Izole and Laila will be
2 able to show you exactly where it is, but many
3 of you met in that room yesterday.

4 And we'll be back here at 1:30.

5 SPEAKER: Bring your ticket.

6 MS. PRICE: Oh, yeah. Bring your
7 lunch ticket.

8 (Whereupon, at approximately
9 11:58 a.m., a luncheon recess was
10 taken.)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 at Clyde's tonight so that we have, like, a
2 final number to give to Clyde's. Joe Bruno
3 wants to go, and Nancy Dragani, Bob Connors. I
4 think I see -- is it Joe? Joe, all right. But
5 she'll go around and check with everybody.

6 And are there any other remarks
7 that need to go on before Mr. Schrader
8 begins?

9 All right then.

10 MR. SCHRADER: Round 2, here we go.
11 I'm going to -- I've been advised by my handlers
12 that I talk too long, so I've only got an hour
13 and this is a long briefing, so I may skip over
14 some things quickly because I get so passionate
15 about it and I'll take three hours and I'll end
16 up with the hook.

17 So anyway, we've got a number of
18 topics in this preparedness update. We want
19 to focus on a couple of key things: The
20 Integrated Planning System that is being
21 developed, the Target Capability List
22 implementation that's underway, and NIMS.

1 And we want to give you some feedback on the
2 NAC comments and talk a little bit about a
3 public review for the credentialing standard
4 that's out there, and then the public review
5 for Intelligence and Investigations Annex.

6 So I'm going to move through some of these
7 quickly and then focus on a couple of these
8 big topics.

9 You've all seen this before, but
10 basically, HSPD-8 and PKEMRA established the
11 national preparedness requirements within
12 PKEMRA 644-Bravo 1 through 8. They're listed
13 up there in terms of what they were. If you
14 really look carefully at PKEMRA, it basically
15 took the HSPD-8 and codified it, and then it
16 combined it with the lessons learned for
17 Katrina. So it really did a lot of good
18 work, and we've been using that as a
19 guidebook, and the transformation back into
20 FEMA is well underway.

21 Just some quick goals in terms of
22 where we've been focused for the past year.

1 You know, we're -- I've talked about this
2 before, but finding the best career people,
3 and we've been making strides in this. We
4 have three new SESers that are either on
5 board or are going to start.

6 John Bridges is now the new
7 assistant administrator for the National
8 Integration Center; been on board for about
9 six weeks now. He was the National Director
10 for Preparedness for the U.S. Postal Service
11 and ran the incident command at the Brentwood
12 facility during the anthrax scare, so he's
13 got a lot of experience. It doesn't get any
14 more local than your local post office, so
15 he's a had a lot of experience in that
16 regard.

17 We have a new director for
18 preparedness policy and analysis coming on
19 board shortly. His name is Ken Wattman (?).
20 He's coming from DoD. He was the analytic
21 director up at the Naval War College for a
22 number of years and has an analytical

1 background, so we're very excited about him.

2 He should start sometime in early to

3 mid-September.

4 And then Director for Technological

5 Hazards, we put an SES in charge of that.

6 We've got a lot of work going on around the

7 country with nuclear plants and the

8 radiological arena. We needed to have an SES

9 there. And what we did there is we got a

10 twofer. We put Jim Kisch (?), who was the

11 former director of training and exercises, in

12 charge of that group. And what that's going

13 to do is two things: One is it puts a solid

14 SES over there, but he also is going to

15 be -- one of our subobjectives in the

16 directorate is to integrate Rapid (?) into

17 the HC program.

18 And this is important for state and

19 local folks around the country because

20 there's nothing worse than having us come at

21 state and local officials who are the same

22 people in the jurisdiction with two different

1 exercise programs that are not coordinated.

2 So that's one of Jim's major taskings.

3 We're continuing to help the
4 regions build program management capacity and
5 capability with new resources. The federal
6 preparedness coordinators are starting to get
7 their feet under them and really starting to
8 get engaged with their states. They have a
9 lot of work to do. That's a long-term
10 investment that's going to take a fair amount
11 of time to pay dividends, but as we
12 start -- and you'll hear later about the
13 Integrated Planning System and some of our
14 other initiatives -- they're really the ones
15 we're looking to to push that out.

16 We're assisting in the development
17 of a national planning community. We want to
18 provide training and development
19 opportunities, and we're designing and
20 Integrated Planning System. I'll talk more
21 about that in a second.

22 And then finally, a training and

1 exercise system that's driven by NIMS, NRF,
2 the National Preparedness Guidelines. We are
3 in the process of recruiting a new SES for
4 that job, and that should be done and be
5 completed sometime by the end of September.

6 So those are just some of the
7 things that we're working on at the high
8 level. But my day-in and day-out focus is on
9 these four things, among all the other issues
10 that come our way.

11 Now, we talk about empowering the
12 regional offices. We see the regional office
13 as our primary connection to state and local
14 government. We're really -- and the good
15 thing that Dave Paulison and Harvey Johnson
16 did early on is that they split the
17 preparedness from the grants function; pushed
18 the grants over so that what we've been able
19 to do in preparedness is really focus on a
20 daily basis on planning, training,
21 exercising, and assessments, and not getting
22 involved in the minutiae of administering the

1 grant programs.

2 Ross Ashley has been doing that,
3 doing a fine job. The last grant rollout was
4 just very matter of fact, went very well.

5 But during that whole process, someone in my
6 job previously would have spent their entire
7 two- or three-month run-up to that focused on
8 that issue, and I didn't have to do that. So
9 I've been focused on the other priorities
10 within preparedness, and I think that's going
11 to serve the country well long-term through
12 that process.

13 It also allows me to be very
14 focused on building bridges, working with the
15 regions, working with other interagency
16 partners, et cetera.

17 And then of course, we're -- you
18 know, as I said, we're decentralizing our
19 programs. We're emphasizing regional
20 planning and coordination. And we're hiring
21 good people.

22 I mentioned the FPCs. I won't

1 spend too much more time talking about this,
2 other than if you're out in your states and
3 you're meeting with various folks, it would
4 be great if you asked a few questions of the
5 regional administrator.

6 Find out how -- the federal
7 preparedness coordinators, the way we set
8 this up, the FPCs work directly for the
9 regional administrator. We also rolled the
10 RAD, the radiological and CCEPT programs back
11 underneath the regional administrators. And
12 they, once again, are doing reasonable
13 assurance for the nuclear program. So you
14 know, just ask how things are going. But
15 we're really pushing, and we have regular
16 communication with the FPCs and the RAs and
17 this is, we believe, the key to our future.

18 Now I'm going to get into some more
19 of the detail of some of the programs. The
20 Integrated Planning System was signed out by
21 the President as Annex 1, the HSPD-8, back in
22 December. We've been working at the federal

1 level developing what's called the IPS. It's
2 now Version 2.3. That was due in February,
3 and it took a few months to negotiate the
4 final product. And by the end of May, that
5 was released to FEMA to go out and negotiate
6 with state and local government on the
7 vertical integration.

8 Chapter 4 of the Integrated
9 Planning System deals with vertical and
10 horizontal integration. And we've -- let me
11 just sort of -- I think the next -- anyway,
12 so there's a number of requirements that
13 we've got to follow-up on within this
14 process. We've been trying to make sure that
15 we have a focus on all the pieces and parts,
16 like the catastrophic incident summary, the
17 regional grant programs, the development of
18 the planning system itself, a concept called
19 TFER -- Task Force for Emergency Readiness.

20 I don't want to get into too much
21 detail, but basically that's a pilot that
22 we're going to be doing with five states

1 around the country. That should be rolled
2 out here sometime in the next week to 10
3 days. We've talked to the five states
4 involved and they're all on board, so we're
5 just getting ready to ramp that up and
6 announce that. And then, of course, we've
7 got major exercises that will be tied in to
8 the planning system.

9 So the other thing we're planning
10 to do -- and this gets into the role of the
11 regions -- we are no longer going to go out
12 with the major exercises like we've done
13 the past and recruit one or two or three
14 states and just have the whole focus on those
15 one or two or three states. We're going to
16 go to the regions, and the regions are going
17 to sponsor the national-level exercises.

18 And there's going to be a
19 national-level exercise every year instead of
20 every two years. So the level of intensity
21 is going to step up, but we're going to get
22 the regions involved and they're going to

1 recruit their states.

2 And so for example, with the
3 National Level Exercise '09, which is going
4 to deal with international terrorism next
5 summer, we're already starting to plan that.
6 There's a conference next week. But we're
7 looking at one region, Region VI, to be the
8 focal point, but then we'll probably go and
9 get all the other fusion centers around the
10 country that want to play involved.

11 So we're going to have a
12 different -- and it's a prevention
13 exercise -- protection rather than a response
14 and recovery. So it's going to have a very
15 different flavor to it. So anyway, a lot of
16 effort going on within the planning, and
17 planning should drive the exercise program.
18 That's our ultimate goal.

19 Let me talk a little bit about
20 CPG-101. This is the Comprehensive Planning
21 Guide that was developed in coordination with
22 state and local government for their needs,

1 which is more of a focus on bottoms-up
2 capability-based planning. The interim
3 document was released on August the 1st.
4 Over the next few -- the reason we did it as
5 an interim -- we had organized a small
6 working group of representatives from the
7 Homeland Security Consortium, and brought
8 them to Washington on two days, June the 17th
9 and July the 1st, and asked the question: Is
10 there a way we can integrate the National
11 Planning System 2.3, which is more of a
12 DoD-oriented kind of system with prescribed
13 formats, and integrate that with the
14 capability-based planning, which is less
15 prescriptive and more process-oriented?
16 That's CPG-101.

17 The advice -- we got some really
18 good advice from that group. And out of
19 that, we realized that we were going to have
20 to make some updates to CPG-101, one of them
21 being Chapter 6, which deals with vertical
22 integration just like Chapter 4 in 2.3. So

1 we're going to rewrite both those chapters
2 and get them linked. And we also need to
3 accommodate prevention and protection in the
4 CPG-101 guide.

5 We're going to work with Dave
6 Maxwell and his group. Dave chairs the NEMA
7 Preparedness Committee, and he provides
8 leadership for a national working group
9 that's been doing CPG-101, and he's agreed to
10 work with us on that.

11 So the final CPG-101, we want to
12 have vertical integration and synchronization
13 with the IPS effort. And we're expecting
14 that to be out in December of 2008.

15 Now, let me talk a little bit about
16 the structure of where we want to go. You
17 can see on the right-hand side here, you've
18 got the NIMS and the NRF are the underlying
19 doctrine, and then you've got IPS that will
20 reach down into the regions, and then
21 bottoms-up CPG-101. And we see the interface
22 point as being the FEMA regions.

1 What we're going to do -- and this
2 was part of the discussion that we've had
3 with this planning group and we've gotten
4 comments from the Homeland Security
5 Consortium, the various associations, and
6 we're digesting those comments as we
7 speak -- there's going to be actually a
8 meeting here tomorrow afternoon as the fourth
9 in a series of meetings with our advisory
10 group to talk a little bit about where we
11 are. But where the rubber meets the road is
12 that as we push down horizontally to the
13 regions with the federal interagency planning
14 based on the Integrated Planning System 2.3,
15 we're going to be focusing on the eight
16 scenario sets that are in the national
17 response framework.

18 We're going to start with what
19 we're calling -- it's been -- the term "IED"
20 has been used previously. We're changing
21 that to "terrorist use of explosives," so
22 it's a little clearer. And that'll be the

1 first one out of the gate. Second will be
2 the improvised nuclear device.

3 And then three and four will be the
4 radiological dispersal device and a bio with
5 a focus on anthrax.

6 Haven't decided yet at the DRG
7 level which one's going to go first. But the
8 bottom line is the first two are coming at
9 us.

10 Rich Kermond, who leads the
11 planning section of Disaster Ops, will have
12 the responsibility for doing that concept of
13 operations plan at the national level, and
14 then focusing with the agencies on their
15 federal operations plans. Then we'll send
16 the national con plan down to the regions and
17 we'll be looking for the regions to develop
18 their regional concept plans with the other
19 federal agencies.

20 And in addition, the next step from
21 that would be reaching out to the states and
22 developing regional operational plans using

1 the IPS format with the states, but that it
2 would be a regional operation plan and the
3 states would not have to necessarily change
4 their plans. So they don't have to use the
5 format if they don't want to. If they want
6 to stick with the CPG-101 concept, that's
7 perfectly within their purview. But at a
8 minimum, what we've got to have is the
9 synchronization of plans at the regional
10 level using these op plans.

11 The other thing that we've agreed
12 to do is to have this focus on the state
13 level in major metropolitan areas, but not
14 try and go to the next level down to local
15 jurisdictions, because local jurisdictions
16 just don't have the resources to suddenly
17 change all their plans nationally. And that
18 really took the temperature down on this
19 quite a bit.

20 Larry Gispert from IAEM has been
21 very heavily involved in advising us on this.
22 And I think we've got a negotiated solution

1 here that's going to make some sense.

2 And so this is the framework so
3 far. We've got to finalize this tomorrow
4 based on the comments we get from the
5 consortium. We've got to write those two
6 chapters to get them linked up. Our goal is
7 by the end of August to have a document that
8 we would then forward back to the Homeland
9 Security Council through the Domestic
10 Readiness Group.

11 The deputies had given an interim
12 approval to IPS -- Integrated Planning System
13 2.3, but that was back in May. And part of
14 the interim approval was with the caveat that
15 we would coordinate with a state and local
16 review on a national level, which is what
17 we're wrapping up.

18 So this is a very important step
19 forward, and I think coming at this as a
20 negotiation has been, I think, very fruitful.
21 And the state and local officials involved in
22 both the advisory group and the consortium

1 have been very, very helpful, so I do thank
2 all of them for their help.

3 Let's talk a little bit about
4 preparedness policy. We're implementing
5 obviously the NRF. You've heard about that;
6 I'm not going to cover that.

7 The target capabilities, we've
8 talked a little bit about. I want to take a
9 deeper dive into that today. You've
10 heard -- I think we've talked about the fact
11 that we were going to do an implementation of
12 the TCL. The document that was released in
13 September of '07 we're calling TCL 2.0.

14 Where we want to get to next is we
15 really want to be able to take this -- have a
16 performance measurement system with the TCLs
17 that make it easier to use and more
18 measurable.

19 Have we handed out the documents to
20 everybody? Do they have them in front of
21 them?

22 You should have in front of you an

1 example. I want to introduce some folks. Ed
2 Dolan is from DHS Policy, a former deputy
3 chief in New York City's Fire Department; has
4 been very helpful in this and one of the
5 thought leaders in this whole process. So
6 hopefully, if it's a good thing, that's good.
7 If it's a bad thing, you're going to get some
8 tomatoes here.

9 But anyway, Josh Dozor is our
10 director of the Policy Branch. And Robert
11 Sullivan is our acting Policy Branch chief
12 now, who's been doing that for about a year
13 and has been leading this effort. And Josh
14 will be taking the reins here with Rob over
15 the next 6 to 12 months.

16 So what I wanted to do here, and
17 let me go to the next page -- you can't read
18 this slide, so I wanted to hand you a
19 document that shows you what's up here on the
20 slide. But basically, if you look at the
21 first page of the addendum I gave you,
22 basically what we're looking to do is each

1 capability framework will have one or more
2 performance classes.

3 And the idea here is that one size
4 doesn't fit all. And we want to make this
5 simpler so that if you're a volunteer chief
6 who's doubling as the EMA in a county of
7 25,000 and working a day job, we don't want
8 you to have to read through 500 pages to
9 figure out how I'm going to get my county
10 prepared. We want you to be able to go to
11 something that's very simple and you can
12 figure out, oh, okay, I'm a Class 5, and then
13 be able to quickly determine what your
14 requirements are. That's the goal.

15 Now, on the same level, even though
16 larger jurisdictions have more resources,
17 they have the same problems. And we want to
18 make it simple there, too, as much as
19 possible for them. So you've got -- you can
20 see we've got the various classes.

21 Then on the next page, page 2,
22 you've got Performance Objectives. The idea

1 there would be, yeah, there would be
2 performance objectives linked to each
3 performance class that would define how much
4 of a capability is needed within your
5 jurisdiction.

6 And it gives you an idea of what
7 the performance level might be. But for
8 example, all communities must decontaminate
9 victims in less than 30 minutes, but Chicago
10 may need to handle more victims than a rural
11 town, so then you've got a volume issue that
12 you've got to deal with. So we're trying to
13 get -- and I'll talk in a minute about how
14 we're developing this across the country, but
15 I just wanted you to get an idea of how we're
16 going to do this.

17 And then, of course, the resource
18 requirements would be based on the
19 preparedness cycle: Planning, personnel
20 training, equipment, and performance
21 assessment. And you can get a sense of the
22 kinds of things that we're talking about on

1 page 3 that we would use as benchmarks.

2 Then the last several pages -- and
3 I'm not going to go through this in detail,
4 but I'll leave this for you to read at your
5 leisure -- is when we're going around the
6 country testing the first six -- and let me
7 see if I've got those up here; yes, here we
8 go -- we form these technical working groups.
9 This is one of them, the HazMat group. And
10 so we're doing -- we've picked 6 of the 37 to
11 test as the first round, and we've got the
12 multiagency coordination EOC, on-site
13 incident management, intelligence, mass
14 transit protection, and animal health.

15 We wanted to spread it across the
16 four domains -- prevent, protect, respond,
17 recover -- and we also wanted to spread it
18 across the various characteristics of the
19 classes. So for example, in New York City,
20 it might be a Class 1 for HazMat, but for
21 animal health, it might be Class 4. So we
22 wanted to get a better -- and we wanted to

1 make sure that we had one in here for rural
2 areas so that we could test that also with
3 rural America.

4 So we've been all around the
5 country. We've got one more session left,
6 mass transit protection in New York. It's
7 tentative. But these technical working
8 groups are organized by region. We're using
9 the regional administrators' staffs through
10 the federal preparedness coordinators to
11 organize it. So we want to have people from
12 each of the regions involved, but then we're
13 also bringing in subject matter experts who
14 have expertise in these areas. Because we've
15 got to -- you know, whether something's 30
16 minutes or 15 minutes is really largely a
17 matter of professional opinion. And we want
18 to make sure that we've got professionals
19 helping us figure that out during these
20 sessions.

21 So where are we? We've done 11
22 sessions across the FEMA regions. So far,

1 we've had over 175 participants. We've got
2 the proof of concept, we believe, and we
3 validated the project direction. We're
4 getting a lot of positive feedback on this.
5 People seem to think this is the right
6 direction.

7 We've got preliminary data on the
8 first six on objectives, classes, and
9 resource requirements. Of course, I'm
10 demanding that we get this done as soon as
11 possible, which is putting pressure on the
12 guys and gals who work for me, but we're
13 going to get this thing done quickly so we
14 get it out.

15 We've got participant support on
16 the tiered objectives for each capability,
17 and willingness to adopt the frameworks. And
18 the participants want to get these tools
19 together as quickly as possible so we can
20 follow through.

21 And then the other thing we're
22 doing now is figuring out what do we want to

1 do for the next rollout. We've had some
2 suggestions. I know the folks here at the
3 NAC, we've talked about maybe doing health
4 care as -- you know, within the mass care/EMS
5 grouping. There's about 13 TCLs in that
6 grouping. But we'd also want to not just do
7 one grouping there. We'd also want to make
8 sure we cut across prevent, protect, respond,
9 recover. And then the other thing I'm
10 pushing on is, because planning is such a
11 priority and it's one of the common TCLs, we
12 may want to focus on that, also.

13 So we haven't put the list
14 together, so your input -- this is the time
15 to really influence direction. That's -- you
16 know, given that that's part of the mandate
17 of the NAC. This is your opportunity to say,
18 hey, this is what we think you ought to do.
19 And then, hopefully, there'll be a consensus,
20 but if not, then we'll decide. But this is
21 the time to get the oar in the water before
22 we move down the road.

1 Let me stop there on the TWG. Let
2 me just talk a little bit about capability
3 assessment. We're doing state preparedness
4 reports.

5 We've got that data. We've now
6 analyzed the data into -- according to the
7 eight national priorities.

8 It was a lot of work. We are going
9 to have to get to a point with this -- it was
10 very text-based this last go around. We're
11 going to have to change the formatting, but
12 we're not going to do that right away.

13 We need -- I've told our guys that
14 if we're going to change anything, we need to
15 give everybody at least a year. So I won't
16 even be around when this happens, but the
17 goal here is to have just an update to the
18 data that we've already got for this next
19 go-round, and then begin developing what the
20 next round might be in 2010.

