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PROCEEDINGS

Time: 10:07 a.m.

MS. PRICE: All right. I would like to open the National Advisory Council’s sixth quarterly meeting. Thank you.

MR. SHEA: Well, good morning. Welcome to Washington. Here we are in the shadow of the nation’s Capitol, and we have provided you with cold wind and wet conditions but, hopefully, that will improve remarkably in the next couple of days or so, and you will learn what Washington is really like in the springtime, which is all about cherry blossoms, amongst other things.

We want to talk for a minute this morning about sort of the status of the Council. You are probably aware that, as prescribed in law, the Council was formed using staggered appointments. So some folks were on one-year appointments. Some folks were on two-year appointments, and some people are on three-year appointments.
So as you know, the anniversary date is June 15th. So we have got about 11 members whose appointments are expiring on June 15th. Of those members -- that is, of the 11, Phil Reitenger and Dick Andrews submitted resignations. So it is up to us to go through the process to accept those.

It is important to note that Phil, actually, was appointed by Secretary Janet Napolitano to be Deputy Secretary for the Department of Homeland Security National Protection and Programs Division, and he was actually sworn in on March 27th.

So that is a division that FEMA does a lot of work with over time. So, hopefully, Phil will bring to that some knowledge of FEMA and some appreciation for the things we have been doing here.

We believe that now we have a fixed date for a confirmation hearing for Craig Fugate. Craig has been nominated by the President, and his hearing is scheduled now
for April 22nd.

Of note, there is also a nomination by the President for the preparedness area of FEMA, a Deputy Administrator position, and that is a man named Tim Manning. Tim is currently the state Director of Emergency Management in New Mexico.

What happened is we kind of went forward with the process that Alyson and her team have put together to welcome nominations. Folks who were already on the Council did not have to reapply. We just simply accepted a nod or an e-mail saying you had an interest in continuing on, and they went through a fairly rigorous screening process.

We brought in folks from the other Federal agencies, Department of Transportation, Health and Human Services, and I think also our friends at the Corps of Engineers joined us during that session, and then a host of FEMA staff as well.
We actually did try to pull in some folks from state and local government and other constituency groups. The attorneys got a little nervous about that. So we had to back off. I apologize to anybody that we reached out to and had to change course of direction on pretty rapidly, but we did go through that process. So those nominations are currently in play.

So basically, though, when we went forward and talked to Nancy Ward -- Nancy will be with us in a little while -- we said here is what we’ve got and here is what the nominations are. There were, I think, 350 applications for the 11 positions.

She said, you know, really, with the proximity now that we’ve got a confirmation hearing set for Craig Fugate, it is probably in everybody’s best interest to let the new Administrator weigh in on those nominations. Can’t do that officially until he is confirmed and his appointment is made by
the President. So that will delay things a little bit.

Fortunately, we are in a situation where the DHS and their committee management process has said, well, it is not an issue; anybody who is currently sitting in a National Advisory Council position whose position would terminate on June 15th can just continue until new nominations or new appointments are made.

So part of what I wanted to say to you this morning is that this is truly an outstanding turnout once again. This is the sixth time that we have met, and you all have been just magnificent in your willingness to leave family and other issues at home and come here and do this public service. So we are very, very grateful for what you are doing with us on this.

I think you are a remarkable organization of people who are clearly dedicated to trying to pull FEMA forward. Some of us have been doing this for 30 years.
or so. I appreciate the hell out of that, and
I think you've got remarkable leadership here
as well.

So thank you very much, and again
welcome to Washington, D.C. With that, Dr.
Bennett, I will turn the mic over to you.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Thank you, Bob.

Appreciate it.

I want to remind everyone on the
Council that our meetings today and tomorrow
are public sessions, open to the public and to
the media, and they are, of course, present.

I want you to be aware that we
will have a public comment session tomorrow
afternoon, which allows anyone to address this
committee who wants to make public comment.
We are not required to respond to that public
comment, but if we want to, we will. But on
the other hand, we do want to hear any
comments that are made, and we will have a
session for that tomorrow afternoon.

Then I want to underscore Bob's
comments to the Committee. First, let me thank those that will be continuing for all the work you have done. I think people here and a few from last year -- we call us plank holders in that we were the first group.

Then those that will perhaps be reappointed or continuing, I want to just thank you for your service and all your hard work. I really think this has been a group that has come together. The chemistry has worked well, and we have accomplished a lot, and I think everyone will carry with them a sense of accomplishment and pride in what we have done.

Who doesn't get replaced, we are going to truly miss you. Everyone here has been such a contributor, but 300-some-odd applications is -- we are in demand, I guess. Anyway, again I just want to, from the bottom of my heart, thank everybody for your support, your leadership and, most importantly, your ability to bring those issues to the table and
have really good discussions and get all sides of this thing looked at before we come forth with a recommendation. It has been truly, truly a wonderful process.

I would like to review our agenda just real briefly with you so you will know what is coming up. First, of course, we are going to be hearing from the Acting Administrator, Nancy Ward. The Stafford Act and Special Needs, NRF, and then subcommittees will provide report-outs today. We will be able to take advantage and hear what they bring forward, and we will see what they have for us.

Again, those subcommittees work very, very hard, and that is where a lot of our work is getting done, and I truly appreciate it. So thank you, and thanks to the leadership of those subcommittees.

We are going to have -- Mark Shriver will be with us this afternoon at lunch to speak on the Children in Disaster,
his work there that he has been doing on his national commission, and give us an update on that.

Don Grant, FEMA’s Director of Incident Management Systems Integration from NPD, the National Preparedness Director, will brief us on the status of the NIMS training. That is something we have asked for. We put these documents together. We want to know where is the training going and how is that going. So we will have a presentation on that this afternoon.

Mike Buckley, the Acting Assistant Administrator for Mitigation, will brief us on mitigation issues, including map modernization in the flood plain. This is, again, something else we have talked about that we would like to have an update on. So we will be receiving that.

Then, of course, we will have more delightful things tomorrow, but at this point are there any questions at this point? Did
Nancy come in yet?

MR. SHEA: Dr. Bennett, we just got word, she may be delayed a few minutes. We will try and figure that out. Maybe you can entertain any comments or issues.

CHAIRMEN BENNETT: Should we move ahead maybe into subcommittee reports, and get started until she comes? Let's go ahead and move into then the subcommittee report, if that is all right. I know we are rushing you a little bit here, but you are always prepared.

You did a marvelous job, by the way, with the Congressional staff questions. I didn't get a chance to talk to you after the phone call, but that was really good. Anyway, if Nancy will come forward and give us an update on the Stafford Act. Then when the Acting Administrator gets here, we will go to her. Got two Nancys here.

MS. DRAGANI: Well, this is probably a good time for the Stafford Act...
Subcommittee to brief, because we don't have a whole lot. So it won't be a long briefing.

We did a lot of work, and we had a very productive meeting, but as I think everyone knows, we worked through the three, three and ten. So now we are back to our original charter, which was to take a look at comments that have come in, particularly those that relate to statutory changes to the Stafford Act.

So I won't go over our subcommittee charge. That is in your notes, but I am going to go right into the discussion.

Our area of focus, again, was particularly on statutory issues and language changes to the Stafford Act. We reviewed and bucketed 56 issue papers, which included recommendations that we collected from the beginning of this process in last May from various stakeholder organizations and, as part of that, attempt to try and bucket, if you
We identified statutory, regulatory and policy. Quite frankly, the bulk of them were statutory in nature. There were seven areas, once we did that. Within those seven areas there were 23 issue papers that were tabled, leaving 33 issue papers for further review.

This is what it looked like after we were done going through each of those issue papers and then putting them into different topical areas.

There were seven that focused on public assistance statutory changes. What we have done is kind of pulled out some of the major issues within those bucketed areas. Host state sheltering was certainly a major issue. Emergency declaration criteria was another under the public assistance.

Individual assistance: There were four focused on housing as well as other areas. There was one on catastrophic, but it
was pretty broad in nature and included not just what defines a catastrophic event, which was certainly a discussion, but there were also some intersections with some of these other areas on funding and eligibility for a catastrophic event once it is defined.

There were nine that were private sector, and those tended to focus on either infrastructure, particularly access and reimbursement for critical infrastructure, utilities, etcetera; but the bulk of them focused on health care and medical systems and medical providers, particularly for profit medical providers that are very engaged in an event post-event or a recovery.

There were -- We have 1.5. There were a couple of issue papers that focused on recognition of tribal organizations and tribal governments, and then there were six that were focused on mitigation language changes.

Then there were four or five -- 4.5, four and a half, there were
miscellaneous. They were either nonprofits -- for instance, private nonprofits that were focused on faith based organizations and their ability to receive reimbursement for provision of services; broadening the Stafford Act to include acts of terrorism, pandemic.

Quite frankly, what we don’t yet know might become an issue, because the issue is what do we not know that we don’t know. so broadening the Stafford Act to make sure that it can cover all of the events that might impact our citizens.

The next steps are to work through each of these issue areas and, using the template that we did with the three, three and ten develop a problem statement, and then address the issues not with language changes, as Dr. Bennett talked about earlier, but with areas for consideration, perhaps recommendations, but really focusing on the problem statement and, as FEMA begins to look at language changes, what are areas that they
need to be aware of, areas for consideration, using again the template that we did with the three, three and ten, which I think was a pretty good template, worked well for us in terms of commenting.

The other comment there is we recognize that we need to seek input from the other National Advisory Council subcommittees. There were probably -- I am going to look at the Committee -- maybe 10 different special interest groups represented, and we didn't have necessarily a special interest group that represented special needs, that represented housing from the Housing Subcommittee.

So we think that we need input from the other subcommittees on the National Advisory Council, particularly as it relates to statutory changes focused on the Stafford Act. So we are seeking that from the other subcommittees.

The challenge will be we would
like to get those before our conference call, which is scheduled the third week of May roughly. We believe that we will need at least two fairly lengthy conference calls in order to have a recommendation to put in front of the full National Advisory Council for our July meeting.

So any comments, questions, from the subcommittee Chairs or members of the National Advisory Council before I move off of that point? It is a short time frame. I know that. Obviously, there will be opportunities at a later date for the Stafford Subcommittee to take a look at those, but in order for us to meet that July time frame and have two substantive teleconferences to focus on these issues, we think we need that by the third week in May. Issues, concerns, problems with that? Okay. That's it. That was quick.