21 So we haven't even rolled this out
22 internally. I just saw the first draft about

1 a week ago, and so we've got work to do on
2 the assessments. But we're really -- we're
3 doing as much assessment as we can. But what
4 the State Preparedness Report does do, it
5 eliminates the need to submit three other
6 reports that we had to do previously with the
7 grants, which was an update of the National
8 Plan Review, the State Enhancement Plans, and
9 the Program Evaluations Report. So we
10 substituted those three for the State
11 Preparedness Report, and we'll continue that
12 again next year.

13 So this is an area of future focus,
14 I believe, that is very important in terms of
15 assessments. It's required by PKEMRA. And
16 we're just getting ramped up on this. And
17 we'll have more to say about this, I believe,
18 probably at the next NAC. It'd be great if
19 we can bring that out to you.

20 Now --

21 MS. DRAGANI: Dennis, could I ask a
22 question before you move off that? This is

1 Nancy.

2 MR. SCHRADER: Nancy, sure. Sure.

3 MS. DRAGANI: Kind of a question and
4 then a caution.

5 MR. SCHRADER: Yeah.

6 MS. DRAGANI: I appreciate the fact
7 that the State Preparedness Report eliminated
8 three other reports, but recognize we still do
9 monitoring reports.

10 MR. SCHRADER: Right.

11 MS. DRAGANI: Which are fairly intense
12 an effort on the part of state and urban areas.
13 And now we're talking cost to capability
14 studies. So I would just caution that you don't
15 replace the three that this replaced --

16 MR. SCHRADER: Right.

17 MS. DRAGANI: With three more.

18 MR. SCHRADER: Right. If I
19 understand, and Ross isn't here, the cost to
20 capability, if that gets -- that's right now a
21 headquarters effort, using data that's already
22 available. And when I've had this discussion

1 with him, just for exactly the reason you're
2 talking about, that would be a next generation,
3 and we would want to combine efforts to do that
4 for exactly the reason you're saying, exactly.

5 MS. DRAGANI: One other question.
6 Analysis of federal requirements, which was an
7 effort that was undertaken --

8 MR. SCHRADER: Right.

9 MS. DRAGANI: By L-3, I think about a
10 year ago.

11 MR. SCHRADER: Right.

12 MS. DRAGANI: Is there a timeline for
13 when that information will be released?

14 MR. SCHRADER: We are working on the
15 draft rollup right now. I'm planning to talk
16 about this at the NEMA conference. We will have
17 some -- we'll either have a draft report ready
18 that's in clearance or we'll have a slide deck.
19 What we're doing is -- and just to give you a
20 quick thumbnail, it was initiated in February of
21 '07.

22 The old DHS prep got it going.

1 There was a data collection phase that went
2 from February to September, roughly, of '07.
3 Then we started -- we got a briefing on it
4 and an initial review in October to January.
5 Then we asked them to go back and do some
6 more work because it was really more of a
7 data collection. It was too hard to
8 understand. So we sent L-3 back to the
9 drawing board. They boiled it all down. We
10 just got it this last spring. And now we've
11 taken it and we're analyzing it so that we
12 can begin to communicate and put an action
13 plan in place.

14 A lot of the things that are in it
15 have already been taken action on, like for
16 example, regionalize the programs and those
17 kinds of things. There's other things
18 that -- so we're working on getting that into
19 a format that we can start communicating.
20 And we'll have the initial communication at
21 the NEMA conference and others as we go
22 forward. But we want to make sure that we've

1 done our homework, which is what we're doing
2 as we speak. As a matter of fact, we're
3 going to continue working on this until
4 September 8th. So just for Ken Murphy, it's
5 going to be a big deal.

6 Anyway, any other -- okay. All
7 right, thank you.

8 Let me go into the NIMS-based
9 document. This is the first document, I
10 believe, that the NAC has actually taken an
11 active review in its portfolio. And when I
12 go back and look at the requirements that
13 were put on the NAC in the laws, you guys
14 have a lot of work. And so triaging what's
15 the first priority is really quite a task,
16 and so I applaud you for it.

17 We've been working closely with Bob
18 Shea and Pat Kalla and Alyson on this. I
19 wanted to make sure that, since this was the
20 first document out of the chute, that it's
21 going to set precedents on how this group
22 operates. So we've been very deliberate

1 about going through this process.

2 We reviewed -- you reviewed the
3 document back in June. The last -- I think
4 we talked about this in Chicago. We sort of
5 gave a briefing on the way things were going
6 to go. We encouraged everybody to send their
7 comments in individually or by organization.
8 I think we ended up getting a couple hundred
9 individual comments from three commenters.

10 And we have those available, if
11 necessary, on an individual basis. But then
12 the other thing we discussed was that given
13 the NAC's role in giving input and
14 coordination on the NIMS in particular, as
15 well as the NRF, we wanted the NAC to be able
16 to take that draft document and give us their
17 take on it.

18 From that came five recommendations
19 in a letter that the chairman sent the
20 administrator. And I want to quickly go
21 through these since this was your work. And
22 I believe the NIMS Subcommittee, Russ Decker,

1 I don't know if you guys were involved.

2 You probably had some involvement
3 in driving this. But anyway, the NIMS
4 document, there was a concern about
5 demonstrating a clear connection between NIMS
6 and the response framework.

7 We agree with that, and we wrote
8 some language in the very beginning that made
9 overt connections between what is the NIMS
10 and what is the NRF. And we put that
11 language into the very -- I think the second
12 page of the document. And it talks about the
13 NIMS -- the various protocols for incident
14 management, and the NRF is a doctrine that
15 describes roles and responsibilities and how
16 people work together, and the various
17 doctrinal statements in the NRF. So we sort
18 of crafted that and put that in the
19 beginning.

20 And then we made some changes in
21 the beginning of the document, in the
22 introduction and the first few pages. So

1 we've modified the language in those three
2 sections, which specifically highlight what
3 we believe the differences to be in those
4 relationships between the two documents.

5 The second one was review the use
6 of "must" and "shall" in the NIMS document,
7 and where appropriate, replace them with
8 phrases such as "must consider" or "shall
9 consider" or "may" or "should."

10 And we agreed with some of that.
11 Again, we had to really analyze what was
12 being said in these recommendations and how
13 we could apply them. Of course, as we put
14 here in the background, "Standardization is
15 the key to success of NIMS." That's one of
16 the benchmarks. On the other hand,
17 prescriptive language is tricky for state and
18 local government in some cases.

19 So what we did is we went back
20 and -- I think we found there were 89, I
21 believe, instances of prescriptive language.
22 And so what we did is we eliminated all the

1 uses of "shall" in the document.

2 And then 33 percent of the
3 references to "must" were changed to
4 "should." And then for various reasons
5 because of its relationship to the
6 standardization of NIMS, in some cases we
7 didn't change the "must" language.

8 But in 33 percent of the cases, we
9 found we were able to do that. And it was
10 where it was referring -- mostly referring to
11 jurisdictional action that should be taken,
12 we changed it from "must" to "should." But
13 where it was specific to the NIMS framework
14 and the way it's put together, we left it as
15 "must." But we did eliminate all the
16 references to "shall."

17 No. 3 was, "More consideration
18 should be given to the role of medical
19 partners." And we went through and reviewed
20 the document and made some changes to the
21 document. But the other point we wanted to
22 make is that if you look at NIMS, it's

1 very -- it's agnostic to the specifics of any
2 one discipline. And where a lot of that
3 clarification is done is in the NRF, in the
4 ESF structure, and in support annexes, and so
5 we wanted to be careful. So we went back
6 through and tried to be -- where it made
7 sense, added some references to public health
8 and hospitals.

9 There were 23 specific references.
10 But then, in addition to that, we wanted to
11 be -- we didn't go much further than that
12 because we -- because of our clarification
13 about the role of the NRF, we wanted to make
14 sure that that's the place where you really
15 want to get the discipline-specific
16 information.

17 No. 4 was a recommendation to
18 include CERT in the document, and reference
19 that as one of the key non-governmental
20 organizations, and we thought that was a good
21 idea. And we went back and included that in
22 the document as an example of a

1 community-based preparedness organization.

2 And lastly, there was a discussion
3 about including flexible language which
4 allows for the possibility of a Unified
5 Operations Section. However, clarify that it
6 is not mandatory to do so.

7 And we agreed with that. Part of
8 the issue here is that we felt that the
9 incident commander has the ability to
10 organize the way he or she sees fit based on
11 the way it could set up a United Operations
12 Section. So it gives that individual the
13 prerogative. And in order to formally
14 authorize this option, that would represent a
15 major change to ICS -- would require the
16 concurrence of all the ICS stakeholders
17 nationally, which means we'd have to start
18 all over again, because that would be a
19 really major change. So what we're going to
20 do is we're going to initiate discussions on
21 the issue with the NIMS stakeholders.

22 Hopefully, we can engage the

1 subcommittee on this issue, and then make
2 this a focus area for the next revision of
3 the NIMS, without making that major a change
4 in this revision.

5 So those are the five
6 recommendations and the actions taken. And I
7 think, Bob, we've given this to -- back to
8 you. We're going to end up providing this, I
9 guess, in a formal letter. I'm not sure.
10 Have we?

11 MR. GOUGELET: (inaudible)

12 MR. SCHRADER: Okay. Okay, great.
13 All right, thank you.

14 So again, this is a model for the
15 first time through. You know, it may not be
16 the best way to handle it. It could -- you
17 know, there could be changes we want to make.
18 But we wanted to make sure we were deliberate
19 in handling these recommendations.

20 All right. Let me go through a
21 couple last things and then we'll open it up
22 for questions.

1 I've got about 10 minutes of my
2 time left, so I'm going to get the hook here
3 in a minute.

4 We've got a credentialing guideline
5 in the law. It talks about "standard," but
6 we went back and talked to the committees and
7 said, hey, we really think this should be
8 guideline. And some of the staffers were
9 saying to us, yeah, well, that was really the
10 intent. Because the intent was not to have a
11 hard-and-fast standard on state and local
12 government because it wouldn't -- you
13 couldn't do that at the federal level without
14 going through significant amount of effort.
15 And the reality is it wouldn't be
16 well-received.

17 But there was clearly a standard
18 for the FEROs, the federal emergency response
19 officials, that was required. And it's in
20 draft as we speak. We're going to put it
21 through a public review period. We're trying
22 to get it out this month, maybe a little

1 later than that.

2 And then we have to have -- by
3 February of '09, using the HSPD-12 system in
4 the federal government, we have to have a
5 database for all federal emergency response
6 officials. And then we have to inventory
7 them and there's a lot of data we've got to
8 collection and report on that to the
9 Congress.

10 And then, of course, within the
11 non-federal arena, we've got to have detailed
12 written guidance and technical assistance and
13 expertise to facilitate credentialing. And
14 there's four elements to this: You've got
15 federal, state and local, private sector, and
16 non-governmental. And it's tricky to write a
17 document that covers all four. And we've got
18 that draft, and that'll be out for public
19 comment soon.

20 Let me quickly just go through
21 this. You know, right now there's no
22 standardized process for entry decisions.

1 What we're thinking about, the way it should
2 work, is -- and we had a working group that
3 was pulled together to look at this. We're
4 working with EMAC from -- you know, which is
5 a committee of NEMA. Doug Hoal (?) from
6 North Carolina has been very active in
7 helping us with this.

8 But we're looking at either visual
9 verification or a FIPS 201 or an electronic
10 validation. If you've got the card, you can
11 do it using the FIPS 201 readers.

12 If you're going to use visual
13 verification, you have to have two forms of
14 ID. And then you would have an attribute or
15 affiliation document, and then a deployment
16 source. So for example, if you've got a
17 REQ-A from the EMAC, that deployment order
18 could be used for deployment authority.

19 The thing that needs to be
20 developed, though, is this receiving staging
21 operations integration concept at the state
22 level. So that when you come to a law

1 enforcement officer, instead of them trying
2 to make the decision, you would show your
3 credentials. And instead of them making a
4 decision on your credentials, they would see
5 that you're -- okay, this seems to be
6 legitimate. They would direct you to this
7 RSOI, and then the RSOI would then go through
8 the process of validating it.

9 And then once that's done, you
10 would be sent to the response and recovery
11 location. So this is the concept that's
12 embedded in the guidelines.

13 And again, as I said, we're calling
14 it "guidelines." The first draft went out,
15 saying "standard." We got a lot of blowback
16 from that, so that's why now we're calling it
17 "guidelines." I'm not going to read this to
18 you, but there's some -- you know, the
19 benefits and how we're going to manage.

20 One of the things that's important
21 to know is that we're about to start the
22 process up. There was a lot of effort last

1 year to put together an Intelligence and
2 Investigations Annex to NIMS.

3 Phil Pulaski, deputy chief of New
4 York City Police Department, was very active,
5 along with a number of folks around the
6 country. They wrote that up. There was a
7 draft document that got put out for public
8 comment -- without going through the process
9 and it got pulled back -- because we didn't
10 want this document to get out in front of the
11 base document being reviewed and approved.
12 And we hadn't laid the groundwork for it.

13 So right now, the decisional draft
14 is going through internal FEMA review. We
15 expect to have a public review process with a
16 30-day comment period sometime in October.
17 And then we want to get that document into
18 the NAC process now so that you can take a
19 look at it and begin to chew on it so that we
20 can replicate the process we just went
21 through. So if that's amenable to the
22 Council, we would recommend that to you.

1 Conclusion. The integration of NPD
2 and its goals within FEMA. Let me just say
3 unequivocally that FEMA is now an integral
4 and unseverable part of DHS at this moment.
5 And I say that with a great deal of
6 conviction.

7 That's what PKEMRA wanted.
8 Somebody asked me that question last week. I
9 said the will of the Congress is that we
10 would do that, and that is exactly what we've
11 done. That's what Dave Paulison and Harvey
12 Johnson and myself and a number of other
13 people -- 2-1/2 years ago, the Congress said
14 thou shalt do this, and that's exactly what
15 we've done. And it's really been quite
16 remarkable, the change and where we've headed
17 and the relationships and the linkages now,
18 which are just really terrific, and it's
19 making FEMA a much stronger organization.

20 We've got a lot of focus on the
21 regions. We're looking at improving planning
22 and assessment capabilities. And we're

1 continuing to develop NIMS.

2 So that's where we are. And I'm at
3 the end of my time, so I will stop. And,
4 Bob, if -- or Mr. Chairman, if you want me to
5 entertain questions, I'm at your disposal.

6 DR. BENNETT: There's a little time.
7 Are there any questions from the floor?

8 Bob Connors.

9 MR. CONNORS: Dennis, with respect to
10 the credentialing in the private sector, I don't
11 know if it was on purpose, but you had utility
12 companies there. It concerns me that if -- I
13 don't know if you meant that as an example or
14 specific, but there's a whole lot of other
15 private sector that are in CIKR that will need
16 credentialing and access.

17 MR. SCHRADER: Yes.

18 MR. CONNORS: And I hope we're going
19 to be considering that.

20 MR. SCHRADER: That was just an
21 example, because it's the one that everybody
22 thinks of off the top of their head, but --

1 MR. CONNORS: It's also the only one
2 that was allowed in during Katrina.

3 MR. SCHRADER: Exactly.

4 MR. CONNORS: And the rest of us --

5 MR. SCHRADER: Exactly. No, Bob
6 Steffan and his team have been very actively
7 involved in this. I think we had 17 on there.
8 There's actually 18 now. They've added another
9 sector. But Bob Steffan's team has reviewed it
10 and is very focused on just the very issue
11 you're talking about. So you're exactly right.

12 Thank you for that comment.

13 DR. BENNETT: Joe Bruno.

14 MR. BRUNO: Dennis, a couple of
15 things.

16 MR. SCHRADER: Yes.

17 MR. BRUNO: On the NIMS-based
18 document, we're very pleased with the CERT
19 inclusion. And we're pleased with the fact that
20 you're going to take a close look at the Unified
21 Operations Section.

22 That's something we do in New York

1 right now.

2 MR. SCHRADER: Yes, okay.

3 MR. BRUNO: But there was something
4 else going on I just want to ask you a quick
5 question about.

6 MR. SCHRADER: Sure.

7 MR. BRUNO: There's apparently a press
8 conference in this hotel tomorrow related to an
9 IPS summit. Do you know anything about that?
10 Is that involved with you?

11 MR. SCHRADER: I mentioned that
12 earlier. It's the --

13 MR. BRUNO: Maybe I missed that, I'm
14 sorry. What is it?

15 MR. SCHRADER: This is an advisory
16 group that we've -- did somebody put a press
17 release out on that?

18 MR. BRUNO: It says currently -- I
19 think Doc Lumpkins put it out. It says, "The
20 meeting will be held at the Grand Hyatt
21 tomorrow." I can't get all of it because I
22 don't get coverage here, and it says that the --

1 MR. SCHRADER: It's a reminder to the
2 consortium members.

3 MR. BRUNO: No, it says --

4 MR. SCHRADER: Is that it? No?

5 MR. BRUNO: IPS Summit Meeting Travel
6 Logistics Announcement.

7 MR. SCHRADER: Yeah.

8 MR. BRUNO: And it appears to be a
9 press -- no press conference.

10 MR. SCHRADER: No press conference.

11 MR. BRUNO: Okay.

12 MR. SCHRADER: No. This is -- like,
13 Nancy's going to be there and probably a couple
14 other people in the room.

15 MR. BRUNO: Our people will be on the
16 call, but I'm just wondering if it was a press
17 conference. That's all.

18 MR. SCHRADER: No, no, no press
19 conference. No. Basically, it's a small group
20 that's been advising us. We're going to take
21 input and feedback and then we'll go from there.

22 MR. BRUNO: No, that's all right. If

1 it was a press conference --

2 MR. SCHRADER: No, no. No, no, no.

3 MR. BRUNO: And I wanted to know what
4 they were doing.

5 MR. SCHRADER: No, I try to keep a low
6 profile.

7 Anything else, Mr. Chair?

8 DR. BENNETT: J.R., did you --

9 MR. THOMAS: Dennis, when you're
10 talking about the credentialing guidelines --

11 MR. SCHRADER: Yes, sir.

12 MR. THOMAS: Is that part of the ANSI
13 process?

14 MR. SCHRADER: When you refer to ANSI,
15 are you talking about the voluntary private
16 sector standards with the ANAB (?) initiative
17 or --

18 MR. THOMAS: I don't know what ANAB
19 is, but I know that Nancy was doing
20 credentialing as well, and I wanted to see if it
21 was a duplication or whether it --

22 MR. SCHRADER: We went to ANSI and

1 asked them to review the guidelines to give us
2 feedback. There was a meeting here recently.
3 It was an advisory kind of meeting because
4 they're in that business. And we said can you
5 take a look at this and give us -- and we had a
6 lot of stakeholders there, and there was a lot
7 of back-and-forth discussion. I don't know if
8 that's -- other than that, I don't think we've
9 got ANSI involved at this point. We could talk
10 offline and maybe take your question to ground.

11 MR. THOMAS: That's fine.

12 DR. BENNETT: Lee Feldman.

13 MR. FELDMAN: Yes. Dennis, with
14 regard to the TCLs and the performance
15 objectives for local government compliance --

16 MR. SCHRADER: Yes, sir.

17 MR. FELDMAN: Regardless of what
18 class, what do you envision as the mechanism for
19 reporting that compliance back up to FEMA? And
20 what are the implications for those communities
21 that either choose not to or can't comply with
22 those standards?

1 MR. SCHRADER: The TCLs -- where it's
2 supposed to be now and where we want to head to
3 is that the TCLs become the bedrock of our
4 capability assessment in the whole preparedness
5 cycle: Planning, training, exercise. So right
6 now, for example, we are assessing all of our
7 courses against the TCLs to determine what TCLs
8 are being taught in the those courses.

9 Within the Homeland Security
10 Exercise and Evaluation Program, we
11 measure -- if you're getting direct support
12 for exercises, we measure whether or not
13 you're planning -- using capabilities as your
14 basis of your planning, and how well did you
15 perform in your after-action report against
16 those capabilities.

17 As we go forward within the -- you
18 know, and then of course, the planning
19 process, we're looking at the -- there are
20 certain capabilities that you need to be able
21 to respond and do the various planning
22 exercises. So the point is that we're going

1 to embed this in everything we do going
2 forward, which is why it's so important that
3 the next version of this 3.0 be easier to use
4 and more measurable.

5 For those that feel it's a burden
6 now and can't participate, I don't imagine
7 that a lot's going to change down the road.
8 But what we want to at least do is make sure
9 the ability to use it and get access to it is
10 a lot easier, so that people aren't trying to
11 scratch their head and figuring out what it
12 is we got to do. I don't know if that
13 answers your question.

14 MR. FELDMAN: I think from a standards
15 standpoint, it's good to have measurable
16 standards. I guess my concern deals with
17 communities that are fiscally strained that
18 desire to meet that but don't have the
19 resources. Do you envision this maybe as a
20 basis for grants or some sort of funding to come
21 back down?