I would be willing to, certainly, take any questions. I would be willing to offer to the Stafford Act Subcommittee members
any clarification, any additional information for the full Advisory Council. Anyone?

MR. BARRON: Nancy.

MS. DRAGANI: David, and then Kurt. Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. BARRON: Nancy, just help me remember. We focused on regulatory and policy the first go-round.

MS. DRAGANI: Yes.

MR. BARRON: And now we are moving to statutory, which makes good sense. But are there still some regulatory and policy issues that need to be dealt with?

MS. DRAGANI: There are not very many of them. So we will circle back to them after we finish looking at the statutory, and there may be an opportunity for us to address some of those policy and regulation issues as part of the statutory discussion, but because we had tabled all discussion on statutory to focus on the policy and regulation, we decided to go ahead and
focus on those this time around.

MR. BARRON: Good. Makes sense.

MS. DRAGANI: There were not very many, though, David. I want to say five or six that ended up being policy or regulatory. Okay, Joe and then Kurt.

MR. BRUNO: Nancy, a couple of questions. First, let's talk about the catastrophic issue. I know that there was a lot of discussion there. My folks who are on the committee mentioned it.

What was the issue? Where are you on the issue of whether there is going to be a "designation" as catastrophic and, therefore, different reimbursement levels, no match by states? Is there some type of disagreement that we should have this at all or you just haven't yet figured out how to describe it?

MS. DRAGANI: We didn't have a lot of substantive discussion on the individual issues, simply because we had to get through
them all.

MR. BRUNO: Okay.

MS. DRAGANI: So where we did veer off, if you will, and start discussing them, there was a concerted attempt to pull us back to making the decision, is it statutory, regulatory policy and, if so, what issue area does it need to be in.

Having said that, we also agreed that the discussion about catastrophic definition is one that needs to take place in the full National Advisory Council, not in the subcommittee.

I think at the end of the day our recommendation will be couched more along the lines of, if a designation is made, these are the issues that need to be considered; because I don’t think, based on our preliminary discussions, we will have full concurrence on what that looks like at the end of the day.

MR. BRUNO: All right. And my suggestion is, obviously, the subcommittee
does it work and then brings it here and we could have a broader discussion.

MS. DRAGANI: Right.

MR. BRUNO: Maybe just a couple of other points. One of the things that came up in our discussion at the Housing Subcommittee meeting was a need to get authorization for HUD to step up to take over a lead, let's say, or a piece of a lead in that post-disaster housing issue.

I know that one of the specific items you have is that suggestion. We in our committee will comment when you ask for it, and we will give you that, but it is a very important issue based upon what we are ultimately going to do in this area of disaster housing, post-disaster housing.

So I just would say, that is a particularly important one. You heard Joe talk about it earlier today. I know it wasn't that articulate in what he said, but he tried.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: He gets me
regularly. Don’t worry about it.

MR. BRUNO: But anyway, that is just what I wanted to point out to you.

The last one is the repair program is a very important program. We had a lot of discussion about that as well in our subcommittee meeting. We would like to hear what you all are thinking about it. We will give you our feedback, but this is like something very important where two committees are working on basically the same issue, maybe from a different perspective. All right?

Thank you.

MS. DRAGANI: Correct. I will tell you that one of our recommendations that went up to the Administrator was on HUD accepting the responsibility to manage the long term housing program. So that has already gone up, and we will continue to work that. We do think it needs statutory changes.

Kurt?

MR. KRUMPERMAN: Just quickly, I
was wondering if there was a specific moment in time you are thinking Stafford Act revisions were going to be made, and was that what you are aiming for timewise?

MS. DRAGANI: Yes. Our understanding is there is a cycle. We got a briefing on that yesterday, because I think that is important to know how we move forward, what the timeline is.

We are looking generally in the August time frame, because the cycle, as I understand it, coincides with the Federal fiscal year. I'm looking at Alyson. Is that correct?

MS. PRICE? I think that the answer to that is the statutory -- We would like to go ahead, yes, and get recommendations to the Administrator in August, in the hopes that that could be included or considered as a part of the agency's legislative priorities that they pull together. They start to pull that together in the summer, and have it ready.
to go in the fall.

MR. SHEA: Yes. Just to be clear, though, that is normally in line with the Federal budget process, and that generally means that the legislative program also accompanies the budget when it is submitted to Congress. So it could be some while longer than that before Congress would be looking at those kinds of recommendations.

MS. DRAGANI: But our target date is August, which coincides with the July meeting. Any other questions? Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: I believe the Administrator is here. Nancy, would you like to address us? We are delighted to see you. Welcome.

MS. WARD: Do you want me here or at the podium?

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Wherever you are comfortable.

MS. WARD: Good morning. I am
sorry that I didn't mean to come in and just interrupt. There was great dialogue, and I hope that we do see those requests for changes. I would like to see HUD with long term housing myself. I would like to see anybody with long term housing, quite frankly.

Well, good morning, and thank you for inviting me to come and say hello. I have told Bob that, although I only went to the one meeting in December, I was very, very impressed sitting and listening in December that you could all have such a diverse background and come in and roll up your sleeves and have such a wonderful dialogue to bring to the table in such a collaborative and coordinated manner.

I don't think that that word gets out, quite honestly, enough in what you all have brought to the table for the FEMA Administrator. I know Administrator Paulison couldn't speak highly enough about you all and what you brought to the dialogue for him to
consider, and I can't imagine that Craig Fugate, our Administrator nominee, is not going to feel the same support and the same confidence, actually, that this body can bring to the FEMA Administrator.

You know, we are in a time right now of continuity and, certainly, of change. I think continuity in the fact that FEMA is celebrating its 30th anniversary this month, and change in the fact that the administration brings, I hope, a new dialogue in FEMA's perception around the country, a new dialogue in the way that we engage our stakeholders.

As I have said to many of you in the room, one of the things that has been very important to me is to engage stakeholders early, not just in a review process of drafted regulations, not in looking at an interim rule, but to actually have a dialogue when we are establishing those policies, establishing those rules, and to use you all as a litmus test to that dialogue.
I think you are critical to be into the criticality of that initial dialogue. I think gone are the days of FEMA’s perception of developing policy and guidance behind some black curtain. We can’t do that anymore, and it doesn’t benefit us. It doesn’t benefit our stakeholders and our partners, and it certainly can’t then benefit the people that we are trying to serve in their biggest hour of need.

I have had the opportunity of working with Craig for several years. As some of you know, he’s got a very definite opinion of the PFO, and I was his PFO in 2007. So we had some pretty frank conversations, but I have been able to have some very good dialogue with Craig since he has been back and forth to Washington preparing for his confirmation hearings, and I have to say that it is just so reassuring to have someone who understands, has lived through what FEMA can put upon a state and local government, and will bring a
sense of that perspective and that stability, quite honestly, to everything we do.

Along those lines, I talked to him about the NAC membership, and many thanks go to Alyson and Bob Shea for preparing the applications and the material and background material that the Administrator needs to have to make new member decisions.

Quite honestly, I think that we are within just a few weeks of having Craig, and these members, this membership for the NAC, is so very critical to his tenure that I have asked that we postpone those membership assignments and selections until he gets on, can look at the information and the applications, to look at what the review board gave him and let him make the decisions based on that information; because it is a committee that he is going to have to rely on and have confidence in for the next several years.

So I hope that in hearing that -- and Dr. Bennett, thank you for supporting that
decision. I appreciate that, but I hope you all will understand that it is important for this body to have the confidence of the Administrator to really utilize them in a way that makes it value added for the Administrator, the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security and FEMA as a whole.

So I hope that you will indulge that and understand why I asked for that to happen, because it just -- This is just too important of a body, quite frankly, to have me make decisions and then have Craig come in just a couple of weeks later and feel like, you know, maybe the decisions weren't the way he would have gone or whatever. It is just too important.

So I hope that, for those of you who it affects individually, that you will agree to stay on until those decisions are made. We have talked to Craig. He is willing to do those selections and engage in that as quickly as possible as soon as he gets in. So
I can't imagine that it would take very long to do that. So I hope, again, that you will understand that decision.

I don't want anybody to think I was afraid to make those decisions, because there is a lot of great selections in there. I just think that it is important for Craig to have that selection for himself.

I also want to thank you all for the recommendations that you have given to the Administrator, not on what you were just talking about but, certainly, the NIMS. We are, hands down, accepting all of your recommendations for that.

It is already starting to be included in our training materials, and I think it was an important look from, again, a different lens, but provided some extraordinarily valuable information and input to us.

That is really all that I really wanted to say, but I would be happy to take
any questions and provide you the answers, if
I know them, and let you know if I don’t. So
I would be glad to field any questions, if you
have them. Great. You guys are tough.

MR. BARRON: Nancy, thanks for
being here, and thanks for your service. You
have done a wonderful job as the Acting
Administrator. So thank you very much.

MS. WARD: Thank you.

MR. BARRON: One thing that is
always valuable to us is, from the senior
leadership’s perspective, what are those
things that are on your mind that we should be
working on? Obviously, we will get input from
Craig and his team, but right now today, what
are those things that you worry about at night
that maybe we could help with?

MS. WARD: Well, I think we talked
about one, and that is housing. We still
don’t have that right. We will still -- If
something were to happen tomorrow where we had
a large urban area that needed housing and
needed long term housing, we would still, quite frankly, be flatfooted, because we still don’t have -- We still haven’t had a national dialogue about housing and how we can help states, how we can prepare them to provide us the right information for what they believe are, one, the challenges for their citizens and how we together can fill the gaps that they believe that they would have.

The other thing is just a national dialogue on recovery. You know, some of our programs just don’t work in their current form, and I would like to see you guys get on your table the ability to talk about the national recovery strategy. I hope that comes to the forefront in 2009, quite honestly.

I hope a dialogue within that framework that we talk about public assistance and how to do that better. I think it is a tough program for everybody to shoulder. There’s got to be an easier way. You know, we are doing it the same way that I did in
California 10 years ago, 15 years ago.
There's got to be a better way.

I think the changes in the, I think, hopeful upgrades or revisions, improvements to the PA program that have happened in the past just didn't hit the really tough questions, didn't really hit the really tough requirements that we've put on states and local governments in the PA program. So I think we've got a long way to go there.

So I would say those two things would be high on my list for 2009. We just don't have it right yet, but we need to start with a national dialogue on both of those.