22 MR. SCHRADER: Let me back up a step.

1 We just did an analysis, and I'll throw a little
2 gasoline on the fire here. We just did an
3 analysis working on -- worked with data from the
4 Census Bureau and OMB, that if you believe that
5 public safety and public health is really the
6 state and local domain of this country, which is
7 the bedrock of Homeland Security, the state and
8 local governments spent almost \$309 billion in
9 2006, which is the data -- the base year we
10 used.

11 The grants are like \$2.9 billion,
12 and the federal expenditures on homeland
13 security, according to OMB, were about \$54.9
14 billion. So when you start looking at state
15 and local government, as we look at these
16 TCLs -- and the reason we want to use these
17 classes and have state and local folks
18 involved as well as subject matter experts,
19 is that if the standard to respond to a
20 HazMat is 30 minutes or less, that's not
21 going to change no matter what the issue is.
22 That's the standard.

1 I mean, we're just documenting that
2 based on SME input.

3 We just want to be able to allow
4 folks to have a sense of what their
5 requirements ought to be, but it's an
6 all-hazards approach to developing these
7 things. So what we really need to begin to
8 look at is what is the differential, and this
9 is part of what Ross is looking at with the
10 cost to capabilities, what's the differential
11 requirements that we have out there to
12 respond to the terror threat environment?

13 Because the HazMat -- or the
14 natural hazards are there and it's a
15 requirement of state and local government to
16 do that anyway. So we're not trying to
17 create -- we're trying to make it simpler,
18 not harder, with the TCLs.

19 DR. BENNETT: Last chance. Okay.
20 Dennis, we really appreciate your update on NIMS
21 and what's happening there. We appreciate that.

22 MR. SCHRADER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

1 DR. BENNETT: Thank you very much.

2 MR. SCHRADER: Yes, sir.

3 DR. BENNETT: We'll now move into our
4 subcommittee meetings, report outs. And the
5 first report out we have would be by Cathey Eide
6 on our National Response Framework Subcommittee.

7 MS. PRICE: Additionally, I know that
8 there have been some presentations today that we
9 haven't had copies for everybody, and
10 particularly the public, so if there are any
11 members of the public who have not gotten
12 presentations, we can get them to you. Next
13 week, we can send them to you electronically and
14 we can mail them to you. So if you could
15 provide your e-mail address and your mailing
16 address to my staff out front at the main table,
17 let us know that you need the additional
18 presentations and we'll make sure that you get
19 them.

20 Thank you.

21 MS. EIDE: Thank you, Alyson. Good
22 afternoon. The National Response Framework

1 Subcommittee, we reviewed our charge, and I'll
2 go ahead and read it to you. "The National
3 Response Framework Subcommittee will provide
4 input on modifications to the NRF, offer
5 strategies for dissemination of the framework
6 and other related plans, assist with the
7 development of meaningful and relevant training
8 programs on the integration and implementation
9 of the NRF."

10 Some of our discussion in our
11 meeting yesterday included just a review of
12 what we felt the audience for the NRF was,
13 and so we recommend that its senior elected
14 officials, senior emergency management and
15 response community and not just emergency
16 management in and of itself -- a tiered
17 understanding of the approach for other
18 emergency management personnel and response
19 partners.

20 Also, we feel very strongly that
21 integration of the NRF into existing training
22 for emergency managers and responders -- and

1 that includes all the NIMS courses -- to make
2 sure they refer to the NRF in proper fashion.

3 We also want FEMA to look at
4 greater emphasis on a resource center, and we
5 want to encourage members of the NAC and our
6 community members as we go back to our homes,
7 again, to frequent that resource center and
8 then as the resource center provides updates,
9 we would ask them to let us know that the
10 resource center has been updated as well.

11 And again, we want to encourage the
12 use of the resource center to be able to
13 answer those questions that are not covered
14 in the framework itself. And one of the
15 things that we reviewed is the framework
16 versus the plan. And we felt that there
17 should be more outreach conducted so that
18 people are trained properly on the NRF,
19 utilizing the resources available in the
20 resource center in tabletops, drills, and
21 other exercises that are available through
22 that resource center.

1 We were talking about the partner
2 guides, and I guess they're still under
3 development. And so what we would like to do
4 is get regular updates from FEMA as those
5 partner guides are updated. And we would
6 also encourage FEMA to show us review drafts
7 as those partner guides are developed, and
8 including the stakeholder input that they're
9 getting on those partner guides.

10 The private sector, we discussed a
11 little bit about the future versions of the
12 NRF should cover more information on the
13 private sector. And perhaps through the
14 strengthening of the support annex, we can
15 address these issues for the private sector,
16 and also encourage FEMA private sector staff
17 to conduct outreach from their sector.

18 So one of the things we also did is
19 we asked all the members of the subcommittee
20 to review the GAO report on the NRF. And one
21 of the questions that we did come up with in
22 the subcommittee meeting is we were wondering

1 where FEMA is on developing the policies and
2 procedures that guide how future revision
3 processes will occur, particularly for
4 collaborating with our non-federal
5 stakeholders or their non-federal
6 stakeholders.

7 Some of the discussion included
8 improving ways by which FEMA communicates
9 these policies and processes to the NRF, and
10 that communication through the NAC, perhaps
11 providing drafts of revised collaboration
12 policies to the NAC and the NRF subcommittee
13 for review. We are looking for some
14 definition of the timelines of how FEMA plans
15 on incorporating stakeholder collaboration,
16 and encouraging that FEMA continues to
17 improve their inclusion of the stakeholder in
18 future revisions of the NRF.

19 One other thing that we really like
20 is the NRF resource center, and so we wanted
21 to put the resource center website address up
22 here. And again, we want to encourage all

1 members of the NAC to go on and take a look
2 at the resources available on the NRF
3 resource center. It's a wonderful site, and
4 there are lots of tools available, and all
5 the subcommittee members do agree that the
6 strength of the framework does lie within the
7 tools available through this resource center.

8 Another thing that we reviewed is
9 the elevator speech. That is something that
10 we would again encourage all the members of
11 the NAC as well as the members of the
12 subcommittee to take a look at the elevator
13 speech, and it is available in your handout,
14 and perhaps memorize it. And then when you
15 go back to your cities and communities, this
16 is a way that we can all provide outreach and
17 assist FEMA in pushing out the NRF, and then
18 again, the tools available on the resource
19 center.

20 Our next steps for the
21 subcommittee: we will be taking a look at the
22 discussion items and then developing some

1 formal recommendations for the NAC
2 consideration to forward onto FEMA
3 administration.

4 Any questions? Thank you.

5 DR. BENNETT: I have a question. I
6 noticed in here there are some -- I know they're
7 not before the body as formal recommendations,
8 but some of them are encouraging FEMA -- are you
9 working through the staff on that right now?
10 Are you going to come forward with something
11 soon to bring before this body?

12 MS. EIDE: Yes. What we have decided
13 to do is over the next couple of weeks, we're
14 going to develop -- we're going to send an
15 e-mail out to the subcommittee members to take a
16 look at the discussion items, and then formalize
17 some recommendations that will be brought
18 forward to the full council.

19 DR. BENNETT: Do you expect to have
20 something before the next meeting in December,
21 or at the December meeting?

22 MS. EIDE: Absolutely. We want to get

1 it done before the next meeting.

2 DR. BENNETT: Thank you very much,
3 Cathey. Any other questions?

4 Our next report out will be by
5 Nancy Dragani on the Stafford Act.

6 MS. DRAGANI: Good afternoon. I want
7 to preface this report out with just a couple
8 statements. One being that when the
9 subcommittee originally formed, the focus was to
10 accept comments on a broad range of issues from
11 a broad range of constituencies, that included
12 both policy regulatory and legislative changes
13 to the Stafford Act.

14 We did a lot of work on that. We
15 put them in categories, but then working with
16 FEMA, FEMA asked us to focus in for the near
17 term on three regulatory issues for public
18 assistance: three ended up being four
19 regulatory issues on individual assistance,
20 and then ten policy issues, with the
21 intent -- and I think a very realistic
22 one -- that much of the Stafford Act conflict

1 comes with policy and regulation, not with
2 the actual Act itself. So that's kind of
3 what we're focused on today.

4 I also want to start off by saying
5 we will have a recommendation. We have
6 developed a memo that has gone to Dr. Bennett
7 that provides input on those three PA
8 regulatory issues and the four IA, individual
9 assistance, regulatory issues.

10 I want to start before I even get
11 into the presentation of the first PA issue,
12 with an overarching statement that will be
13 included in our memo, and it's not on the
14 slides, and it comes with input from our
15 tribal representatives. And I'm going to
16 read this to you because you don't have it in
17 front of you.

18 "This subcommittee highly
19 recommends that FEMA respect tribal
20 sovereignty and the government-to-government
21 relationship, especially as it relates to
22 associated regulations and policies. In

1 particular, appropriate references to states
2 should also include federally recognized
3 tribes."

4 That is a broad overarching
5 statement that really isn't reflected in any
6 one regulation, but would be reflected across
7 the board.

8 With those kind of opening
9 statements, we'll jump into the first PA
10 regulatory issue -- oh, I'm sorry, we've got
11 a subcommittee charge. And the subcommittee
12 charge, as you can see, is to examine the
13 provisions of the Stafford Act and related
14 federal regulations and recommend changes.
15 And I'm going to jump to the bottom.

16 "Recommend changes that will most
17 quickly and directly result in greater
18 flexibility in providing assistance." And I
19 think that the committee -- I hope that the
20 committee would agree with me that the
21 changes that we saw that were brought to us
22 for review and input on really did focus on

1 flexibility in increasing, in terms of speed,
2 getting assistance out to both public and
3 private individuals.

4 So public assistance issue number
5 one. The issue is public assistance advanced
6 funding program. I'm going to read to you a
7 restatement of what the FEMA issue was and
8 what their solution was, which you don't have
9 in front of you, and then we'll talk about
10 the subcommittee -- I don't think you
11 do -- and then we'll talk about the
12 subcommittee input.

13 So the FEMA issue -- again, this is
14 a restatement -- is major disasters can
15 severely impact the operating budgets and
16 revenue streams of local government. Their
17 proposed solution is to provide advanced
18 funding to local governments through the
19 states so that they can expedite the
20 initiation of recovery projects and speed the
21 recovery process. So you have the problem,
22 you have FEMA's solutions, and now we'll take

1 a minute to discuss the subcommittee
2 recommendations. And in most cases, these
3 are an overall recommendation on whether we
4 found the problem and the solution something
5 worthwhile, and then some issues or areas of
6 concern that we wanted to make sure FEMA was
7 aware of and could address as they moved
8 forward.

9 The first issue -- there were
10 several that were kind of under a clear
11 guidance statement, that yes, we think this
12 is important, but as you develop this, you
13 need to make sure that you have very clear
14 guidance on cash management and how the cash
15 flow will occur -- on interest accrual and
16 accountability if you provide advanced
17 funding, then the assumption is there may be
18 interest accrual, and how will the
19 sub-grantees manage that and account for it,
20 and what is the process that guides that.

21 Scope of work issues. In other
22 words, if you live in an earthquake-prone

1 state, then you probably know that the simple
2 initiation of recovery to earthquake-damaged
3 businesses and buildings involves a lot of up
4 front assessment that may not be necessary in
5 a flood, for instance, or a tornado. So
6 there was a recognition that the scope of
7 work, the type of event, may change depending
8 on the hazard.

9 This is an issue that I feel very
10 strongly about, and that is increased
11 management costs for state and locals. Any
12 time you advance funding, there is by its
13 very nature an increased cost to manage the
14 advance to make sure that the money's going
15 to the appropriate expenditures, so there is
16 an increased management cost on the part of
17 sub-grantees.

18 And then finally, one of the
19 solutions within the FEMA recommendation was
20 advance the funding only up to 25 percent, so
21 it is a rolling 25 percent advance, and we
22 asked for clarification on that. There was

1 some confusion in the document. The document
2 referred to -- funding can be advanced up to
3 25 percent, but again, it's rolling. So
4 again, it's a rolling 25 percent advance.

5 Those were guidance
6 clarification-type issues. In addition, and
7 this is a state perspective, a state request
8 as a primary grantee -- I think the states
9 would be concerned that there's a cutoff,
10 that only, for instance, 75 or 80 percent of
11 the funding allocation would be advanced, so
12 that there's a time to let the dust settle,
13 if you will, and reconcile before the entire
14 award amount has been advanced to local
15 government.

16 Having done many, many, many
17 mitigation problems and public assistance
18 projects in the past, I think there's always
19 a good opportunity to reconcile before you
20 have every last dime spent.

21 I'm going to take this one by one
22 because it's a lot of information, and stop

1 at this point and ask if there are any
2 questions, any issues, any comments or
3 concerns on PA Issue No. 1. And I need one
4 alibi because there is one more that's not on
5 your slide. There was also I think a really
6 intriguing recommendation, and that's the
7 benefit of the NAC -- quite frankly, it
8 brings new partners to the table -- that FEMA
9 explore the option of providing collateral or
10 federal loan guarantees to local government
11 that would allow them to more easily borrow
12 money to initiate recovery projects, which I
13 think is kind of an out-of-the-box solution,
14 but a really valuable one. So it isn't
15 necessarily anything more than a
16 recommendation that FEMA explore, but a good
17 thing to have on the table.

18 So with that, I will stop and ask
19 if there are any questions, if there's any
20 information that needs to be clarified.

21 Dr. Bennett, your mic is on. Did
22 you have a question?

1 DR. BENNETT: Well, no. I was going
2 to say, I think if there are no questions right
3 now, or discussion, or clarification, I think we
4 should take a motion at some point to carry this
5 forward and do them one at a time. That way, we
6 won't get confused in the end. So we would need
7 a motion for me to carry this forward from your
8 committee.

9 MS. DRAGANI: Before we move into
10 motion and discussion, though, it looks like
11 there is a question.

12 MR. BROWN: Michael Brown from Grand
13 Forks. Does part of this rule relate to
14 snowstorm assistance? This is defined as, like,
15 you have to have a major event bigger than any
16 event in your past. And it would not provide
17 assistance to communities like ours where, in
18 1997, we had eight blizzards. So the
19 accumulation of the wind, water, ice, put our
20 community at risk, and we evacuated 90 percent
21 of our population. So if you have that
22 definition, it seems like each hurricane would

1 have to exceed the previous hurricane, and each
2 earthquake would have to exceed the previous
3 earthquake to qualify for assistance. So we
4 would like that looked at again regarding
5 snowstorm assistance.

6 MS. DRAGANI: Bob, I can very easily
7 talk to snow declarations, but would you like to
8 handle that? Snow declarations are a different
9 animal. Is there anybody else from FEMA PA
10 here? Snow declarations, as I understand it,
11 are the only declarations that actually require
12 a snowfall of record in order to be eligible,
13 and I think that, mayor, is what you're talking
14 about. This would not apply to that issue. I
15 do think that that's a very good policy issue or
16 regulatory issue that we could take a look at,
17 but this would not apply to that one.

18 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

19 MS. DRAGANI: Anything else you want
20 to add, Bob?

21 MR. SHEA: No, that was perfect.

22 MS. DRAGANI: We just went through

1 that. Any other questions, issues, thoughts, or
2 discussion before we take a motion?

3 Okay, then I would gladly accept a
4 motion to move this particular discussion and
5 recommendation forward -- Dr. Bennett, does
6 it go to you or does it go to --

7 DR. BENNETT: It goes to me to go
8 forward to the administrator.

9 MS. DRAGANI: That the full NAC
10 consider moving this forward to Dr. Bennett for
11 then movement forward to the administrator.

12 MS. COLLINS: So moved.

13 DR. BENNETT: If you recall in the
14 guidelines, if we adopted, you would draft a
15 letter to me that I would then send forward from
16 me to the administrator with the
17 recommendations.

18 MS. DRAGANI: So what we're really
19 doing is adopting this piece of the
20 recommendation?

21 DR. BENNETT: Yes. This one for right
22 now. We'll go through each one. David, did you

1 have a question?

2 MR. BARRON: Just a question. I'm
3 certainly glad to move it forward, but Nancy, do
4 you think we've got clarity around all these
5 issues where we can move it and vote it out?
6 I'm all for that. I think there's a couple in
7 there that maybe we don't know for sure what
8 we're going to do, so we can put those to the
9 side.

10 MS. DRAGANI: Are there some in here
11 that you are concerned about? Can you be
12 specific?

13 MR. BARRON: Not that I'm concerned
14 about. Do you think they're all ready to be
15 moved forward? Done.

16 MS. DRAGANI: Yes, and I'll tell you
17 why, David. In many cases, what we had in front
18 of us to work with was fairly conceptual. It
19 was a problem statement, a recognition that FEMA
20 has a problem in this area, and then some
21 recommended solutions -- in this case, for the
22 solution of getting governments on the road to

1 recovery faster, it was to look at an advanced
2 funding program.

3 So given what we had, I think that
4 as long as we indicate, as you move this
5 forward, please be aware of these issues, I
6 am comfortable that we've done about as much
7 as we can at this point.

8 MR. BARRON: That's great. And I
9 think you've done a great job with this, so I'm
10 fine with it.

11 MS. DRAGANI: Okay.

12 DR. BENNETT: Irene, did you --

13 MS. COLLINS: I did. I so moved that
14 we set PA#1 to be forwarded to Dr. Bennett from
15 the entire NAC and then on to Chief Paulison.

16 MR. BARRON: Second.

17 DR. BENNETT: Second by David Barron.
18 All those in favor of -- are there any
19 questions? Any comments at this point? All
20 those in favor of the motion, signify by saying
21 aye. All those opposed?

22 Passes unanimously. Okay. Do you

1 want to move on to the second issue?

2 MS. DRAGANI: Thank you. Public
3 Assistance Issue No. 2 is to implement key
4 public assistance reforms. This actually
5 contained five separate initiatives within it.
6 I will read again the FEMA issue and their
7 proposed solution. The issue is: "Public
8 assistance regulations do not reflect the new
9 FEMA's post-Katrina business practices and
10 philosophy changes regarding the provision of
11 disaster assistance, nor do they address the
12 post-Katrina legislative amendments to the
13 Stafford Act."

14 So that is FEMA's issue.

15 Their solution is to complete a
16 comprehensive revision of public assistance
17 regulations. The initiatives are in front of
18 you. The first one was expediting payments
19 to states for debris removal. Quite frankly,
20 I think everybody thought that was a
21 no-brainer and a good thing to move forward
22 on. There were no comments.

1 Delineating authority to provide
2 public assistance to newly recognized or
3 required types of recipients for assistance.
4 There was some discussion on that, and the
5 discussion is in italics -- a little bit hard
6 to see when it's a sans serif type -- but the
7 discussion is in italics. And that was to
8 ensure that FEMA specifically addresses the
9 types of activities. And that's kind of the
10 first point, that as they look at delineating
11 authority for required types of recipients,
12 they identify them clearly. And secondly,
13 that they take into account responsibility
14 for debris removal at private or gated
15 communities.

16 So the first one's a fairly generic
17 statement. Be specific and clear when you
18 identify the types of recipients of
19 assistance, and the second was specific to
20 gated or private communities and debris
21 removal.

22 The next is streamline and improve

1 project worksheets. Again, kind of a
2 no-brainer, if you will. The only concern
3 was that ensuring policy is consistent with
4 regulation.

5 The fourth is institutionalized
6 funding and applicant protection
7 improvements. The only comment here is there
8 was a statement about cost overruns. FEMA
9 notified us that they would pull that out and
10 move cost overrun -- the statement about cost
11 overruns -- to a separate regulatory action
12 paper.

13 And then the fifth is to improve
14 state administrative plans. And again, the
15 only concern we had was a recommendation that
16 they ensure policy is consistent with
17 regulation.

18 Any questions about PA Issue No. 2?

19 Yes? Kurt?

20 MR. KRUMPERMAN: I am not clear what
21 was meant by the newly recognized or required
22 types of recipients. Could you give an example?

1 MS. DRAGANI: Boy, I didn't bring the
2 full paper. Do you have it, Alyson? I just
3 don't have it. I didn't bring it up with me.
4 FEMA's initial -- I'm talking about the initial
5 policy statements from FEMA. That's okay. I
6 had it way back by my -- Kristen, do you know?
7 Can you look for it and find it for me. Thank
8 you. I'm sorry.

9 MR. MURPHY: Nancy, I think I've -- if
10 you're referring to what we started out with,
11 again, delineating authority to provide public
12 assistance to or for newly recognized or
13 required types of recipients, and they went in
14 to -- and most of these, I think, are resulted
15 references to PKEMRA. Durable medical
16 equipment, community arts centers, performing
17 art facilities, educational added to definition
18 of critical services, pet rescue, sheltering,
19 and care, and then precautionary evacuations.