MR. BARRON: Thank you.

MR. KMET: Good morning, Nancy. I wanted to echo what David said about your service.

Before you had your other duties as assigned --

MS. WARD: In California?
MR. KMET: Yes. Yes. You obviously have -- are the Administrator for one of the regions that has the largest number of tribes in it. So I am wondering, from your perspective as the regional administrator and then as the Acting Administrator, what you can do as part of the transition or what the FEMA folks can do as part of the transition for the new leadership that we are going to have in here that don't have a lot of tribal government experience.

MS. WARD: I would say, first and foremost, we don't have enough resources agency-wide to really say that we do enough, coordinate as best we should where it comes into tribes, and that is in very directorate in FEMA.

So first and foremost, in fact, one of the things on my transition dialogue with Craig is we need to have better tribal resources and be much more proactive in assisting tribes.
We have made a lot of headway. I can say in Region 9 we have tried to come up with ways that will easily get tribal attention, and I will give you an example. We had some widespread flooding in California. Lots of tribes had not done hazard mitigation plans. Totally understandable. Don’t have the wherewithal, don’t have the actual resources to be able to do that.

Met with several tribes, didn’t really get the understanding that they were going to lose out on a lot of money. So I had my folks actually write project worksheets for every single facility that would be eligible and stacked them up for that tribal chairman and said, here is the hundreds of thousands of dollars that you are going to not get because you won’t do a hazard mitigation plan.

They signed up that day. I had resources that afternoon, helping them. We just don’t do enough, and a lot of regions don’t have the resources to stop everything
and do that.

So I think, if we made dedicated resources in the regions and a lot more than one person at FEMA Headquarters, that would be a huge start. We now have a Secretary who is very engaged in tribal relations, and I can't imagine that that is not going to be her expectation across the components in DHS. So that would be my first and foremost discussion with Craig.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Joe?

MR. BRUNO: Good morning, Nancy. Joe Bruno from New York City. How are you?

MS. WARD: How are you?

MR. BRUNO: A couple of things. What will your role be, at least based on maybe discussions you have with Craig now, as he comes on board? Do you expect to be going back to your region? Do you expect -- I know you would like to, but are you going to be carrying over for a while?

MS. WARD: I don't think so. You
know, well, I have to admit, Craig and I have
not had this very specific dialogue. You
know, I've done a transition and an Acting
role at the gubernatorial level in transition
from one governor to the other, and I have to
say, in all fairness to the incoming folks,
they really don't want you around once they
get in, and I understand that totally.

I certainly don't take that
personally. They want to get in. They want
to get started with their team and dialogue
on their own with the Secretary's office and
those kinds of things.

So I would assume that, as soon as
he gets in, within a couple of days I'll be
back in California.

MR. BRUNO: Is that helped by the
fact that Jason McNamara is there with you now
and kind of getting the day to day
understanding of what is going on so he can go
in?

MS. WARD: I think that is a help.
I think what is a huge help is the level of senior leadership we have in Acting positions in all of the directorates, long time senior leaders. We also have the commitment from Mr. Bob Shea to be an advisor to the new Administrator. That, in and of itself, will bring the continuity that he would need to get started.

So, quite honestly, I think that is sufficient for him. Again, I'm a phone call away, but headed to California.

MR. BRUNO: I have one other question. That relates to the National Disaster Housing strategy. I am on the subcommittee, and of course, we are interested in it, regardless of whether I am on the subcommittee or not, in New York City.

You know that there are two basic reports that are going to become due on June 19th and November 19th, and that is part of the strategy. The problem is one that I would like to ensure that you pass on to Craig, the
need to get permanent people into the spots to run that task force.

MS. WARD: I can't agree with you more.

MR. BRUNO: Yes. That is a critical need. You understand that, and obviously, the reason is that not the due dates -- those are check-in boxes that ultimately you can do, but to really get this thing going there is an awfully lot of responsibility on that task force.

MS. WARD: Absolutely, and I take full responsibility for stopping the recruitment early on of the Executive Director, because again this position, in my opinion, is critical to the success of the National Disaster Housing strategy and where this agency takes housing in the future.

It looked like we were going to have folks to be able to consider long before Craig was ever going to be on board, and since this position reports directly to him, again
I thought it was incredibly shortsighted of us to put someone in that role that doesn't get the benefit of having him provide them his vision and his support to whoever is selected.

So we are ready to hit that button, but that really was my decision to hold off, because again, just like the NAC membership, it is just too critical of a position to bring someone on board and not share Craig's vision for the future. But I couldn't agree with you more.

In fact, on the way over here, we were talking about the other memberships from other Federal agencies, the American Red Cross who has been just fabulous with their support of naming a person. But we are struggling with permanent assignments to this task force from other Federal agencies.

So one of the things, again, that Craig will, hopefully, do as soon as he gets here is under his new leadership the importance of housing to him and the Secretary
is to reach out to those other agency heads and ask for support for full time folks for those agencies that are going to be critical, HUD as an example.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Nancy, you had a question. I think, John, you are next.

MS. DRAGANI: Nancy, I also want to thank you for your service, and I know you are anxious to get back to California, but you have certainly done a great job, not just in keeping the ship afloat, which is one of the transitional responsibilities, but being very responsive in your position as well.