20 And these are all PKEMRA section
21 references.

22 MS. DRAGANI: Thank you, Ken. And Ken

1 did a good job of summing it up. What they're
2 really talking about is in the post-Katrina
3 world, we recognize, or they recognize, that
4 there are new types of recipients -- and I'll
5 give you an example that I don't think Ken
6 talked about -- host states.

7 When we see some kind of mass
8 evacuation like we saw in Louisiana, and we
9 had almost every state in the nation, if not
10 every state in the nation, except individuals
11 that have relocated. There are some
12 non-traditional types of assistance that FEMA
13 had to provide. Does that make sense? And I
14 think again, the point was, if they're going
15 to delineate, delineate clearly what those
16 types of assistance and recipients are.

17 Okay? Yes, J.R.?

18 MR. THOMAS: Nancy, could you explain
19 a little bit more about the address eligibility
20 criteria and responsibility for debris removal?
21 That's a brand-new area, isn't it? Because you
22 weren't able to go onto private property before

1 to clean up debris?

2 MS. DRAGANI: Really depends on -- and
3 I'm going to look to my South Florida
4 partners -- it really depends on who has
5 responsibility to maintain those roads and the
6 property day-to-day. Is that correct, Susy? So
7 in other words, if you have a gated community
8 and the county typically maintains that
9 property, plows the roads, makes sure that the
10 roadways are navigable, then arguably, they
11 should have the ability to come in for
12 reimbursement for debris removal. And I want to
13 make sure I captured that correctly. Anybody
14 else want to add -- this is not an issue we face
15 a lot in Ohio. Does that answer your question?
16 So it's an eligibility issue.

17 Any other questions? Okay.

18 DR. BENNETT: A motion on this issue,
19 PA No. 2?

20 MR. THOMAS: J.R., I move to accept.

21 DR. BENNETT: We have a motion to
22 adopt by the committee the recommendations of PA

1 Issue No. 2. Is there a second?

2 MR. DECKER: Second.

3 DR. BENNETT: Russ Decker is the
4 second. Any discussion? All those in favor of
5 the motion, signify by saying aye. All those
6 opposed, like sign?

7 Passes unanimously.

8 MS. DRAGANI: Okay. Public Assistance
9 Issue No. 3. This addresses force account
10 reimbursement catastrophic disaster staffing.
11 The issue, as identified by FEMA is, "Response
12 and initial recovery efforts of state and local
13 government can overwhelm government resources,
14 especially during large-scale incidents where
15 emergency work continues for many weeks." Their
16 solution is in large-scale events and for a
17 limited period of time, reimburse state and
18 local government for the regular or straight
19 time salaries and benefits of applicants
20 permanently employed staff for the cost incurred
21 in assigning permanent staff to engage full-time
22 on emergency protective measures and debris

1 removal.

2 So it's a real departure in the
3 sense that straight time and benefits would
4 be an eligible reimbursement under the public
5 assistance program when there is a long-term
6 recovery in effect. Okay?

7 Our subcommittee discussion -- and
8 there was, as I say, significant discussion
9 with this issue -- one was very basic. If
10 straight and overtime are eligible, is
11 backfill eligible as well? So that was kind
12 of a basic eligibility question.

13 The second was, clear guidance must
14 be established to prevent supplanting of
15 existing state and local budgets. So if I
16 have an existing budget to pay an individual
17 to clear my roads and we have a long-term
18 event, I'm paying him anyway, so when we get
19 that reimbursement, am I supplanting my
20 initial budget? And for those of us who've
21 lived with federal grants for a while, we
22 know that's always an issue.

1 Universal match was unclear and
2 needs to be better defined. There was some
3 information in here about a universal match.

4 The solution, which was fairly
5 lengthy, talked of 30-day threshold. So in
6 other words, an event had to unfold for at
7 least 30 days before this kind of force
8 account reimbursement would be an eligible
9 activity.

10 So the question then was, nobody
11 really argued the 30-day. Clearly, a 30-day
12 recovery effort is one that's going on for a
13 long time, or emergency protective measures
14 under category A and B. But the question
15 was, once that 30-day threshold's been met,
16 is the reimbursement eligibility retroactive?
17 So on day 31, can you go back and claim days
18 1 through 31, or does it start on day 31?

19 And then finally, the document
20 refers several times as catastrophic as a
21 threshold. And without a clear definition of
22 "catastrophic," we don't think that's a good

1 threshold. Because what is catastrophic in
2 my city is a blip in New York City, and what
3 is catastrophic in one state may just be
4 business as usual. What is a snowstorm in
5 Maryland may be just a couple of inches of
6 sledding weather in Maine. So clearly,
7 catastrophic is in the eye of the beholder.
8 So we thought the 30-day threshold was a good
9 indicator, but asked that unless catastrophic
10 was defined, that it be eliminated, or
11 requested recommended that it be eliminated
12 from the document.

13 At this point, any discussions,
14 questions, comments, and issues? And I would
15 encourage the subcommittee, if there's
16 anything that you think I need to clarify or
17 you need to clarify, please, I'm not shy.

18 Joe?

19 MR. BECKER: Actually, it's a process
20 question for all of these. So if we approve
21 these and they go to the administrator and
22 they're deemed to move forward for action, how

1 does this happen? Maybe it's a question for
2 Bob. How does FEMA change its regulations or
3 policies in this way?

4 MR. SHEA: I think the vision was that
5 the Council would provide their guidance and
6 input and then -- actually, we'll reach out and
7 ask a variety of people, including probably
8 members of the Council, to come and help us
9 actually draft the changes to the regulations.
10 Those in turn have to go up for public comment.
11 There's a Federal Register process.

12 So this is not as if you're trying
13 to write the regulation today or change
14 things. It's more -- here's where you should
15 look and here's the sensitivities that were
16 expressed by the Council as we were looking
17 at this.

18 Is that what you understand too,
19 Nancy?

20 MS. DRAGANI: Yes. And in fact,
21 thanks for asking that question, Joe, because I
22 forgot to mention this. One of the things

1 that's a little bit non-traditional is these
2 really are conceptual in nature. They're areas,
3 they're problem areas FEMA's identified, they
4 basically gave the subcommittee these problem
5 areas that are regulatory in issue and said,
6 give us your input. Tell us what you think
7 about our proposed solution, and tell us what
8 the pitfalls might be or what your concerns
9 might be. So it's fairly general. And at this
10 point, I think as Bob said, it's really more on
11 the front end, this is what we think we need to
12 work on -- on the front end, to tell us what you
13 think about that and what your concerns might
14 be.

15 MR. BECKER: Given the fact that these
16 came out of PKEMRA, PKEMRA said you need to
17 change and FEMA's saying, okay, to change, we
18 need to change these policies and procedures.
19 What's the check back to say, no, that wasn't
20 what we had in mind when we passed PKEMRA?

21 MS. DRAGANI: I would never try to
22 guess what our legislators had in mind.

1 MR. BECKER: How do you know that
2 you've got it right, I guess is the question?

3 MR. SHEA: I think, Joe, the statement
4 that was made earlier is relevant here, which is
5 that, as Nancy and the Chairman indicated,
6 there's a wide variety of things that we can
7 look at. This was an attempt to capture things
8 that were perceived as some of the most critical
9 out of the post-Katrina environment.

10 And with a limited agenda, it may
11 be possible to make some changes during the
12 remainder of this administration. So the
13 answer is, it's not comprehensive. It is
14 those things that there was a general feeling
15 that we thought we were targeting areas where
16 we could bring fruit forward and make some
17 real substantial changes. But clearly, it's
18 not designed, I don't believe, to cover the
19 waterfront at this point.

20 MS. PRICE: Can I add?

21 MS. DRAGANI: Absolutely.

22 MS. PRICE: And because I know what

1 our regulatory attorneys have been saying this
2 over and over, I think it's pretty important to
3 remind everybody that the federal rulemaking
4 process has not actually begun. What FEMA is
5 doing is a little bit different than what
6 they've done previously.

7 They may have handed you a document
8 after they've done a lot of the work on it,
9 and asked for your input, but in this case,
10 they're asking for this input before they
11 even put pen to paper. And once they begin
12 putting pen to paper, the federal rulemaking
13 requirements are then closed to the public
14 until the language is actually put into the
15 Federal Register and is presented to the
16 public for public comment.

17 So this is kind of a different
18 process. And I felt like it was important to
19 mention that because they're going to be much
20 happier if they know that the public doesn't
21 think that the federal rulemaking process has
22 actually started. They have not started

1 actually writing the regs yet. They've been
2 waiting for your input.

3 MS. DRAGANI: In a sense, they almost
4 used this committee as a focus group, if you
5 will, just to say this is what we're thinking.
6 What are you thinking? And I think it worked
7 very well. Kurt?

8 MR. KRUMPERMAN: On the issue of -- I
9 guess it's the second bullet point where you're
10 talking about straight and overtime and backfill
11 costs. I'm a bit confused on the issue, and
12 apparently, you discussed it a lot.

13 My understanding of what you said
14 is that, let's say it's the streets
15 department there's a disaster in a community,
16 the streets department is involved in dealing
17 with debris removal and whatever -- their
18 efforts are now reimbursable through public
19 assistance, even though they're working
20 straight time as part of their normal duties?
21 Am I missing the point?

22 MS. DRAGANI: I think that the issue

1 is, and I'm going to go back to the original
2 issue as identified by FEMA, government
3 personnel during "catastrophic" events are
4 pulled from their regular duties and assigned
5 full-time to emergency- and disaster-related
6 activities. As a result, local government may
7 suffer severe disruption in revenue, making it
8 difficult to sustain operations.

9 So I think that some of the issue
10 is straight time has never been eligible,
11 only overtime. And I think FEMA's
12 recognizing that when you have an event, a
13 large-scale event, like a Katrina, like an
14 earthquake, that lasts for weeks and weeks
15 and weeks, that the straight time issue
16 becomes critical for local government.

17 MR. BRUNO: Nancy, can I add something
18 to that?

19 MS. DRAGANI: Yes. Thank you, Jim.

20 MR. BRUNO: Jim Bruno. I think,
21 that's the big issue, that we've never been
22 eligible. It may very well be that when this is

1 written, there may be some requirement that you
2 establish you've been overwhelmed. It seems
3 logical, but the purpose of this thing is if you
4 are overwhelmed, if they'll come back and
5 they'll pick up straight time costs.

6 Obviously, every local would like
7 to see straight time costs picked up, even
8 backfill costs, which would all be great, but
9 I have a feeling when FEMA starts writing
10 this and working it, they're probably going
11 to look for some needs test.

12 So that's a possibility, right? I
13 mean, that's not clear --

14 MS. DRAGANI: I think so.

15 MR. BRUNO: What we're doing here
16 doesn't really say they will not have that. So
17 my sense is that if you are concerned about
18 that, I think that you'll see a needs test
19 somewhere along the road on this, because the
20 general feeling, I think, is not to reimburse
21 straight cost, only overtime, since you would
22 have had the people working anyway and would

1 have paid for them. This recognizes, in some
2 cases, in a large-scale incident, whatever we
3 want to call it, that that may overwhelm the
4 overall resources of that local government and
5 allow us a little more flexibility. We
6 certainly think it's a great idea in New York,
7 as almost any local government would, but I
8 think there will be some pushback on it.

9 MR. KRUMPERMAN: I support it
10 completely. I'm aware of in the ambulance world
11 where folks have not been paid that were
12 extremely overwhelmed, but it was seen as a part
13 of their regular activities, so this seems to
14 give more flexibility in a lot of areas.

15 MS. DRAGANI: I do think, though,
16 Joe's right. I think there's going to be
17 probably a needs test. It will -- even though I
18 don't like the word "catastrophic" without a
19 definition, it will be probably not the norm for
20 99 percent of disasters, but really saved for
21 those truly extraordinary events. Yes?

22 MR. BROWN: Michael Brown from Grand

1 Forks, North Dakota. During our flood of '97,
2 we immediately went to the Bank of North Dakota
3 and borrowed \$24 million to keep our city
4 running. And this type of legislation or help
5 would have been greatly appreciated, so I would
6 move this forward.

7 MS. DRAGANI: I think there was
8 also -- John?

9 MR. PATURAS: Nancy, Jim Paturas.

10 MS. DRAGANI: Oh, Jim. Sorry.

11 MR. PATURAS: That's okay. Just a
12 point of clarification. So your decision, which
13 I agree with, to get rid of the reference to
14 catastrophic events -- was consideration given
15 for substitute terminology or will the primary
16 determinant be the 30-day window?

17 MS. DRAGANI: I think we would
18 recommend substitute terminology as long as it's
19 clearly defined, and it may be there isn't one
20 phrase, it's more of these kinds of initiating
21 events or initiating circumstances like a 30-day
22 threshold. So again, the catastrophic is

1 probably my buzz more than anybody else's.

2 John?

3 MR. STENSGAR: I'd just like to add
4 that when you're looking at them from rural
5 America, like a lot of you are talking about
6 debris removal -- out in rural America, we wear
7 many hats, and so when we have an event -- I
8 mean, we have a major fire within the boundaries
9 of a reservation right now -- for instance, we
10 have several of our accountants who's
11 cross-trained in the federal financial
12 management systems that are moved over to
13 support the fire efforts.

14 So folks that are left behind -- I
15 mean, we authorize overtime, et cetera, for
16 them to continue carrying out the mission,
17 and also authorize e-hires to continue to
18 work while -- you know, basically those
19 individuals are deployed to the fire. So I
20 mean, it definitely works in rural America as
21 well as within the municipalities.

22 Thank you.

1 MS. DRAGANI: Any other comments?

2 Questions?

3 Dr. Bennett?

4 DR. BENNETT: I'll entertain a motion

5 that we move forward the recommendations on PA

6 Issue No. 3.

7 MR. BROWN: So moved.

8 DR. BENNETT: Do we have a second?

9 MS. EIDE: Second.

10 DR. BENNETT: I have plenty of

11 seconds. Let's see, I'll give this one to

12 Cathey E. I was looking at her.

13 MS. DRAGANI: Who moved it,

14 Dr. Bennett?

15 DR. BENNETT: Mayor Brown.

16 MS. DRAGANI: Mayor Brown. Cathey

17 seconded.

18 DR. BENNETT: All those in favor of

19 the motion, signify by saying aye. All those

20 opposed, like sign.

21 Passed unanimously.

22 MS. DRAGANI: Thank you. Now we'll

1 move on to the Individual Assistance issues.
2 This was intended to be 3, 3, and 10. It's
3 actually 3, 4, and 10 now, because we have four
4 Individual Assistance issues that we looked at.

5 The first issue is to streamline
6 and signify the recertification of assistance
7 to disaster applicants. The issue here is
8 the current process for evaluating and
9 verifying a continuing need for temporary
10 housing, which is called recertification, is
11 viewed by some as subjective and
12 inconsistent.

13 So the FEMA solution is to revise
14 the regulations or criteria for continued
15 assistance to significantly streamline the
16 recertification process.

17 This issue had three primary areas.
18 The first was to eliminate the requirement
19 for a permanent housing plan. And keep in
20 mind, these are individuals, so it's an
21 individual's requirement for a permanent
22 housing plan. The second is replace ability

1 to pay determinations with a structured
2 reduction of rental assistance. And the
3 third is to replace recertification
4 correspondence with face-to-face visits by
5 FEMA personnel.

6 So the subcommittee's comments,
7 specific concerns, and issues, were to -- we
8 agreed and supported the elimination of the
9 permanent housing plan, but wanted to ensure
10 that if it was eliminated, the face-to-face
11 visits picked up that discussion.

12 So in other words, you have an
13 individual in temporary housing. At this
14 point, they have to file a permanent housing
15 plan that discusses how they're going to move
16 into a permanent solution. That will be
17 eliminated, but the face-to-face visits as
18 part of the recertification process should
19 include a discussion with the applicant on
20 what steps they're doing to get themselves
21 and their family into a permanent housing
22 situation.

1 The second bullet, or actually
2 third on the slide, is to clearly identify an
3 appeals process that takes into account the
4 entire range of issues that may be faced by a
5 disaster victim. We had a lot of discussion
6 about this. That could include victims that
7 have relocated across the country. And so
8 the appeals process needs to accommodate the
9 victim no matter what their issue or where
10 they're located.

11 The fourth bullet is to clarify
12 bullet two, and this was an ability to pay
13 determination. And the bullet read like the
14 ability to pay determination would be
15 replaced with a gradual reduction in rental
16 assistance. After some discussion, the
17 committee understood that the intent was the
18 personal visits would take into account a
19 range of information on the part of the
20 applicant to clarify household income and the
21 ability to pay.

22 And then based on those and other

1 factors, there could be an incremental
2 decrease or reduction in rental assistance
3 again as they move off of federal assistance
4 and into a permanent solution. So it wasn't
5 a straight switch, but rather a discussion
6 that could result in incremental reduction in
7 assistance.

8 And then the final bullet, disaster
9 victims who have relocated outside the
10 disaster event area must be provided the same
11 level of service as those in the event area,
12 immediate event area, and this was again a
13 reflection that in Katrina, people ended up
14 in every state in the nation, and there has
15 to be a process developed by FEMA that allows
16 them the same type of access that somebody in
17 the immediate area has for face-to-face
18 visits for appeals process, et cetera.

19 Comments, issues, questions,
20 clarification from the committee? Bob?

21 MR. CONNORS: Just a comment.

22 Obviously, this is probably one of the most

1 sensitive subjects and the one that will get the
2 most press if it's not done right, so I hope
3 we're taking and FEMA is going to take extreme
4 care to make sure we get this one right when we
5 do forward it and change anything that's in
6 place right now.

7 MS. DRAGANI: I think that in fact,
8 some of the proposal reflects that sensitivity,
9 moving from a documented process where you're
10 relying on paperwork and mail which gets lost,
11 which gets misplaced, which people can't read or
12 understand, and moving to a face-to-face
13 personal contact is a reflection of that
14 sensitivity.

15 MR. CONNORS: That face-to-face
16 contact, though, that's concerning as well.
17 We've got to make sure that there's a lot of
18 care and feeding of those people that will be
19 doing that -- in recognition that it's a
20 sensitive thing there, too.

21 MS. DRAGANI: And quite frankly, it
22 will take a lot of people to do it in a large

1 disaster. Yes, Joe?

2 MR. BRUNO: If I could just say
3 something. I think the balance at this
4 discussion and all of this IA assistance is to
5 provide that sensitivity but to avoid
6 opportunities for fraud and misuse and abuse.
7 Clearly, we have public monies here. They have
8 to be protected. We recognize that in this
9 group here in the subcommittee and in the NAC,
10 so it's a balance. You'll see throughout this,
11 this balance of trying to prevent abuse but
12 trying to be more sensitive. I think this is a
13 pretty good opportunity to do that.

14 MR. CONNORS: I agree. And my concern
15 with that, Joe, is only that you don't have
16 somebody walk up and look and say, you've got a
17 Mercedes in your driveway, you're all set, we'll
18 talk to you later. So there's a lot of care and
19 feeding of those people that will do that.

20 MS. DRAGANI: Agreed. Yes, Christina?

21 MS. CATLETT: I think my question is
22 for Bob. I'm just curious, do you have any

1 angst about this particular issue, that FEMA's
2 going to have the resources to meet this
3 request?

4 MR. SHEA: I don't think there'd be
5 any question that this is moving away from a
6 system where we relied heavily on the internet
7 and documentation. In other words, even the
8 letters were generated by a computer system, and
9 moving towards what is called case management,
10 and it is a huge investment of people and
11 resources to be able to carry out successfully.

12 The flipside to that is, I frankly
13 don't think we have much choice. We don't
14 have a great track record in this area, and
15 this is what essentially most people are
16 recommending to us to do.

17 DR. BENNETT: Angelina?

18 MS. ELGIN: I just want to second what
19 Bob said. My concern is that we use a lot of
20 sensitivity when we're looking at the
21 face-to-face and when we're doing these personal
22 visits in the home, because like you said, we

1 don't want to start stereotyping people, and we
2 want to ensure that the decision-making is
3 consistent across the board for everyone.

4 MS. DRAGANI: Bob?

5 MR. GOUGELET: I would just like to
6 say that a face-to-face visit may not be
7 required in all cases, and if the net is working
8 well and everything's running smoothly, then
9 there's no need to add to that, but if somebody
10 requests it or there's a problem, then I think
11 they should have access to try to solve that
12 problem face-to-face, so could we put a
13 qualifier in maybe?

14 MS. DRAGANI: We can do that -- before
15 we -- because we'll need to craft that right
16 now.

17 MR. GOUGELET: So when appropriate or
18 when requested or when required, a face-to-face
19 visit would be FEMA's obligation to provide.