MS. WARD: Thank you.

MS. DRAGANI Can you talk to us just a little bit about the Secretary? I have had a chance to talk with her a couple of times, been very impressed with what she brings to this position, and also the action directives that, I think, give us a feeling for where she is thinking about moving forward.
MS. WARD: Sure. I have had the opportunity to be with the Secretary on various issues. I have spent a lot of time with her, actually, and I have to tell you, just short, sweet, she really gets it. She understands the state and local coordination. She understands the need for the Federal government not to feel like a bureaucracy, not to feel like we are inflicting pain on our stakeholders, and she is very supportive of FEMA, has said in numerous forums that FEMA's mission is probably the best in Federal government.

The action directives have been a way -- have been twofold for her, I think. It has been a way for her to take, whether it was preconceived notions prior to coming to the job that she had or preconceived and previous dialogue that she had, but there were certainly some topic areas that she wanted more information on and kind of get a snapshot of where the components, all of us in DHS,
were.

So we have used the action directives to not only say this is where we are, she wanted less information, quite honestly, on where we've been, but then giving her ideas of what are the possibilities. What are the -- Stafford Act as an example: What are the possibilities for change?

You know, there has just been a tremendous amount of dialogue on do we need to change it? Do we not need to change it? Do we take that step and open it up to, you know, only knows what we will get, or do we do a very deliberate job and only try to tweak those areas where, really, it would give us maximum flexibility?

So it has been a way for us to get issues on her radar screen, but also afford her a component’s read on where we could take this in her framework of stakeholder involvement, efficiency reviews, and really just a new way of thinking in terms of all of
these issues that, in some cases like FEMA, have plagued us for many, many years.

So it has been an excellent process. They come out fast and furious. It is a huge workload, but it also a huge opportunity for us to have dialogue directly with her.

MR. STENSGAR: Thank you. I would just like to maybe share some information and stories, maybe dovetailing off of what Chuck just talked about a few moments ago, and it is real life occurring right now in talking about some of the recommendations coming from the Stafford Act Committee which puts tribes at the same level as states.

There are two tribes in the Dakotas, you know, with the current things going on, Standing Rock and the Cheyenne River, that still today have not received any assistance. One of the tribes actually made their own declaration under which the Governor’s office finally came and picked up
a copy of that yesterday.

These are some of the issues that we are trying to get addressed. I know in the past, the previous major flooding that occurred in the area, they went some three and a half months without getting a major road rebuilt, but FEMA fundings was going to other areas throughout the States and weren't being addressed in the Indian country per se.

You know, just a point of information, that is going on right now as we speak, and I just hope that something can be done.

I, too, would like to thank you for stepping up to the plate in the interim until we find a leader for our organization. I did have the opportunity back in -- when we were back here for a National Congress of American Indians, and the new Secretary actually came and addressed our general assembly, and I was one of the five tribal leaders who actually got to meet with her for
a half-hour in that sidebar.

Now it is time to -- and it is probably not the best term -- hold her to her words now, but the tribes in Arizona just praise her for her work, not only with the tribal leadership but all populations within Arizona, and I just think it is going to be phenomenal opportunities here in the future in what kind of what I see the NAC is set up to do is streamlining the red tape within the organization so that the funding gets to the folks that need it in a more timely, expeditious fashion, but even with all the checks and balances still in place.

I think we all take that very serious. You know, how can we help FEMA do their jobs better.

MS. WARD: Absolutely. Well, I will tell you, I don’t think you will have a problem in her staying with her commitment and her words. I’ll tell you, as having Governor Napolitano from Arizona in my region, I can
tell you that we use her as a model Governor
for how to relate to tribes when there are
events that are relegated just to tribal
lands.

We have, I know, taken her
language in her letters as a Governor and
given them to all of our states and
territories to utilize in a training to be
able to show other Governors' offices how easy
it is to support a tribe and send in a request
for a disaster declaration as an example.

There are other Governors' offices
who are not so receptive to that, but we used
her as a model, and so I don't think you will
have a problem with her sticking to her words.

MR. CONNORS: Nancy, I hate to be
redundant, but thank you very much for your
service.

MS. WARD: Thank you.

MR. CONNORS: I think redundancy
when we thank you is a good thing.

I would like to ask you about --
We saw some dramatic changes, particularly with the response to Hurricane Ike, compared to previous disasters. Since you have been in the Acting position -- I think that came after Hurricane Ike -- what have you seen in the response so far, given your previous experience as a regional administrator and now as the Acting Administrator? What have you seen in the responses to the Minnesota, the North Dakota, all the major incidents that you have been dealing with since you have taken this role?

Are there some major things that you have seen that have gone well, and are there some major things that we need to really get on top of as we move forward here?

MS. WARD: I would say the biggest thing is engaged partnership with state and local governments. I would have to say that in years past -- and one of the huge lessons we learned out of Katrina was the fact that there were states who had very strong opinions...
about us interacting at the local level, several in my region, but I think Katrina changed all that.

It not only changed our ability to engage much more proactively and the wont to do that. It also changed the state and locals' receptive to having us on the ground much earlier at the local level to provide whatever guidance we can right there with a mayor or a county administrative officer or whoever really needs our assistance and who really can benefit from the knowledge of asking for Federal resources much more easily.