20 MS. DRAGANI: Could we add, or could I
21 propose that we add a bullet? Alyson, I'll ask
22 you to take this -- to modify this particular

1 issue with a bullet that says, "FEMA may want to
2 consider alternate uses of personal contact in
3 addition to face-to-face"? Would that suffice?
4 Which would allow for phone, might also just
5 allow to continue documentation.

6 MR. GOUGELET: I think that
7 the -- first of all, they may not be required in
8 all cases -- even though we hear about cases
9 that don't work. I mean, if I'm not mistaken,
10 most cases have worked out very well over time.
11 So I think just -- our purpose would be to limit
12 it to just the only necessary ones, and I think
13 we can make sure people are taken care of in any
14 number of different ways.

15 For me, the final result would be
16 if all else fails, then you're guaranteed to
17 talk to somebody that can solve that problem.

18 MS. DRAGANI: Yes. Russ?

19 MR. DECKER: Yes, I agree with what
20 Rob said. I think what we need to do is somehow
21 craft it so that it's the recipient that
22 reserves the right to have the face-to-face, but

1 if they don't want the face-to-face and can do
2 it all on the internet, they should be allowed
3 the flexibility to do whatever fits their needs
4 as the disaster victim.

5 MS. DRAGANI: Can I then ask -- I'm
6 sorry -- did you have something else, Bob?

7 MR. CONNORS: I think that kind of
8 defeats the purpose of making sure there's no
9 fraud in the system, because anybody can say, I
10 don't want you coming because I don't want you
11 seeing that I don't really need assistance. So
12 I think we've got to -- I'm not sure this one's
13 ready yet.

14 MS. DRAGANI: Keep in mind, we're not
15 commenting on actual language, we're commenting
16 on a concept, so we could come up with a concept
17 that reflects some of the additional concerns
18 about overwhelming the system, additional
19 concerns about people using continuing processes
20 to perpetuate fraud, waste, and abuse, if you
21 will, before we finish that then.

22 Joe? You had a comment?

1 MR. BECKER: Just a comment that I
2 want to make sure we recognize what a narrow
3 slice this is.

4 This is recertification, so it's
5 already been determined that they have
6 disaster cause need. It's a recertification,
7 not the original face-to-face, not the
8 original inspection that's resulting in that,
9 so when you look at -- all we're trying to
10 find out here is what's changed since the
11 last time we interfaced with you, and I think
12 the exposure here is significantly less than
13 the first time around.

14 MS. DRAGANI: This is after receiving
15 the initial three months of assistance; is that
16 correct, Bob? They receive an initial three
17 months of assistance for rental?

18 MR. SHEA: That's correct. It's three
19 months right out the door once you're certified.
20 It's three months.

21 MS. DRAGANI: So this would be month
22 four. So that's a good clarification. Thanks,

1 Joe. It's not the whole universe. I will tell
2 you, Christina, we had the same kind of
3 discussion and concerns that you raised about
4 overwhelming FEMA's capability to do this. And
5 the discussion, at least the input from FEMA,
6 seemed to be that through their use of current
7 contractors and people, they felt like they
8 could handle this additional workload. Because
9 I was doing the numbers in my head going, holy
10 Toledo, I don't want this mission.

11 So okay. Yes? Lee?

12 MR. FELDMAN: Nancy, wasn't there also
13 some judicial determination that entered in here
14 in creating the face-to-face requirement?

15 MS. DRAGANI: I do believe there was a
16 lawsuit, and this might be in reaction to a
17 lawsuit.

18 MR. FELDMAN: So I'm not sure FEMA has
19 as much flexibility in providing alternatives to
20 the face-to-face, at least that's the way it was
21 presented to the subcommittee at the
22 teleconference on the 4th.

1 MS. DRAGANI: I'm sorry, Bob. Go
2 ahead.

3 MR. SHEA: I'm not sure the lawsuit
4 totally was driving this. I can tell you, I've
5 been on the other end of the phone line when a
6 victim calls and says what is a housing plan?
7 And it's clear that it's not an easy issue for
8 most people to deal with. And if they don't
9 come up with the right answer, they get shot out
10 of the system. So all I'm suggesting is I think
11 this just opens the avenues to use more sane
12 processes to address this kind of thing.

13 MS. DRAGANI: In the interest of time,
14 if we don't feel that this particular issue is
15 ready as it is and may need one more bullet that
16 reflects some of the concerns of the group, I'd
17 like to ask from a procedural point of view if
18 we can table just this one. I can talk with
19 Dr. Gougelet and others who are interested;
20 after we get done with this full session, craft
21 an additional bullet and then can we revisit it
22 tomorrow?

1 I'm asking, I guess, the Chair if
2 that's an opportunity. If we're only really
3 talking one more bullet, because keep in
4 mind, we're really just providing our input.
5 If we're talking one more bullet that
6 identifies those additional concerns, I think
7 we could do that and revisit it.

8 DR. BENNETT: We don't have a motion
9 on the floor, so why don't we allow time for you
10 to bring that back tomorrow.

11 MS. DRAGANI: Okay.

12 DR. BENNETT: That's what we'll do.

13 MS. DRAGANI: Thank you. Let's move
14 on to Individual Assistance Issue No. 2. This
15 is a rental repair pilot. Kind of again an
16 out-of-the-box solution that FEMA has developed.
17 The issue is the legislative criteria that
18 underpins the Individual Assistance rental
19 repair pilot -- this is a pilot that is in the
20 PKEMRA legislation -- limits the operational and
21 field opportunities that makes implementation
22 problematic for FEMA.

1 Their solution is to develop
2 regulatory guidance that allows or requires
3 FEMA to mission assign the responsibility for
4 the pilot execution and the implementation of
5 the pilot to Department of Housing and Urban
6 Development, to HUD. This is really a
7 reflection that housing is a HUD mission.
8 They know how to do it. They know how to
9 rehab rental properties, and they know how to
10 manage this mission. And so that is their
11 solution.

12 So looking at then our comments, I
13 will reiterate again that PKEMRA includes the
14 authority for FEMA to conduct an IA pilot
15 program to refurbish privately owned
16 multi-family rental units for disaster
17 victims. They will implement the pilot. So
18 this isn't a discussion on really whether we
19 think it's a good thing necessarily or not,
20 because they are going to implement it. It's
21 part of PKEMRA, but again, input on how they
22 can implement it better.

1 So the comments are, HUD should be
2 the federal entity that oversees the repair
3 and enhancement of the rental units which,
4 while not affected by the event, could be
5 used to provide temporary housing for those
6 displaced.

7 We recommend that HUD evaluate
8 their policies and procedures to expedite the
9 process of providing the disaster housing,
10 and that FEMA should consider including
11 specific timelines and deliverables in their
12 guidelines -- specifically their funding
13 guidelines -- because the assumption is FEMA
14 would then provide funding for HUD to do this
15 repair project -- that would specifically
16 speed the process for this rehab to occur.

17 A lot of concern among the members
18 about HUD's ability to do this in a timely
19 fashion, because typically they're not
20 moving, I think, at the speed that most of us
21 would like to see them move when we're
22 talking housing disaster victims.

1 Joe, did you have a -- you've had
2 your mic on since the beginning.

3 MR. BECKER: I'm sorry. I'm still
4 back to the very beginning. Can you explain
5 again what the problem is that we're trying to
6 solve here?

7 MS. DRAGANI: I think the problem is,
8 in PKEMRA, FEMA has an assignment to do a pilot
9 repair of rental units housing project. FEMA
10 believes, and the committee I think concurred,
11 that this project would be better served if it
12 were under HUD. The issue is, they have this
13 mission identified in PKEMRA to do this pilot.
14 I think the pilot's a great idea. All of us
15 agreed this makes great sense to house displaced
16 victims, but the issue is, is it a FEMA mission
17 or is it more appropriately a HUD mission?

18 And so our recommendation is in
19 fact, we do think it's a HUD mission. But if
20 it's a HUD mission, then we're concerned
21 about up front, them looking at their
22 policies and procedures so they can do this

1 expeditiously, and actually as part of the
2 pilot and the flow of funding, that FEMA then
3 put timelines and deliverables that are
4 specific -- to ensure that they could do this
5 in a timely fashion in that grant or that
6 funding flow.

7 MR. BRUNO: Could I just add one
8 thing? We're talking about rental houses not
9 affected by the emergency. These were houses
10 that were not destroyed by the emergency or the
11 incident. These are houses that could become
12 upgraded so people can live in them. We're
13 making more housing available. That's maybe a
14 little confusing.

15 MR. BECKER: This will get you out of
16 a shelter.

17 MR. BRUNO: Exactly.

18 MS. DRAGANI: Right.

19 MR. BRUNO: It will get you into
20 housing. So it's a way of kind of fostering
21 more available housing. It's a great program.
22 I think the other point is where it's going to

1 go. I think ultimately, we support it.

2 MS. DRAGANI: Yes? Joanne?

3 MS. HAYES-WHITE: Hi. It could just
4 be semantics, but if it's the authority of FEMA
5 at this point, would you maybe try and have HUD
6 evaluate the policies and procedures prior to
7 handing it off to them? So should that
8 precede -- should the fourth bullet precede the
9 third bullet in that -- so there's some sort of
10 an expectation that they are going to evaluate,
11 they submit something, and then that would be
12 the recommendation.

13 MS. DRAGANI: I see what you're
14 saying.

15 MS. HAYES-WHITE: Prior to handing it
16 off, that you have the goods in hand, so to
17 speak.

18 MS. DRAGANI: So part of the funding
19 guidance would include the requirement to
20 evaluate their policies and procedures ahead of
21 the --

22 MS. HAYES-WHITE: I'm just throwing it

1 out as a recommendation. I think it's not a bad
2 idea.

3 MS. DRAGANI: Do we need to craft the
4 language or can we just reverse the bullets?

5 MS. HAYES-WHITE: I think you could
6 probably just reverse the bullets.

7 MS. DRAGANI: Can I do that on the
8 screen? I can do it as long as I'm allowed to.
9 Or Alyson will. Any other discussion? Yes?

10 Jim?

11 MR. PATURAS: Nancy, Jim Paturas.
12 Just, again, a question. So if PKEMRA said that
13 FEMA must do this -- and it is a good program, I
14 agree with that -- and we're suggesting that HUD
15 has maybe better place to do that, what role
16 then does FEMA play?

17 MS. DRAGANI: Well, certainly --

18 MR. JP: So will FEMA still have the
19 authority based on the legislation?

20 MS. DRAGANI: And they're the grantor.
21 So it's a dual authority, as Bob very
22 appropriately indicated with a hand signal.

1 MR. PATURAS: I saw that. I just
2 wanted to make sure it was.

3 MS. DRAGANI: Ultimately, the
4 legislative authority is in PKEMRA to initiate
5 the pilot. FEMA can certainly provide the
6 funding to HUD as the appropriate sub-grantee to
7 do that.

8 Go back to that one, because we
9 need to vote on this one if we think that
10 this has cleared it up. Any other questions,
11 issues, comments, concerns?

12 I see no lights or hands.

13 DR. BENNETT: We'll entertain a
14 motion.

15 MR. KMET: So moved.

16 DR. BENNETT: Who was it that so
17 moved? Chuck? We'll give it to Chuck. Do I
18 have a second?

19 MR. DECKER: Second.

20 DR. BENNETT: I'm looking over here.

21 MS. HAYES-WHITE: Joanne Hayes-White.

22 DR. BENNETT: We have a motion and

1 it's been seconded for the adoption of
2 Individual Assistance Issue No. 2. All those in
3 favor, signify by saying aye. All those
4 opposed, like sign.

5 It passes unanimously.

6 MS. DRAGANI: Thank you. Oh, there
7 was another part to two.

8 MS. PRICE: Take that back and go in
9 to do the next four --

10 DR. BENNETT: Were there four more
11 bullets?

12 MR. BECKER: I think in Robert's Rules
13 of Order, that's called a do-over.

14 DR. BENNETT: All right. I think
15 technically we passed all but the last four
16 bullets, right? So the next four bullets are --

17 MS. DRAGANI: We'll take a look at the
18 next four. Okay.

19 FEMA and HUD -- these again are
20 comments -- FEMA and HUD should explore ways
21 to maximize the use of units restored for
22 future disasters, a recognition we think this

1 is a good program. We think we should have
2 ways, or FEMA should have ways to provide
3 these units once they're restored for housing
4 future victims or future individuals that
5 have been relocated.

6 The next bullet, FEMA will retain
7 the mission to fund locals or states or to
8 provide on its own post-disaster temporary
9 housing. And this is just a reflection that
10 FEMA is not giving away the whole mission.
11 This is specific to the rental repair pilot
12 project.

13 Third bullet was a reflection that
14 we want to ensure that FEMA and HUD can use
15 this pilot as an opportunity to encourage
16 locals if they want to accept the assistance,
17 and the pilot to consider modifying their own
18 regulations within the boundaries of law so
19 that this can happen faster.

20 Significant concern, legitimate
21 concern, that we don't want to initiate this
22 pilot project and a year later, we're done,

1 because by then, it's no longer needed. So a
2 reflection that just like the federal
3 government has to move quickly on this,
4 locals have an obligation, if they want to
5 benefit from this pilot, to move quickly as
6 well and take accommodations regarding
7 building codes, within the boundaries of law,
8 to move quickly and safely ahead.

9 And then the fourth bullet is to
10 recognize that we want to continue and to
11 improve the continued use of Section 8
12 housing vouchers for disaster victims, and
13 work with locals to improve and increase the
14 Section 8 capacity. And this is really just
15 a reflection of what already occurs, but we
16 want to encourage FEMA and HUD to work
17 together to improve that process.

18 Questions, comments, clarifications
19 on those four bullets?

20 MG LIBBY: Yes, Nancy. Bill Libby.
21 We should have stopped on the first page. I'm
22 developing a real problem here with the notion

1 that we'll refurbish privately owned housing,
2 and that privately owned housing will shortly
3 thereafter revert back to privately owned
4 housing, and we're putting the word "maximize"
5 in there with regard to future use. That's a
6 hell of a deal for slum landlords in some ways.
7 I mean, that's my take on this, unless I'm
8 missing the language implication here.

9 I understand what we're trying to
10 accomplish, but who benefits in the long run
11 from this program?

12 MS. DRAGANI: Right. I hear you, and
13 would recommend a couple things. Because again,
14 we also had this discussion -- in fact, the very
15 first time we looked at this particular issue,
16 that was an issue that was raised, was why are
17 we putting federal dollars into the pockets of
18 private landowners to benefit from -- for
19 profit, if you will.

20 The first is, it's a pilot that is
21 going to happen. So my second piece of that
22 is, perhaps we should put in there very

1 strongly that FEMA and HUD must look at
2 funding, or must look at some ability to use
3 these as part of the agreement to
4 participate. That it isn't a "Mother may I"
5 the next time they need it, but it's "You
6 received these dollars to rehab, now you are
7 obligated for a period of time to make these
8 available as appropriate for future housing
9 needs."

10 Yes, Robert?

11 MR. GOUGELET: Along those lines, I
12 mean, I can understand going out of our way for
13 private homes to supplement things, but
14 shouldn't we say that there's some kind of
15 minimum requirement that they have insurance and
16 other ways of covering this?

17 This is just catastrophic, I guess.
18 I'm not allowed to use that word, but I mean,
19 if they're profit-making, they could just
20 say, well, if FEMA's going to come ahead and
21 pay for everything, then I'll just drop my
22 insurance.

1 MS. DRAGANI: Bob, and then Joe?

2 MR. CONNORS: I think I probably
3 misunderstood where this was heading. I was
4 under the assumption that HUD was going to
5 renovate these things, own these things, buy
6 them off of the private landowner, and HUD was
7 going to own it and then maybe sell it back to
8 somebody, but I guess what I'm hearing is, what
9 Major Libby -- Gen. Libby's saying -- sorry for
10 the demotion --

11 MG LIBBY: Private sector.

12 MR. CONNORS: Where it's going to be
13 turned back to the potential slumlord, then this
14 is one heck of a deal. So I definitely have a
15 problem with this, and I'm not sure us as a NAC
16 want to put our name on this.

17 MS. DRAGANI: I think we should put
18 our input in, though. Again, we're not
19 necessarily putting our name on it, but this is
20 the opportunity for the NAC, I think, to
21 indicate or elaborate on those issues and
22 concerns. Joe? And then there's somebody at

1 the other end of the table. Hang on, just a
2 moment, John. I think Joe, you had -- John?
3 Yes?

4 MR. LANCASTER: Yes. I kind of have
5 another concern in the bullet concerning the
6 whole issue of the local building codes, et
7 cetera. One of the big problems we had with
8 Katrina was related to housing for people with
9 disabilities. And if you start allowing them to
10 waive accessibility requirements in housing,
11 particularly if there's going to be federal
12 money involved there, I would have concerns
13 there, because as it was, there wasn't enough
14 housing for people with disabilities.

15 The other thing is, I think there's
16 some real safety issues you wouldn't want to
17 be waiving related to electrical codes and
18 things like that. So I think there'd have to
19 be some serious guidance around that -- I
20 guess is what I'm saying -- before you'd want
21 to get into waiving local building codes, or
22 encouraging them to do it rapidly without

1 much thought to keep things moving. You
2 wouldn't want them to be throwing out safety
3 and accessibility and other important
4 aspects.

5 MS. DRAGANI: Joe?

6 MR. BRUNO: Yes, I think the bullet
7 says "safely," so it already took into account
8 that. And I think that what we're trying to
9 say, if you're going to run this program, you
10 don't want it to end up a year later or two
11 years later before you get local building codes
12 in line, what you do is you ask communities to
13 come forward with their plan of how they're
14 going to expedite the building of these, or the
15 repair of these units.

16 I don't think anyone, certainly
17 localities aren't, going to allow people to
18 build unsafely, and in fact, we're saying you
19 shouldn't do that. You have to maintain
20 safety. But there are certain things you
21 certainly could do to enhance and speed up
22 these applications and these repairs.

1 As to accessibility, that's an
2 issue, and I think locals will have to deal
3 with that and FEMA should deal with that as
4 well. All we're saying is this program's
5 going forward. These are some of the things
6 that you should be thinking about in putting
7 it together. One is, let's get these things
8 online quickly.

9 There is this other issue that the
10 general raises, and there is -- there's that
11 potential for someone to have a windfall.
12 One of the things that we talked about a
13 little bit in the committee was that you
14 mandate that these units become available in
15 the event something else occurs. The problem
16 with that is, they're rented the next time
17 this occurs. Okay, so that's an issue. Not
18 everything's going to be perfect, but the
19 idea of having the ability to do this is a
20 good idea. It's a pilot.

21 My view is, we support the pilot
22 with the recommendations we have, and we'll

1 let FEMA, the agency that has responsibility,
2 to then take a look and see how it works.
3 And if they need more advice from us, they
4 can come back to us. I mean, I don't think
5 it's in our interest to say we don't think
6 something innovative should be tried. This
7 is not a bad program. It has certain
8 pitfalls like every other one, including, for
9 example, Individual Assistance has lots of
10 pitfalls, which we read about in the paper
11 every time we give out Individual Assistance.

12 MS. DRAGANI: Somebody will always
13 find a way, unfortunately. Angelia had her hand
14 up and then -- no? Okay, then Bob and John.

15 MR. CONNORS: Maybe I'm getting a
16 little worked up about this whole thing, but
17 maybe we need to preface by saying that
18 the -- since we are an advisory council, the
19 National Advisory Council does have some
20 concerns with the implementation of this
21 program, specifically within the area of people
22 making out on us -- I don't know how we'd word

1 it, but if this program is to continue, which we
2 guess -- these are the guidelines we'd like to
3 put in place. I don't think it's very clear
4 that we -- and we're talking about we have
5 concerns, and I think we should, as an advisory
6 council, say that we are concerned.

7 MS. DRAGANI: John, and then Jim.

8 MR. STENSGAR: Just a few comments.
9 You know, there are terminologies out there that
10 we can easily put in with whatever the final
11 draft is. You know, hearing some of the
12 concerns that are coming up in talking about
13 pays of last resort, FEMA would be the -- you
14 know, I fully agree -- the general was talking
15 about the building codes, and across the country
16 it's been accepted, most folks have evolved up
17 to the international building code standards
18 which also -- keep in mind that it puts more
19 work on the local planning departments who have
20 to carry out additional functions along with
21 that.

22 But as it's been said, I support

1 seeing this project go through. I mean,
2 there's these bumps and things in the road
3 that we all need to get by, but I see it as a
4 viable pilot project, because what we were
5 talking about is getting recovery. Getting
6 the communities back to some type of
7 normalcy, and if this is one of the avenues
8 to help do that, then I think we need to
9 support it. Thank you.