I don't think you will see that change. I think that we have now set the mark for how we will respond to state and local governments, have set up an organization and a standardized organization.

As a matter of fact, I signed off on that this morning, going out to all of our regions on a field guide, an incident management field guide on how we will all
respond, every region, every organization, and how that will include going down into the local level with the state.

It is not to usurp a state’s authority, but to offer our assistance at the local level, especially for local governments who are struggling in a response environment to understand what they should be asking for, and maybe not as aggressive about getting that word up to their state EOC and asking for Federal resources.

We want to really put someone down in the local government who has the expertise, and we are struggling with that, because it is a widespread event. Putting someone at the local level is a huge resource drain on FEMA, but we are starting now with the guide, with our guidance, with our training, starting to develop those resources so we can be much more engaged and user friendly, quite frankly, at the local and state level.

I don’t think you will see that
change. I think we are doing everything in our power to move and continue to strengthen in that area.

I think we've still got a ways to go on logistics. We have made huge strides in commodity movement. I think, in Hurricane Ike, quite frankly, it was one of the largest commodity movements to a large number of people in FEMA's history.

We have training to do, quite honestly, at our regional levels. Not all of our regions, most, quite frankly, are not supported with staff and resources to shoulder that challenge in a big way. So we've got to continue to look at that.

Then again, in our recovery programs we have got to do a better job, and to really look -- and I hate this term, but I will use it here anyway -- look outside the box at how we can eliminate the bureaucracy to getting these folks much needed critical funding faster than we have been able to do...
that in the past.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Rob, did you have a question?


MS. WARD: Hi, Rob.

VICE CHAIRMAN GOUGELET: You know, I was wondering. When we first started a couple of years ago, there was a lot of talk about the old FEMA and new FEMA, and there was a lot of concepts, some of the things that you are talking about now. But I was curious to know whether you could give us an idea of how things are working on the inside, whether there is momentum, morale and different things like that.

Then also, you know, more importantly, how we are perceived or FEMA is perceived on the outside, in maybe the Capitol. You know, obviously, we hear all the bad things, and that is what makes it, but there's successes, too, and I would like to
see how people feel about that.

    MS. WARD: Well, you know, it is no secret that morale at FEMA is on the lower end. I think that is changing. I think there is excitement around Craig. I think that there is an excitement that has built around the recent successes that FEMA has had.

    I think that, in terms of the Hill, FEMA is being much more responsive and proactive in doing very routine briefs to them, good, bad or indifferent. We used to shy away from the bad news, quite frankly. I don't think we do that anymore.

    I think we go now and have an honest, candid dialogue with the Hill, and I think that has paid off. I think that in the three years that Administrator Paulison was here that we enjoyed unprecedented support and resource improvements from the Hill. I don't see that changing, quite honestly.

    I think for that to change, it would mean that we would have to revert back
to where we were in terms of our dialogue with
them and our stakeholders, and I don’t think
you will see that happen. We can’t afford,
quite frankly, to have that happen anymore,
but we’ve got a long way to go in the morale
business.

I think that folks are seeing a
much more open, inclusive leadership. Again,
I think they are excited about the new team.
We could not enjoy a better supporting
Secretary and front office, something we have
never had in the six years that DHS has been
established. That’s huge.

No longer is there mistrust, is
there a lack of confidence. I think that we
really enjoy a platform where we are now that
we have not had in probably a decade. So I
think folks will start seeing that momentum,
will see the support and the confidence that
the Secretary has, that Craig will bring.

We only got one way to go in
morale, and that is up. So my hope is that we
will enjoy that, as there is transparency and
the folks see the actions that are in the
works.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Any other
questions? Bob?

MR. CONNORS: I guess I might ask
the one self-serving question. What are your
views of the private sector partnerships, and
how do you see the current state and the
future state of working with the private
sector in disaster response?

MS. WARD: Well, the future state,
in my opinion, needs to change for the future.
I think we have only tapped the tip of the
iceberg where we could enjoy a much stronger
public-private partnership.

I think, as Federal agencies
struggle with what that means, public-private
partnership -- who comes to the table; you
know, how do we engage -- I think states are
probably doing a much better job of that right
now than we are, but I know that is a huge,
huge commitment from Craig.

He has done it in his state just phenomenally. I can't see where that wouldn't just strengthen both in FEMA, but quite honestly at the Department level as well. I think you will see more resources go into public-private partnerships, and I think we will start a new dialogue and a new way of thinking as we bring them to the table ourselves.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Chuck?

MR. KMET: One other question. Obviously, the Administrator nominee has not had the opportunity or the pleasure to go through the budget development for FEMA yet, but have you all had frank discussions on EMI, its future support, and bolstering and building that?

MS. WARD: He has gotten budget briefs -- as you probably know right now, they can only be briefs -- as well as briefs from EMI, all of our training focus. We are doing
-- enhancing some training out in the Pacific. So he has gotten those briefs.

I think the folks have actually learned a lot from him already in the national preparedness arena during those briefs. As you might imagine, Craig did most of the talking.

So I think that really gave them an insight into the future, and I think they are very excited about his engagement there. But right now they can only be briefs, and so he hasn't really been able to engage quite yet, but he has had briefs on everything FEMA to prepare him for his confirmation hearings.