10 MS. DRAGANI: Jim, and then I'm going
11 to offer a proposal.

12 MR. PATURAS: Jim Paturas. And maybe
13 Nancy, the committee looked at this, but since
14 this is a pilot -- and I agree also that it
15 should go forward, it would seem to me, one of
16 the things I don't see on here is, what would be
17 the report back to us from the pilot? How well
18 did it succeed? Was there an evaluation done?
19 Was there criteria that we may -- actually to
20 the points that Bob or the general made -- put
21 in to that that we would suggest they review as
22 part of the evaluation of a pilot?

1 That's why we called it a pilot.

2 That can then come back to -- obviously, it
3 will come back to FEMA and HUD, but possibly
4 even come back to this group for review.

5 MS. DRAGANI: I will offer a
6 proposal -- much like we did, I think, with one
7 of the previous bullets, I would like to suggest
8 that part 2 of IA Issue 2, we take the
9 opportunity -- I'd like to talk, perhaps
10 further, with Bob and Joe, if you have time,
11 Gen. Libby, if you have time, anybody else who's
12 interested. And I do think -- and John, at the
13 end of the table -- I do think that we may want
14 to include three more bullets: One that
15 addresses disabilities and requirements for ADA,
16 a concern to ensure that that's addressed; the
17 second that takes a look at a report back, which
18 I think is a good idea; and the third that
19 addresses in probably clearer language what we
20 talked about yesterday -- and that is, is there
21 a mechanism, or encourage FEMA to look at a
22 mechanism, that once they put money into this

1 project, that owners who accept it also accept
2 some kind of willingness as part of the grant to
3 participate fully in future activities as able
4 because some of them will be rented?

5 Does that work for everybody?

6 I will also say, just for clarity,
7 it is multi-family units, so I don't think
8 we're necessarily talking -- as I read it,
9 that is not single family homes, that
10 is -- the intent, I believe, is multi-family
11 units that can house a number of families.
12 So certainly slumlords still own multi-family
13 brownstones, but -- Robert?

14 MR. GOUGELET: So we'll see this again
15 tomorrow?

16 MS. DRAGANI: Yes. So again, those
17 who are interested in having some input on this,
18 Alyson, if you don't mind staying for a few
19 minutes afterwards, we'll see what we can craft.

20 DR. BENNETT: So since we don't have a
21 motion on the table, these particular bullet
22 points with additions will be brought back

1 tomorrow with the other issues.

2 MS. DRAGANI: Yes.

3 DR. BENNETT: I suggest we take a
4 15-minute break now to 4:00, and we'll come back
5 and finish, because we still have a couple more
6 of these, plus two more subcommittee reports to
7 finish.

8 MS. PRICE: One more.

9 DR. BENNETT: Is it one more? We have
10 Special Needs and Public/Private Partnerships.

11 (Recess)

12 MS. PRICE: I think we're going to
13 kind of switch some things around because Irene
14 Collins needs to leave. And so I think we may
15 go ahead and have Irene present, and then we'll
16 return to the Stafford Act issues.

17 Irene, is that okay with you?

18 MS. COLLINS: I'm here.

19 MS. PRICE: I'm pulling it up, the
20 slide show.

21 DR. BENNETT: We're going to go back
22 into session, and we will go back to the

1 committee -- the Stafford Act, after Irene
2 Collins makes her report out for her
3 subcommittee, which is on Special Needs.

4 Irene?

5 MS. COLLINS: Thank you. How do I do
6 this board without --

7 MS. PRICE: You just hit this button.

8 MS. COLLINS: That. Okay. Thank you.

9 MS. PRICE: Are you ready now?

10 MS. COLLINS: Yes, that's fine. Thank
11 you.

12 Thank you so much. And Nancy,
13 thank you for letting me preempt the last two
14 parts of our Stafford Act results.

15 I'm really excited about what our
16 committee has been working on. And I think
17 it's very, very eventful today, in light of
18 everything that we've heard, with the flurry
19 of activity that's going on in FEMA right
20 now, looking at the fact that they're really
21 focusing on regionalism, which is something
22 that we highly support.

1 So we were delighted to hear all
2 the comments that were presented today about
3 the new FEMA, and also what Harvey Johnson
4 said about who are our customers. And
5 certainly with regard to the committee that
6 we serve on, our customers are those that are
7 our Special Needs population.

8 I want to read our subcommittee
9 charge again. That is, "to expand the Office
10 of the National Disabilities Coordinator; to
11 fully integrate the definition of special
12 needs as written in the National Response
13 Framework; to further enhance the office by
14 the inclusion of faith-based and special
15 needs volunteer programs; and assure full
16 integration and coordination with the
17 Interagency Coordinating Council."

18 Today, we want to bring to the
19 committee a proposal, looking at the regional
20 disability coordinators. And this comes to
21 us in light of some of the things that have
22 also been presented today. We've heard about

1 CPG-101, and the fact that they are looking
2 at hiring additional people. With regard to
3 that paper, even though it is still one that
4 is an interim paper, we have been presented
5 as well with an interim paper in our
6 committee for Emergency Management Planning
7 Guide for Special Needs Population. It's
8 CPG-301. We're going to be reviewing that
9 and discussing it.

10 But I think in light of all that
11 we've heard today, and our committee did vote
12 yesterday to go ahead and present to the NAC
13 a proposal -- so at this time, I'd like to
14 present that to you. And the purpose is,
15 again, to look at our charge and to look at
16 what we're trying to accomplish through that.

17 And so what we're going to
18 recommend today is that a disability
19 coordinator position would be hired within
20 each of the 10 FEMA regions to appropriately
21 expand and enhance the work of the FEMA
22 disability coordinator, both in maintaining

1 relationships with volunteer groups and in
2 coordinating response activities. So we're
3 presenting that to you today as a proposal.
4 And I'm open for any questions.

5 Do I hear a motion that we move
6 this proposal forward?

7 MR. LANCASTER: So moved.

8 MS. COLLINS: John Lancaster.

9 A second?

10 MS. TORRIENTE: Second.

11 MS. COLLINS: I'm sorry. Susy
12 Torriente, the second. Thank you so very much.

13 Just to give you some further
14 information about other things that we have
15 done, again, we are -- I'm sorry?

16 DR. BENNETT: Let me go ahead -- let's
17 vote on the proposal --

18 MS. COLLINS: Oh, I'm so sorry.

19 DR. BENNETT: Yes, I'll go ahead and
20 go. Okay.

21 We have a motion on the floor. The
22 motion is that a disability coordinator be

1 added in each of the regions. Is that --

2 MS. COLLINS: Yes, sir.

3 DR. BENNETT: Okay. And it has been
4 moved and seconded. All those in favor of the
5 motion, signify by saying aye. Opposed?

6 Carried unanimously.

7 Okay. Continue with your --

8 MS. COLLINS: Thank you so much.

9 Thank you very, very much.

10 A couple of other things that I
11 wanted to update you on is, regarding our
12 committee, we are going to have a conference
13 call regarding CPG-301 on August 25th to
14 evaluate all that's in that, and we'll have
15 an opportunity to have a lot of valuable
16 input into that proposal.

17 Also, another thing that we
18 discussed yesterday that I think is extremely
19 important is to be able to look at best
20 practices. And I'm sorry Joe Bruno's not in
21 here right now, because one of the areas that
22 we're going to be talking to in our next

1 call, and working out some arrangements to be
2 able to see what they have in place regarding
3 special needs, is in the New York area. And
4 we're very excited about that because we
5 recognize that if we look at best practices,
6 things that have already been proven, already
7 set up, and developed from that, I think
8 we'll all be better off for it. And there's
9 no point in reinventing the wheel when it's
10 already been invented. So we're looking
11 forward to that.

12 And essentially, that is what our
13 committee had to offer to you today. Are
14 there any questions regarding anything that
15 our Special Needs Committee has been working
16 on?

17 Again, thank you, Nancy, for
18 allowing me to preempt you in this session.

19 Thank you.

20 DR. BENNETT: Nancy?

21 MS. PRICE: There we go.

22 MS. DRAGANI: Thank you. I want to

1 remind people because I, quite frankly, had
2 forgotten that the full proposal that has all
3 the FEMA information was e-mailed to you from
4 Alyson last week. So it is easier to
5 understand, I think, some of the recommendations
6 if you have the source document. If you don't
7 have it with you, you can't pull it off your
8 e-mail, and you want a copy, I know Alyson can
9 get copies made for you, so just see her.

10 Okay. Moving on to Individual
11 Assistance Issue No. 3. This is a lessons
12 learned kind of area with multiple bullets.
13 The FEMA issue is the Individual Assistance
14 Program regulations contain ambiguous and
15 outdated provisions. This leads to
16 difficulties in administrating the Individual
17 Assistance Programs in a consistent, clear,
18 and understandable manner.

19 FEMA's solution: FEMA is drafting
20 regulatory language based on lessons learned
21 to address ambiguous and outdated provisions
22 so they are clear and consistent, and do not

1 impede effective delivery of disaster
2 assistance to applicants.

3 So again, I think an effort to
4 clean up some regulations to speed the
5 delivery of effective disaster assistance.

6 Subcommittee discussion. I'm going
7 to flip forward and make sure I've got
8 everything on one. Thank you.

9 Semi-permanent housing. There is a
10 recommendation that the NAC Post-Disaster
11 Housing Subcommittee take a look at the issue
12 of semi-permanent housing and what that looks
13 like as part of their recommendations on the
14 National Disaster Housing Strategy.

15 So to recap, there was a request as
16 part of this position paper from FEMA that we
17 identify what semi-permanent disaster housing
18 looks like. We thought that was a mission
19 more appropriately assigned to the Disaster
20 Housing Subcommittee. Thank you, Joe.

21 Caps. Right now, there is a cap in
22 place. So if you're a homeowner, your home

1 is significantly damaged or destroyed, you're
2 eligible for up to \$28,800. FEMA, based on
3 your need for rental assistance, can cap the
4 amount of money eligible for repair so that
5 you have money within that \$28,000 to rent
6 property while you're repairing your home.
7 So does everybody understand what I just
8 said? \$28,800 -- there's kind of an
9 artificial cap that's put into place to make
10 sure that you have rental money.

11 There is a recommendation that FEMA
12 identify an administrative way for homeowners
13 to waive the rental assistance cap, allow
14 homeowners to formally waive that because
15 they don't need rental assistance, and then
16 access their full Individual and Household
17 Program grant. So they could access the full
18 \$28,800, or whatever they're eligible for, to
19 begin repair of their home -- or of their
20 primary property.

21 Next bullet is security deposits.
22 Again, this was a bullet that drove a lot of

1 discussion. The subcommittee recommends that
2 FEMA extend utility eligibility to internet
3 and cable service providers.

4 This is in specific response to a
5 regulation and a change in this -- or a
6 proposed change in the Stafford Act
7 that -- is it proposed or actual? It's a
8 PKEMRA change in the Stafford Act that
9 specifically allows for utility deposits and
10 reimbursements, but specifically prohibits
11 phone. So utilities, with the exception of
12 phone service.

13 And a lot of discussion on that.
14 The subcommittee recommends that FEMA extend
15 utility eligibility to at least internet and
16 cable service providers, particularly based
17 on the 2009 rollover to digital television.
18 And in addition, FEMA, obviously, actively
19 encourages internet and online applications.
20 And that online ability helps the applicants
21 speed the recovery process by allowing them
22 to readily search for jobs, housing

1 opportunities, and social services.

2 We were somewhat silent on the
3 phone issue at this point, but certainly felt
4 that FEMA needed to include eligibility for
5 internet and cable.

6 And then finally, the bullet on
7 case management services. There is, again,
8 in the PKEMRA language that authorizes the
9 President to pay for or provide case
10 management services to victims of disaster.
11 The discussion there is that those services
12 should be provided under the disaster
13 programs that are appropriate for FEMA. At
14 the same time, supporting local surge
15 capacity. So limit the case management
16 services to those that are appropriate for
17 FEMA as a disaster recovery -- response and
18 recovery mission set, and at the same time,
19 use the opportunity to build local surge.

20 A reflection, then, in the latter
21 part of that bullet, that we believe strongly
22 that the provision of those services is

1 critical to successful recovery, and they
2 need to be provided and funded regardless of
3 who provides the service when there's a clear
4 disaster-related need. So what we didn't
5 really want to get into is it FEMA, is it
6 HUD, is it Social Services, is it Aging.
7 Just a reflection that the services are
8 critical, they should be provided, and they
9 should be funded appropriately when it's
10 disaster-related.

11 Questions, comments, concerns?

12 Yes, Bob.

13 MR. CONNORS: Nancy, I'm not really
14 following the security deposits discussion.

15 MS. DRAGANI: In our second meeting,
16 in the meeting that we had just a couple of
17 weeks ago in Columbus, we were provided -- we
18 asked for back-up documentation that helped us
19 understand what the issue was. And in that
20 back-up documentation was a two-pager that
21 discussed changes in the Stafford Act that came
22 out of PKEMRA. One of the changes was a

1 reflection that the Stafford Act would allow the
2 provision of utility security deposits and
3 payments, specifically excluding phones.

4 So the initial discussion was
5 driven by why are we excluding phones from
6 utility payments and deposits? And then we
7 kind of rolled into if we're excluding
8 phones, are we also excluding, by
9 implication, cable and internet providers.

10 Does that help?

11 MR. CONNORS: I think I missed -- I'm
12 sorry. I think I'm missing a piece. Internet
13 access to what? Internet and cable services and
14 phone services to where? And why are there two
15 security deposits? I think I missed a piece
16 here.

17 MS. DRAGANI: It may be there. And
18 actually, we probably focused on security
19 deposits overly much. The actual language is
20 security deposits and reimbursements for
21 utilities. So we focused too much on security
22 deposits. Because you're right, for internet

1 access and cable, that's not necessarily an
2 issue, but reimbursement for utilities. And we
3 wanted to extend the reimbursement to internet
4 and cable. Does that make sense now?

5 So we need to clean that up. And I
6 would recommend that we either we take
7 security deposits off or we talk utility
8 reimbursements, replace that with utility
9 reimbursements.

10 Kurt?

11 MR. KRUMPERMAN: Yes. My
12 understanding is you're saying that telephones
13 are excluded from this assistance? And my
14 concern there is that, particularly when people
15 are relocated or a different place, the
16 telephone is the primary access to 9-1-1.

17 I believe in most areas, you can
18 have access to 9-1-1. At least, you
19 can't -- it may be the only thing you can do.
20 But it would seem to me that's a fundamental
21 part of our public safety system.

22 MS. DRAGANI: There was a lot of

1 discussion about that issue. And certainly, I
2 think, as many areas are going to reverse 9-1-1
3 as a part of notification, that came up. But
4 it's my understanding that that -- this is
5 something that we don't -- FEMA doesn't have the
6 ability to change right now through regulation.
7 Is that correct?

8 MS. PRICE: Yes, a statute by
9 Congress.

10 MS. DRAGANI: It was put in statute by
11 Congress. So may be something that we look at
12 as part of statutory changes, but not as part of
13 the regulatory change.

14 MR. KRUMPERMAN: That's interesting.

15 MS. DRAGANI: Any other questions?
16 Comments? I see no red lights.

17 Dr. Bennett?

18 DR. BENNETT: Do we have a motion?

19 MR. CONNORS: Motion.

20 DR. BENNETT: Bob, motion to adopt
21 Individual Assistance No. 3.

22 Do I have a second?

1 MR. BRUNO: Second.

2 DR. BENNETT: Seconded by Joe Bruno.

3 All those in favor of the motion, signify by
4 saying aye. All those opposed, like sign.

5 Passes unanimously.

6 MS. DRAGANI: Now, I would hope this
7 is a short discussion, but may not be because it
8 was long in our committee.

9 The last issue is transportation
10 assistance provided to individuals and
11 households. And I will again read the FEMA
12 issue and the solution. The movement of
13 individuals and households displaced by a
14 disaster was a critical issue during
15 Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. Numerous
16 disaster victims were evacuated significant
17 distances from their homes, and FEMA did not
18 have an existing policy and procedure for
19 assisting in the return to their communities.

20 The solution: FEMA will draft the
21 regulations necessary to implement the
22 provision of transportation assistance. And

1 it's really relocation, if you will, back to
2 your pre-disaster residence.

3 Again, a lot of discussion on this
4 one. And at the end of the day, believe that
5 clear guidance was critical on three
6 particular areas.

7 One, we thought that it was
8 clearly, clearly the responsibility of FEMA,
9 and they needed to have the authority to
10 return disaster victims to their pre-disaster
11 location -- if FEMA initiated the
12 transportation. And that's kind of a
13 critical point in here. If FEMA loaded
14 people on aircraft like they did post-Katrina
15 and flew them to Grand Forks, then FEMA has a
16 responsibility to get those individuals, as
17 they choose or need to, back to their
18 pre-disaster home of residence.

19 The reason that's important is we
20 had a lot of discussion about where to draw
21 the line. Is it just those individuals
22 transported by FEMA? Or is it everybody who

1 relocates from their home to another
2 location, and does FEMA have the
3 responsibility to get them back home if they
4 voluntarily went from Louisiana to Ohio, for
5 instance.

6 So first bullet, I think, was -- it
7 was again a no-brainer. Obviously, if FEMA
8 moves them, FEMA has the obligation to get
9 them back. Second bullet --

10 MG LIBBY: Nancy?

11 MS. DRAGANI: Yes?

12 MG LIBBY: Nancy, Bill Libby. A
13 question and a comment. First of all, you're
14 right, that's a slippery slope. Because I'm a
15 responsible citizen and I get the hell out of
16 the way, and I don't get taken care of.

17 MS. DRAGANI: Yes.

18 MG LIBBY: But those who don't do.
19 Secondly, for those people -- and let's use
20 Katrina as the good example -- who were
21 relocated to Grand Forks and choose not to go
22 back to New Orleans because they live in the 8th

1 Ward, whatever ward it was, and they don't want
2 to rebuild there, but they do want to rebuild in
3 Bar Harbor, Maine, will FEMA get them there?
4 FEMA relocated them, they choose not to go home,
5 but they don't want to stay where FEMA relocated
6 them.

7 MS. DRAGANI: You know, we didn't
8 really talk about that. I mean, we didn't
9 talk -- you know, that's interesting. We had a
10 lot of discussion about this, but that
11 particular issue did not come up.

12 Let's -- Kem, if we can hold that
13 for just a minute. Let me get through the
14 next two, and then maybe that's something we
15 want to take a minute to explore.

16 You're right. Slippery slope, I
17 think, was what we ended up with at the end
18 of the day. And the next bullet addresses
19 that, by saying we want to make sure that
20 those citizens who do take responsibility for
21 their own safety by heeding the warning of
22 their local and state government officials

1 aren't discounted, because obviously, we want
2 people to get out of harm's way before FEMA
3 needs to load them on aircraft. So to that
4 end, we strongly encourage FEMA to consider
5 similar types of assistance to those who have
6 taken the appropriate action and have
7 self-located by complying with
8 recommendation.

9 And then the third bullet talks
10 about -- or fourth bullet, rather, talks
11 about a way they might do that. And that is,
12 consider adding relocation transportation as
13 an allowable IA expense, or built within the
14 IA cap and determined on a case-by-case
15 basis. So I voluntarily get myself and my
16 family out of harm's way, maybe that should
17 be part of my \$28,800 IA IHP eligibility.

18 We had a lot of discussion about
19 this because we didn't want to discourage
20 people from taking personal responsibility.
21 But the slippery slope is, again, where do
22 you stop, and where do you draw the line.

1 And what about people who choose, as a very
2 precautionary evacuation, to relocate? What
3 are the criteria to make sure that we're not
4 paying for people to move back and forth
5 unnecessarily?

6 Kurt? And then Robert and Bob.

7 MR. KRUMPERMAN: The question relates
8 to the definition of FEMA moving people. And
9 there are lots of other entities that move
10 people under these circumstances. NDMS moves
11 people. All sorts of EMAC resources move
12 patients and others. So is that -- is FEMA a
13 broad definition or is it a specific, the Agency
14 was directly involved?

15 MS. DRAGANI: I think under this
16 discussion, it was FEMA-specific. It could
17 probably be broadened to federal, which would
18 pick up NDMS. I think that the challenge with
19 EMAC -- again, if it's a sponsored mission,
20 perhaps that's something that we could include
21 as a discussion point. If it's another
22 federally or state-sponsored mission, take a

1 look at opportunities for reimbursement.

2 I'm sensing this might be another
3 one I have to work on tonight. Okay.

4 Robert and then Bobby.

5 MR. GOUGELET: Just a quick thing.

6 Actually, I was okay with things until the EMAC
7 discussion came up. So I think that we don't
8 want to supplant something that's already done.
9 And if it's a state or local responsibility, I
10 mean FEMA can't be the giant umbrella that comes
11 and takes care of everything.

12 But I was just going to add to it
13 that aren't there federal recommended
14 evacuation directives as well, or do they all
15 come locally --

16 MS. DRAGANI: In my state, it's all
17 local.

18 MR. GOUGELET: It's all state and
19 local?

20 MS. DRAGANI: Yes.

21 MR. SHEA: It's always
22 either -- primarily local, but sometimes states

1 have the authority to order evacuations. Never
2 federal.

3 MR. GOUGELET: But the directives are
4 all federal, but the -- I mean, the directives
5 are all local or state, but the recommendations
6 can be federal, right?

7 MR. SHEA: Right. They could be, and
8 we do, but the only authority to actually order
9 an evacuation rests with local government or
10 state government, not federal.

11 MS. DRAGANI: And that's why it
12 specifically doesn't say if FEMA initiated the
13 evacuation, but rather, if FEMA initiated the
14 transportation. So we're making a distinction
15 between those two.

16 MR. CONNORS: And that was going to be
17 my comment, too, Nancy, is since it does say if
18 FEMA put them there, FEMA should have the
19 responsibility to get them back. And I think
20 that's the essence of this, and your guidance is
21 specific to that. So I think this kind of hits
22 on it. I think the process -- I think we're

1 getting wrapped around the -- and the process
2 itself as far as how FEMA makes that decision to
3 get the person from A to B. And we've got to
4 make sure that they have a good decision process
5 in that, and they don't move people just because
6 they didn't follow evacuation orders or
7 whatever.

8 MS. DRAGANI: That also might, I
9 think, go back to Kurt's comment about NDMS,
10 because that would be under a mission
11 assignment, I would think, by FEMA. So again,
12 that would be a FEMA mission to move people.

13 MR. SHEA: I would expand that to
14 contracts. Mission assignments, contracts,
15 FEMA's taking an action through whatever
16 mechanism, that that's a FEMA responsibility, I
17 think is what the point is.

18 MS. DRAGANI: Robert, and then Joe,
19 and then Jim.

20 MR. GOUGELET: Yes, this is actually a
21 little bit interesting, because the NDMS is
22 under HHS. So does that mean HHS takes care of

1 those? Because NDMS would mostly evacuate
2 patients, and so --

3 MR. SHEA: In a declared disaster,
4 unless it was also a public health emergency,
5 FEMA would be paying, and so FEMA would issue a
6 mission assignment --

7 MR. GOUGELET: So could you just spend
8 a second telling -- so what happens during a
9 public health emergency?

10 MR. SHEA: That's done by the
11 Secretary of the Department of Health and Human
12 Services. It would be a separate set of issues.

13 MR. GOUGELET: But if we had to
14 evacuate under a public health emergency or
15 quarantine the whole city or something like
16 that, would FEMA still come in and help then or?

17 MR. SHEA: You're asking me to do
18 hypotheticals, Rob --

19 MR. GOUGELET: Oh, okay. Yes.

20 MR. SHEA: And let me just say this:
21 If we had a public health emergency that
22 affected a whole community, it's likely as not

1 FEMA would get involved in it as well, in my
2 opinion. Health and Human Services doesn't have
3 the deep pockets we do, so.

4 MS. DRAGANI: And I think, again, we
5 probably need to be careful that we don't get
6 too broad, because this is really focused on
7 extraordinary events like Katrina that required
8 putting people on aircraft and sending them
9 multiple states away from their home of record.

10 We had discussion about that again,
11 how -- what's the distance? And I think if
12 we focus in on this kind of event, it, again,
13 would be a very extraordinary event for any
14 of us to be involved in it.

15 Bob Shea -- so FEMA initiated, I
16 think covers all of the things you talked
17 about when we talk mission assignments. And
18 the second bullet, if FEMA, under the mission
19 assignment process initiates transportation,
20 whether it's NDMS or any other provision, it
21 would be FEMA initiated.

22 Bob, did you have your hand up?

1 Joe? Okay.

2 MR. BECKER: I'm still back on the
3 people who evacuate themselves, FEMA returning
4 them, and I know that was a slippery slope. And
5 the idea that there might be thousands or
6 hundreds of thousands that FEMA moves and FEMA
7 needs to bring back, but there might be a
8 million or several million that evacuate
9 themselves.

10 The idea that, oh, we'll take it
11 out of the IA and still have the cap of
12 \$28,000, that's too simple. It's going to
13 cost money, to the extent that vast numbers
14 of people don't max out the \$28,000. So this
15 would cost tremendous sums of money to pay
16 for the relocation of people back to where
17 they evacuated from. I don't want to gloss
18 over, well, we'll just take it out of the
19 \$28,000, and as long as they stay within the
20 \$28,000 cap, it doesn't cost money. This
21 would cost big money to do.

22 MS. DRAGANI: One of the things we can

1 certainly take a look at, because again, the
2 intent isn't the kind of floods I have generally
3 in Ohio, where people might evacuate 50 miles
4 for a limited period of time. The intent is
5 those extraordinary disasters that occur. So we
6 could certainly add something in here that talks
7 about encouraging -- because these are just
8 encouragements for FEMA to consider specific
9 criteria that would only activate this in -- I
10 hate catastrophic -- large-scale events.

11 I agree with you, Joe. We
12 didn't -- we were trying -- we were
13 struggling with how do you encourage
14 self-responsibility, and not create a
15 situation where people are going to wait
16 because, hey FEMA's going to be behind me
17 picking us up and getting us to where we need
18 to go. And guess what? We're going to get
19 plane tickets home when it's over.

20 We were really trying -- battling
21 with that duality, if you will.

22 John, did you have your hand up?

1 MR. STENSGAR: Not only that aspect of
2 it, but also the initial response to the
3 activities. And if you have folks sitting and
4 waiting for -- because they know the only way
5 they're going to get reimbursed is if FEMA moves
6 them, then we're putting more of our folks in
7 harm's way trying to protect them, rather than
8 if they moved on their own. You know, we give
9 them a Level 3, you need to evacuate -- evacuate
10 on their own accord, that's less
11 responsibilities those that are working on the
12 ground have to deal with because we know that
13 they are gone. And you know, just looking at it
14 from that aspect as well. Thank you.

15 MS. DRAGANI: Jim, did you have
16 something?

17 MR. PATURAS: Actually, it was the
18 same question Rob had, and Bob Shea did a great
19 job of answering it. That was regarding the
20 NDMS and back to Kurt's initial.

21 MS. DRAGANI: Lee, and then the
22 general.

1 MR. FELDMAN: Is there a need to
2 distinguish between pre-incident movement of
3 people and post-incident? It seems to me that
4 we're talking about when FEMA initiates or
5 assists in the transportation of individuals,
6 that's post-incident.

7 And we're sort of mixing in the
8 individuals that leave an area under a
9 pending threat as a pre-incident. I know we
10 didn't talk too much about that in the
11 subcommittee, but I think we need to make
12 that distinction somewhere in this policy.

13 MS. DRAGANI: Let me push back just a
14 little bit, Lee. As it relates to this policy,
15 and FEMA's obligation and responsibility to
16 return people to their pre-disaster home of
17 record if they transport them away from it, does
18 it matter whether it's pre or post?

19 MR. FELDMAN: I don't think,
20 philosophically, it matters whether it's pre or
21 post, but doesn't FEMA only get involved after
22 the declaration, which means you have to have an

1 incident to have occurred?

2 MS. DRAGANI: FEMA has pre-declaration
3 authority now, do they not, for emergency
4 measures?

5 MR. SHEA: Yes --

6 MR. FELDMAN: But does that include
7 evacuation or just pre-positioning --

8 MR. SHEA: Yes. Actually, we have a
9 hurricane pre-landfall declaration policy, part
10 of which is that the responsible government
11 official has ordered evacuations in the areas
12 likely to be impacted. So we have an existing
13 policy on that right now.

14 MR. FELDMAN: Right. But Bob, does
15 that policy also -- under the pre-declaration,
16 include assisting in moving people, or is that
17 just in preparation?

18 MR. SHEA: No, I think it will and has
19 in the past included moving people if necessary.
20 You know, a good example was recently, we
21 pre-positioned assets to move people out of the
22 areas that Hurricane Dolly was likely to impact

1 in Southern Texas, both buses and also airlift
2 capability to get people out of those areas if
3 necessary. As it turned out, we didn't have to
4 use it, but we had stationed them and we were
5 prepared to use it if necessary.

6 MR. FELDMAN: But I guess my point is
7 at some point, FEMA will only get involved when
8 it's a declaration, whether it's post-incident
9 or pre-incident. Coming from Florida, some
10 local officials tend to encourage or order
11 evacuations prematurely, which may not trigger
12 the evacuation, and create an expectation among
13 the public that it's good to leave whenever your
14 local officials do because you're going to get
15 reimbursed for that. And I'm not sure that's
16 what we want to create.

17 MR. SHEA: I kind of agree. And I
18 don't want to preempt what the Council is trying
19 to do here. One of the -- these discussions are
20 important, but I think all of us need to bear in
21 mind it's the health and safety of the
22 individual that we're trying to protect here.

1 Whatever would be set up has to deal with that
2 issue of how to encourage, appropriately, them
3 to evacuate under the right circumstances and
4 not stay in place for some fictitious reason,
5 so.

6 I agree this is a difficult issue,
7 but what we're trying to do is get a sense of
8 what the Council would want us to do. But
9 then a lot of the details, we're going to
10 have to work through in the regulatory
11 process, to be honest with you.

12 MR. FELDMAN: My only thought is that
13 if we're moving people a great distance, then it
14 should be the government's responsibility to
15 bring them back. If they're evacuating to other
16 areas that are locally, that's just a cost of
17 being a citizen, at some point. So in my case,
18 if they're deciding to go 70 miles away to
19 Orlando and stay at Disney, that's fine. But
20 that shouldn't be on the government's nickel.

21 MS. DRAGANI: I think, Lee, I agree.
22 That's that slippery slope we started to talk

1 about, actually. I think that that was why we
2 added that fourth bullet and added the
3 case-by-case basis; that it wouldn't be an
4 auto-determination. If you evacuated 75 miles
5 away and stayed in the Hyatt, FEMA will pay the
6 gas to get you home, but rather on a
7 case-by-case basis. If it was extraordinary and
8 you moved your family to Columbus because you
9 went to Ohio State, and now you don't have the
10 resources to move your family back to Louisiana,
11 is there an opportunity for FEMA to explore
12 that.

13 MR. FELDMAN: I know, but once you do
14 it once, it's like the record snowfall paradigm.
15 Once you do it once, you're never going to be
16 able to reverse it. So if you get into a
17 position because of a disaster, that you create
18 this reimbursement on a case-by-case basis,
19 that's going to become the new precedent for the
20 next disaster. And it just -- it is a slippery
21 slope, and you will end up, eventually, I think,
22 doing reimbursements for a vast majority of the

1 population that wants to leave -- that doesn't
2 necessarily have to leave, either.

3 MS. DRAGANI: Gen. Libby?

4 MG LIBBY: I don't think anybody
5 disagrees that anyone from Katrina who was
6 evacuated to Grand Forks probably ought to be
7 returned at government expense. But I don't
8 think we need to endorse -- or we need to be
9 careful not to endorse a policy that encourages
10 poor public and local policy.

11 I don't want to get into a long
12 discussion; I'd love to do it over a beer
13 with somebody in the sports bar tonight. But
14 the fact of the matter is I have a hard time
15 when you've got 72-hours notice that
16 something catastrophic is going to happen
17 that public officials don't mandatorially
18 evacuate people, and the federal government
19 ends up -- the federal taxpayer, that's all
20 of us, end up picking up the tab.

21 That I think might be the
22 unintended consequence of some of the

1 language that's up there. And that's my only
2 concern. I don't mind looking back at what
3 we weren't planning for, but I think we need
4 to be developing policy that's a little more
5 forward-looking. And the government, at all
6 levels, has a way of rewarding poor behavior
7 and ignoring good behavior. And this is
8 another example of that, in my opinion.

9 MS. DRAGANI: So let me then suggest
10 that maybe over a beer at the sports bar -- no,
11 before that, that we take a look at
12 strengthening the language, particularly in
13 bullets three and four, and specifically say,
14 unless anybody objects, the subcommittee has
15 concerns about rewarding poor public policy as
16 it relates to this initiative, or something like
17 that.

18 And be clear that we are concerned
19 that this is a slippery slope, and that it is
20 rewarding not only poor public policy, but
21 poor personal behavior. And I think we can
22 go on record as saying that.

1 MR. GOUGELET: Just add a bullet --

2 MS. DRAGANI: Yes. My sense is -- I
3 could be wrong; Bob can certainly chime in -- I
4 don't think FEMA really wants to transport
5 people, and I think it will be a pretty
6 extraordinary event if they ever have to do it
7 again. But I think that they do need the
8 ability to return people to their home if they
9 in fact are in that role. So. I think we can
10 go on record as saying, though, we don't want to
11 endorse.

12 MR. BECKER: But it's -- I'm sorry,
13 Joe Becker. It's not going to be an
14 extraordinary event when FEMA transports people.
15 It's going to be an extraordinary event when
16 FEMA transports people long distances.

17 MS. DRAGANI: Right.

18 MR. BECKER: And I think that nuance
19 is what's missing from here. We're going to
20 send buses to Hidalgo County next time a storm's
21 coming in.

22 MS. DRAGANI: FEMA doesn't do that,

1 though. The local and state governments do
2 that.

3 MR. BECKER: But you write the check.

4 MS. DRAGANI: That's different,
5 though. We need to be clear; I think we need to
6 be careful.

7 State and local government have a
8 responsibility to support their citizens and
9 protect them. Under the Emergency Public
10 Assistance, we may -- I can guarantee you if
11 there's a hurricane in Houston, Texas is
12 going to order up a boatload of buses. But
13 Texas orders them up, and Texas is on the
14 hook for 25 percent of the cost of those
15 buses. Is it eligible under PA? Sure, but
16 Texas is paying a boatload just for the
17 privilege of having those buses on the hook.

18 That's not a FEMA transportation
19 issue -- mission. It's FEMA transportation
20 when I get a phone call at 2:00 in the
21 morning that says is Ohio willing to accept a
22 planeload of people that we're shipping over

1 from New Orleans? And it was FEMA calling me
2 to say is Ohio willing to do that? That's a
3 federal mission. And that's what they I
4 think need to respond to.

5 So I think you have to make a
6 distinction. I have great authority and
7 ability to do things at the state level that
8 I'm going to go in and ask for FEMA
9 reimbursement for under PA, but that's my
10 decision, not FEMA missions.

11 You look like you're still
12 struggling.

13 MR. BECKER: I'm just not sure a
14 casual reader not in the room would read that
15 into what we have here.

16 MS. DRAGANI: Okay.

17 MR. BECKER: Because whoever writes
18 the check is who I think people would think is
19 moving -- are moving the people.

20 MS. DRAGANI: So we need to clean up
21 that second bullet and make it clearer, more
22 clear, federal -- boy, this is where I'm too

1 deep into this. Because to me, it's very clear,
2 but you're right, a casual -- of course, FEMA
3 would know what we mean, because this is going
4 to Dave Paulison. So he would know that what
5 we're talking about -- we can even say, if you
6 think it would help, FEMA initiated the
7 transportation as occurred post-Katrina in the
8 airlifts from New Orleans. Something like that,
9 that actually says this is what we're talking
10 about. You've taken over an airport, you're
11 loading people onto airplanes, and you're
12 sending them to Minnesota right before the snow
13 flies.

14 MR. CONNORS: Why wouldn't you say
15 under a specific FEMA mission order?

16 MS. DRAGANI: I'm sorry?

17 MR. CONNORS: Rather than all that,
18 just say if FEMA initiated the transportation
19 under a specific mission order, or something
20 like that.

21 MR. GOUGELET: Just to use that as an
22 example.

1 MS. DRAGANI: I guess -- I think the
2 recommendation was if we're that clear about the
3 example, then people will know what we're
4 talking about is that air transport. Or we can
5 add, or for a specific FEMA mission order, which
6 would cover NDMS. I'm okay with that.

7 Let me recap because this is not
8 going to be voted on right now. What I think
9 I'm going to do is I'm going to clear up
10 bullet two to include a specific example of
11 post-Katrina transportation by aircraft; to
12 add, or under a specific mission assignment
13 by FEMA, which would pick up NDMS and some
14 other types of transports.

15 I'm going to ask the will of the
16 group. Bullet four, in or out? One, two,
17 three, four. Bullet four is the IHP cap. We
18 were just looking at potential solutions.

19 MG LIBBY: I don't have a problem with
20 bullet four. I don't have a problem with a lot
21 of the stuff that's up there. As long as we add
22 those caveats at the end about slippery slope --

1 MS. DRAGANI: Right. We're concerned.

2 MG LIBBY: Poor public policy, poor
3 personal behavior. Those are my concerns. And
4 the fact of the matter is this is not my
5 decision, but I'd like to go on the record as
6 having said that these are concerns.

7 MS. DRAGANI: Very good. Any other
8 comments or things that I need to do to shore
9 this up? Before I sit down, I need to, for my
10 own knowledge base and benefit, recap what I'm
11 doing this afternoon.

12 We have held -- not held, because
13 it was never put on the table -- I will work
14 on the bullet points for IA Issue 1 and clean
15 those up. I will work on additions for IA
16 Issue 2, slide 2, second half of Issue 2.
17 And I will work on cleaning up the
18 recommendation, as we just discussed, for IA
19 Issue 4. Okay.

20 And with that, I think I'm done.

21 And Alyson, I hope you took good notes.

22 Thank you.

1 DR. BENNETT: Nancy, great job. We
2 really appreciate it.

3 I would like to add in the -- this
4 is -- this came before us -- is we know we
5 had the Stafford Act Subcommittee established
6 and these -- an opportunity came forward to
7 look at what some of the areas in the policy
8 that might have great impact on some of the
9 issues dealing with it.

10 And this subcommittee has worked
11 hard and fast, and I really appreciate the
12 fact that Nancy took on that challenge. And
13 I think we had a good discussion today, and
14 we'll look forward to the changes tomorrow.

15 Chuck, did you have a comment?

16 MR. KMET: Yes, sir. Since it wasn't
17 part of a motion and I don't think it really
18 necessarily needs to be, but I would ask that
19 the first part that Nancy brought up on the
20 tribal piece before we got into all the
21 different regulations, I would ask that when you
22 do the report out to the administrator, that you

1 keep that --

2 DR. BENNETT: Yes, that preamble is
3 right up front and it will remain there so that
4 if the word states and so forth used that they'd
5 understand -- is we're also talking about the
6 tribes. Let's be very clear, right up front.

7 Okay. I believe, Ann, are you up
8 today?

9 You're up, I think, because we
10 moved Irene. We changed -- Russ swapped off
11 with Irene because Irene had to leave.

12 You thought you could get prepared
13 in the next report, huh? Okay. Yes.

14 SPEAKER: No, just show me what to do.

15 SPEAKER: Got it. All right. Forget
16 it. This one here.

17 MS. BEAUCHESNE: Okay. Thank you.

18 Hello. I promise I will not be nearly as
19 lengthy as the last group because we don't have
20 things for you to vote on today. What we're
21 going to do is just give you a quick overview of
22 where we are on a couple of things, and the

1 conversation that we had yesterday with two
2 different parts of the Department.

3 So again, here's the charge for our
4 public/private partnership: to define a plan
5 that will enable FEMA to effectively
6 facilitate public/private partnerships.
7 Pretty basic. How are we going to do that?
8 How are we defining our plan?

9 We are crafting a survey right now
10 that's going to go out to the state emergency
11 management directors from NEMA. Trina
12 Sheetz (?) has agreed to send that out on our
13 behalf. Her counsel was that it go only to
14 the state emergency managers, not down to the
15 locals -- that we not send it to the locals
16 ourselves, that they have the state emergency
17 managers do that as well.

18 And the questions will be along the
19 lines of how are you incorporating the
20 private sector -- you, state emergency
21 manager, in your planning training
22 exercising? How are you partnering with the

1 private sector? Are they on committees? Are
2 they in the EOC? Do you have a private
3 sector liaison like Utah does in their
4 Homeland Security Department?

5 So that we will have actual data to
6 share with the next administration and FEMA,
7 and the transition team. Like, look, these
8 are good public/private partnerships that are
9 working. You know, don't throw them away.
10 We don't need to reinvent the wheel or
11 whatever. So that's one of the reasons.

12 Then we're going to also ask the
13 private sector same question: how are you
14 working with your state emergency management
15 and local emergency management department?
16 Do you share your plans? Do you reach out to
17 them as well? And you know, ask the same
18 questions back. And see what some of the
19 barriers might be, if there are barriers.

20 Who are we going to ask in the
21 private sector? We are going to use the U.S.
22 Chamber of Commerce, since that's where I'm

1 from. We are also going to reach out to the
2 PCIS, the Protecting Critical Infrastructure
3 Sector Coordinating Council.

4 For those of you not in that world,
5 that's -- there's 18 critical infrastructure
6 sectors, and this is the overarching body
7 that coordinates all of them. And we're also
8 going to talk to BENS. So more to come on
9 that.

10 We will definitely have this by our
11 next meeting, so that's months away. We're
12 going to try to make quick work of this. And
13 NEMA is actually going to collect the surveys
14 back and they have a survey tool, so it
15 shouldn't be that onerous. Bob, my co-chair,
16 and I just need to get the survey finalized.

17 So okay. What did we do yesterday?
18 We are really sort of -- we discovered that
19 FEMA and the Department has really discovered
20 our group now.

21 It was sort of like a light went
22 off. We had the -- we had Col. Eric Smith

1 come over and talk about logistics
2 transformation yesterday. And you know, he's
3 now like, oh, I can use this group. Oh, I'm
4 going to talk to you more. So we're
5 really -- we're happy about that.

6 Basically, what did he talk about?
7 He discussed the -- FEMA's logistics
8 transformation since Katrina. He explained
9 that his division's there to serve as the
10 national logistics coordinator. He spent a
11 lot of time discussing their challenges,
12 their focus on planning rather than response,
13 who their partners are -- a plethora of
14 federal folks: state, local. And then the
15 interesting part for our group was that where
16 he had a private sector box and it said,
17 "under construction." And he fully admits
18 that while they have had conversations with
19 the American Trucking Association and the
20 U.S. Chamber, there is a lot more work to be
21 done there. And they're going to use our
22 group. So that was the good news.

1 Let's see. We also had a briefing
2 after that from someone from his team on the
3 division's Total Asset Visibility Program.
4 That's the tracking capability, if you will,
5 for -- in the logistics. I'm not going to
6 get into that. I'm sure a lot of you know
7 all about that. But if you're interested in
8 their PowerPoints, we have all of that and
9 we're happy to send that out to you.

10 This next one, this is the more
11 intriguing one to us in the private sector.
12 As you probably know, we had Jan Mares from
13 the Private Sector Office at DHS, and we had
14 Brian Scott (?), who's from the
15 Infrastructure Protection Directorate at DHS,
16 come talk about the status of the Voluntary
17 Private Sector Preparedness Certification
18 Program, which FEMA actually has the lead on
19 for implementation. This program came about
20 because of the 9/11 Act of 2007, and it
21 requires DHS to establish a common set of
22 criteria for private sector preparedness and

1 disaster management, emergency management,
2 and business continuity.

3 DHS also has to -- or FEMA
4 designate an accrediting body, and must
5 designate one or more standards for assessing
6 private sector preparedness.

7 So what might those standards be?

8 Well, we've got NFPA-1600. In the supply
9 chain world, we've got CTPAT. In the
10 different sectors, there's a plethora of
11 standards already out there. DHS recognizes
12 that, so what they're doing is just -- this
13 isn't going to be one new standard. It may
14 be a menu of standards. It may be a
15 compilation. It may be checking the box
16 saying, you, in the transportation sector, if
17 you're already doing this, then you're
18 certified.

19 So again, there's lots of work to
20 do on this. They haven't even put the
21 Federal Register notice out yet. It was
22 supposed to be out in the spring, and then

1 July, and so now we're told any minute,
2 probably next week. So once that Federal
3 Register Notice goes out, that is when FEMA
4 will -- parts of DHS will make the hard
5 press. You're going to see a lot more about
6 this in the fall. There'll be a full
7 outreach campaign to all the different parts
8 of the private sector.

9 And as you might suspect, this is
10 not -- it sounds like mom and apple pie. Of
11 course we want the private sector to be
12 prepared. Of course they should have
13 business continuity plans. Well, if you're
14 in the private sector, when you hear
15 standards and then you hear voluntary, you're
16 like, yes, that's a joke.

17 I mean, that to the private sector
18 sounds like slippery slope to regulation.
19 And that -- and there was a lot of heartburn
20 about this when it first was introduced, to
21 tell you the truth.

22 I think most folks -- including

1 Raytheon, who is a big proponent of
2 this -- have come around and understand that
3 this is in the law. We are -- it is going to
4 be implemented. It is not a regulation, and
5 DHS can't make it a regulation, because they
6 don't have the authority to do that.

7 Once we kind of get everybody off
8 their off the cliff on that one, I think we
9 can -- we're having more concrete discussions
10 now about this. You know, and figuring out,
11 okay, how do we do this. And the bigger part
12 there, too, is think about the small and
13 medium-sized businesses. So there, we might
14 use something like the Ready Campaign, which
15 you heard about at lunch.

16 If you're a mom-and-pop shop and
17 you can demonstrate, like, look, I've got my
18 kit, I've got this, I've got that, then fine;
19 you're going to be certified. There's
20 definitely -- and it was in the law that
21 there's a definite, separate tier for small
22 and medium-sized businesses. So more to come

1 on that.

2 I would like to mention,
3 October 2nd, ANSI is having a meeting at the
4 U.S. Chamber of Commerce, an all-day event on
5 this topic. You'll hear a variety of
6 opinions about this. It is a little
7 controversial. And I will send out that
8 notice to my subcommittee members. And if
9 anyone else is interested in it as well, let
10 me know.

11 If you want to see what this is all
12 about, there's a site called Intercept that's
13 done a summary, that's done lots of work on
14 this. It's Bill Raiche (?) at New York
15 University. And I can get you that
16 information as well.

17 And again, if you'd like to see
18 what the logistics team presented to us
19 yesterday, the PowerPoint, feel free, we'll
20 get those out to you, too.

21 So that's all I have, unless anyone
22 has any questions. Yes.

1 MS. STENSGAR: I had a -- make a
2 recommendation at you: Include at state level
3 as well with the tribal communities. I mean,
4 when you're talking about where I'm from in
5 North Central Washington, I mean, the majority
6 of the resources that are going to respond to an
7 incident will come from the tribes. And we also
8 have emergency response plans in place in
9 collaborations with the counties in the five
10 municipalities, and it's a working document.
11 And so there's regional tribal organizations
12 that can help facilitate getting that
13 information out and are providing input into
14 your process.

15 I apologize for missing your
16 meeting. I did ask Alyson if FEMA had monies
17 to clone me because there were two meetings
18 going on at the same time, and I wanted to be
19 at both and had to make a choice.

20 MS. BEAUCHESNE: No problem.

21 MR. STENSGAR: So apologize for not
22 being at yours, but I was at the NRF. Thank

1 you.

2 MS. BEAUCHESNE: Thank you. You know,
3 I'd like to actually talk to you a little bit
4 more about that after, figure out if -- is there
5 a list? Are there organizations we can talk to
6 about getting a survey out to the tribes as
7 well? I think that's something that we should
8 definitely make a part of our work.

9 MR. STENSGAR: There is one main one
10 that probably over 500 tribes participate in,
11 and it's called NCAI. It's the National
12 Congress of American Indians, and they do
13 have -- their main office headquarters is here
14 in D.C.

15 MS. BEAUCHESNE: Great. Thank you.

16 MR. PATURAS: And just a point of
17 clarification so we're all on the same page. My
18 understanding of the accreditation process
19 that's going on with ANSI is it's more
20 organizational right now. It's not individual,
21 correct? So in other words, it's -- if there's
22 going to be an accreditation process, or a

1 certification process, if you will, for private
2 sector companies, industry, it will be
3 organizational, not individual. Is that
4 correct?

5 MS. BEAUCHESNE: No.

6 MR. PATURAS: No. So it could be
7 individual, too, insomuch as an organization is
8 required to have individuals who are also
9 certified?

10 MS. BEAUCHESNE: If you're selling
11 something or if you're in a -- yes, isn't it you
12 the company. It's not by sector.

13 MR. CONNORS: People versus company,
14 right?

15 MR. PATURAS: Correct.

16 MS. BEAUCHESNE: Oh, oh, no. I'm
17 sorry.

18 SPEAKER: That's what I thought --

19 MS. BEAUCHESNE: I was talking company
20 versus sector.

21 SPEAKER: It's company not people.

22 MS. BEAUCHESNE: Exactly.

1 MR. PATURAS: Because I know there's a
2 lot of controversy out there with other
3 organizations who are certifying individuals to
4 make sure that there's not another set of --

5 MS. BEAUCHESNE: Yes.

6 MR. PATURAS: Criteria.

7 MS. BEAUCHESNE: As you can imagine,
8 this -- a small cottage industry is going to
9 crop up around this. And who's going to be the
10 accreditors, and it's -- more to come.

11 DR. BENNETT: Russ, Cathey, and then,
12 Bob, do you have yours on? Okay. In that
13 order.

14 MR. DECKER: Ann, we were just talking
15 sort of offline. But as you do the survey, and
16 I understand you want to use NEMA, but we would
17 strongly encourage you also to send that survey
18 out through IAEM. Because I think what you're
19 going to find is that most of those private
20 partnerships are going to be ascertained at the
21 local level, and the state directors don't
22 necessarily work with all the local directors,

1 municipalities, and things like that. So you
2 know --

3 MS. BEAUCHESNE: That's a good point.
4 We have thought of IAEM --

5 MR. DECKER: You may want to use both
6 organizations --

7 MS. BEAUCHESNE: Yes.

8 MR. DECKER: Because we're going to
9 hit 4,300 local people, and which is
10 probably -- you might want to go both
11 organizations, so. All right.

12 MS. BEAUCHESNE: Okay. Is Beth
13 Armstrong still the head of -- the executive
14 director?

15 MR. DECKER: Yes, she's our --

16 MS. BEAUCHESNE: She is? Okay.

17 MR. DECKER: Yes.

18 MS. BEAUCHESNE: We'll get in touch
19 with her.

20 MS. EIDE: My question has to do with
21 the accreditation and certification also. Is it
22 pertaining to an emergency response? Or is it

1 just an overall accreditation of a --

2 MS. BEAUCHESNE: It's demonstrating
3 that you're prepared as a business.

4 MS. EIDE: So preparedness
5 accreditation and certification? Okay.

6 MS. BEAUCHESNE: It's like a Good
7 Housekeeping Seal of Approval, to show that you
8 have a business continuity plan, that you have
9 plans in place, you know? So think about if
10 you're Wal-Mart, you want your suppliers to be
11 prepared.

12 MS. EIDE: My other question is in
13 regards to the survey. The subcommittee is
14 coming up with the survey?

15 MS. BEAUCHESNE: Yes.

16 MS. EIDE: And you're going to send it
17 out to everybody in the United States?

18 MS. BEAUCHESNE: No. We're sending it
19 to the state emergency management directors --

20 MS. EIDE: They're going to send it
21 to?

22 MS. BEAUCHESNE: Now, we just had a

1 suggestion, and send it to IAEM, the local
2 emergency management directors as well. And
3 then on the private sector side, we're going to
4 use the U.S. Chamber's National Security Task
5 Force, and we're going to talk to the PCIS.
6 That's the council I mentioned for the 18
7 sectors.

8 MS. EIDE: And who's going to do the
9 data collection and reporting out?

10 MS. BEAUCHESNE: NEMA is going to do
11 the data collection for the states. They've
12 already said that they would.

13 MS. EIDE: Wow. Okay, great.

14 MS. BEAUCHESNE: Yes. And the Chamber
15 will probably do it for the private sector.

16 MS. EIDE: They'll do the reporting
17 out, too?

18 MS. BEAUCHESNE: The reporting out of
19 the --

20 MS. EIDE: As they collect the data,
21 then consolidate the data and come up with a
22 report.

1 MS. BEAUCHESNE: Yes, I think -- yes,
2 they have the Survey Monkey tool.

3 MS. EIDE: Yes. Okay, cool. Wow.

4 MR. CONNORS: Just to elaborate on the
5 accreditation certification, there was actually
6 a standard endorsed in the 9/11 Commission. It
7 was NFPA-1600, as a matter of fact. And it was
8 put into the Intelligence Reform Terrorism
9 Prevention Act as a voluntary standard. This
10 was just the next -- sensible next step.
11 Because if you're going to have a voluntary
12 standard, you should have some accreditation
13 certification process to show that people are
14 complying with the standard, especially those
15 that want to.

16 And it levels the playing field,
17 because there are so many people that say
18 that they do this stuff. And you as
19 emergency managers, you have no clue when
20 you're meeting with a company and they say
21 that they have all these plans in place,
22 whether or not they really do. This will

1 give everybody some sense that they know that
2 when somebody comes to them and tells them,
3 they show that Good Housekeeping Seal of
4 Approval, you have at least some indication
5 that they really have done some work.

6 MS. EIDE: Great. So we won't have to
7 go back and ask -- can I see your plan.

8 SPEAKER: We don't show.

9 MS. BEAUCHESNE: And we won't show
10 them to you anyway. Proprietary. Yes, General?

11 MG LIBBY: Ann, Bill Libby. Just a
12 brief comment on the logistical briefing that
13 Eric Smith gave us. First of all, I think he's
14 done a magnificent job in pulling that whole
15 area together in FEMA. Secondly, he's got a
16 vision with a lot of goodness in it to put a
17 logistician from FEMA at each of the JFOs.

18 And in our discussions, we
19 acknowledge that a significant part of
20 recovery in the states is recovery
21 financially, also. And that led us to a
22 point where we thought a FEMA logistician in

1 the state EOCs; whereas we talked about
2 buying ice, buying meals, buying water, and
3 being able to buy that locally as opposed to
4 getting it shipped in from some FEMA
5 warehouse, would make great sense. That
6 process would be facilitated in the state
7 EOC.

8 I cautioned Eric -- Murph (?) and I
9 talked about it today -- the states are
10 sovereign beasts. The federal government has
11 great ideas, but when they push the great
12 ideas down directly at us, we tend to reject
13 them. I encouraged him to approach Trina on
14 this idea of a logistician, which I think has
15 real goodness in it, being in a state EOC as
16 a bridge to getting the state emergency
17 management's officials, rather than FEMA
18 simply publishing policy that says we're
19 going to do this in the future.

20 But I think he's done a magnificent
21 job in pulling it together.

22 DR. BENNETT: Joe, did you have a

1 comment?

2 MR. BRUNO: Yes, I do. The mission of
3 the subcommittee is to define a plan that will
4 enable FEMA to effectively facilitate
5 public/private partnerships. So I would ask
6 that as the committee goes forward -- or maybe I
7 wouldn't ask -- just say, is the committee, as
8 it goes forward, going to look at FEMA's role in
9 leading the development of public/private
10 partnerships? What I mean by that is FEMA
11 becoming the honest broker to bring the private
12 sector to the table, and then get the private
13 sector together with state and local
14 governments, and tribal governments. So that in
15 fact there will be visibility right by -- and
16 communication by the locals to the private
17 sector that's brought to the table.

18 The reason I think that's important
19 is that FEMA, as a federal entity, should
20 have the capacity to bring to the table the
21 biggest and most important elements of the
22 private sector that we may need.

1 So I don't know if that's
2 envisioned as one of the things you're
3 thinking of.

4 MS. BEAUCHESNE: And that's, actually,
5 if you're -- you probably don't remember, but
6 that -- the one-pager or two-pager that Cindy
7 Taylor (?), the head of the Private Sector
8 Office, put together. When we first started,
9 they were asking for our help in doing just
10 that: helping craft a plan, helping make them
11 the person -- the entity that brings people
12 together. So after we do the survey, look,
13 these are some of the excellent things that are
14 working. Then we'll get the results, then we'll
15 put a plan together for them: here's what you
16 need to do, FEMA.

17 Make some recommendations.

18 MR. BRUNO: Assume a leadership role.

19 MS. BEAUCHESNE: Yes.

20 MR. BRUNO: And the only other thing
21 I'd mention on the certification issue, we've
22 talked quite a bit about this, New York and

1 other places, of some carrot for people becoming
2 certified. And of course, that's the insurance
3 industry rebates. They're very hard to get.
4 And we are doing some of that with the insurance
5 industry generally. I have New York trying to
6 get them to give some rebates. That's something
7 you might want to just consider.

8 MS. BEAUCHESNE: Again, Bill Raiche's
9 group, Intercept --

10 MR. BRUNO: Yes.

11 MS. BEAUCHESNE: There's about five
12 work groups, and one of those is on incentives.

13 MR. BRUNO: Yes. Bill Raiche's group
14 is -- someone we know quite well. And he's very
15 good. And you can get a lot of information
16 already done. A lot of the surveys have been
17 done by him. And he's talked to all the
18 sectors; he brings them in regularly. So you
19 might be able to find lots of material right
20 there, but -- thank you.

21 DR. BENNETT: Any final comments?

22 Ann, appreciate it. Thank you very

1 much.

2 I'd like to now recap sort of
3 what's going to happen tomorrow very, very
4 briefly. And then I'll ask Alyson to -- I
5 keep hitting this.

6 Tomorrow, we will -- of course,
7 Nancy will be back with us with the -- she's
8 still got work to do.

9 We will receive final subcommittee
10 report outs tomorrow from the Post-Disaster
11 Housing and from the NIMS subcommittees.
12 We'll also be briefed on the Regional
13 Advisory Council by Jonathan Sarubbi from
14 Region 3. He'll be with us. He's the
15 regional administrator.

16 Pauline Campbell, director of
17 FEMA's Office of Equal Rights, will provide
18 us with a quick brief on minority hiring at
19 FEMA, to follow-up on some questions we had
20 at our May meeting. And we will also hear a
21 presentation regarding FEMA's Urban Search
22 and Rescue Program. So that's pretty much a

1 recap of what we'll be doing tomorrow.

2 Yes, Jim?

3 MR. PATURAS: Kem, based on the need
4 for Nancy to come back -- she did a great job; I
5 feel bad for her -- do we want to reconvene a
6 little earlier because we've got a pretty busy
7 agenda? The way today went, I'm just fearful
8 that we won't get to everything. And I don't
9 really want people to have to get up any
10 earlier, but -- if we weren't going to do one of
11 those other reports, I'd say we could slip this
12 in.

13 But if not, would it be wise to
14 convene at 8:15 or something?

15 DR. BENNETT: It's wise to do that,
16 but we'll try to shorten some things that we
17 have scheduled, some of the reports, but we're
18 obligated because of the Federal Register
19 publications, so forth, to start at that time.
20 But we'll try to compress other ways.

21 MS. PRICE: We'll use the so-called
22 agenda wedge. We can generally leave a little

1 earlier, but starting earlier is tough because
2 of the public access issues. So again, we're
3 going to -- we'll work on that for you.

4 I have one thing -- I'm sorry, Bob.

5 MR. CONNORS: I have a logistic
6 question.

7 MS. PRICE: Yes.

8 MR. CONNORS: Given the days now where
9 we have limited room to -- we have to pack
10 everything into a small bag to get it on the
11 plane, I don't really have much room to put
12 anything in it. Are we going to start working
13 it so we can get some DHL packages to ship our
14 stuff back, because I'm not gonna.

15 MS. PRICE: You know, if you need
16 that, we can work through Izola and Laila to
17 return things to you. And so --

18 MR. CONNORS: Maybe we should get a
19 show of hands to see how many people want to
20 start shipping things home because --

21 MS. PRICE: Yes.

22 MR. CONNORS: This is -- I have no

1 room. I mean, this is getting thick.

2 MS. PRICE: Bob, if you need to put
3 that in the recycling bin and we can e-mail you
4 the documents, we can always do that. We always
5 provide documents to those members who can't
6 make it -- after these meetings. So you know,
7 we'll work with you on that.

8 And by that token, could I have a
9 volunteer of those who are going to dinner at
10 Clyde's tonight, to kind of serve as the
11 chief dinner wrangler for the lobby?

12 MR. BECKER: Joe Bruno just
13 volunteered.

14 MS. PRICE: These are my terms, mind
15 you. I just would like someone -- to ask
16 someone to kind of wait around in the lobby.
17 The dinner reservation is actually at 6:45.
18 It's about four blocks away.

19 Thank you very much.

20 MR. BRUNO: I accept the assignment.

21 MS. PRICE: That's lovely. Thank you.

22 Additionally, for those of you who

1 wanted pictures with -- to be signed -- sworn
2 in -- and we need to swear in Mr. Stensgar
3 tomorrow.

4 If you could show up about 8:30, I
5 think the administrator will be here at 8:30
6 tomorrow, along with our photographer, we'll
7 get photos of you.

8 We'll start at 8:30 sharp -- I'm
9 sorry, 8:45 sharp and we will move swiftly.

10 And the meeting is recessed until
11 tomorrow morning. Thank you.

12 (Whereupon, at approximately 5:13
13 p.m., the MEETING was continued.)

14 * * * * *

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22