MR. CONNORS: And completely separate, when you do get back to your day job and relax a little bit, you are still more than welcome to come down to southern Arizona and visit us.

MS. WARD: Well, I will take you up on that. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Any additional
questions?

MS. WARD: Thank you all so much, and thank you for what you do here for FEMA. I don’t think you realize quite the impact that you have when folks know that there is such a forum to go up to the leadership and ask to have issues raised or discussion from a well cross-disciplined membership. I just don’t think you realize the influence and confidence that the agency has in all of you. So thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Nancy, we really do appreciate, on behalf of all the NAC, the role you played in keeping us going and really appreciate that, and we hope on your agenda when you talk to Craig, you will remind him, one of the things he should do is address this body. We definitely want to hear from him as soon as we can. Thank you very much.
We will move on with the agenda.

I believe -- is it Irene that's up next with the Special Needs report?

MS. COLLINS: Good morning. I would like first to bring an update on David Paulison. I had the opportunity to be with him this past Thursday. I almost didn't recognize him. He was rested. He was tanned, and he had just enjoyed the week with his grandchildren. So he did bring greetings again to all of you, and thanked you for what you all have done.

So I thought that was very -- It was a great opportunity, and he was honored at the National Hurricane Conference for his leadership. So I wanted to share that with you.

With our Special Needs Subcommittee, I want to thank all of the members of the committee for the work that we did yesterday. It was interesting, because when we looked at the agenda, it was pretty
packed, and we thought we will never be able
to get this done. But we were able to get
through it, maybe a 30-minute extension into
the day. But nonetheless, we were able to
complete the things that we needed to do.

The first thing you see again is
the Subcommittee charge, which is something
that has not changed, and we read this and
revisit it each time we gather, because it is
important for us to remember the mission that
we've set for ourselves.

In our discussion yesterday, we
talked again about the Regional Disabilities
Coordinator positions. The opportunity that
we had with the signature in December of David
Paulison to say yes, this is a good idea
opened up a whole new avenue for us. So we
are excited about the creation and development
of these positions.

We had updates yesterday from Doc
Jennings on CPG 301. The Committee had
revisions that we thought needed to be placed
in that document, and as a result, he shared that that had been completed, and the document would be going out.

We also had discussions yesterday, very lengthy discussions, regarding the FEMA handbook on accommodating people with disabilities and special needs in disaster, which was prepared by Cindy Daniel along with others in the Office of Disabilities. We had, as I said, quite a lengthy discussion regarding that.

We also learned a little bit more about the special needs population Go Kits, which we will discuss in just a moment. Then we had the opportunity to learn even more about case management, which has been a real issue for us as we look at the needs of the individuals that we serve.

Case management is one of those things that we feel has to be expanded. So we learned yesterday about a pilot program that the Office of Children and Families of the
Administration for Children and Families has and a pilot project that they developed in Louisiana. Sylvia Menafee brought that information to us, and it was quite interesting.

The conclusions that we drew from our discussions yesterday are as follows: We feel that FEMA needs to revisit the concept of the term Go Kits. What we have historically used as Go Kits are those backpacks or packages or whatever, if you will, that individuals use as they move from their home into a different setting as a result of a disaster.

Those are the things that they know they need to take with them from their normal environment to wherever they need to go. What we learned was that the Go Kits that FEMA is discussing are something that are quite different.

They are big kits, if you will, that are designated for specific purposes,
such as hearing impaired which I think has been completed, and others that they are in the process of developing. So we are going to be in further discussion with the folks regarding the term Go Kits and how those are designated from FEMA.

A question that was raised yesterday: Is there a way in which FEMA is showcasing best practices? I think this is something that is very interesting and something that, certainly, would serve us well.

As we have discussed earlier today, though, I think just by simply moving our event into Grand Forks in July is going to be a good example of best practices. So I think, as we look to the future and we look at other things that we are able to accomplish, best practices is going to be something, I think, that will be on the forefront of this committee.

Our Subcommittee also is going to
hold a conference call to further discuss the
FEMA handbook that we were presented yesterday
for special needs and disabilities. There
were a lot of questions that were raised, and
we feel like we need to have a conference call
immediately to talk about that.

Again, the Subcommittee is excited
about the opportunity for the Regional
Disability Coordinator positions and, as a
result of our conversations yesterday, it was
determined that we will be able to go ahead
and have input into what we think the job
descriptions really need to incorporate.

We will not write the job
descriptions nor was that our intent, but we
do want to be able to have input into what we
think should be a part of those positions. So
we had James Montgomery with us yesterday to
talk about that, and I think we are all in
agreement. But we will discuss that in our
conference call as well as the FEMA handbook.

Hopefully, we are going to have
that this next week, because these are pressing issues that we need to address.

We don’t have anything that we want to bring to the NAC as anything to vote on from our meeting, but we did have a very healthy discussion, I think, on all of the topics that I have just gone over and learning ways that we can do things better and improve.

I think some of the discussion we had earlier today with Nancy talking about the fact that we are overlapping in some areas is certainly something that we recognize as well, and we will be on top of when it comes to housing and the Stafford Act and those other things that we need to be an integral part of.

So any questions for us from our — or any comments from any of our other members? If not, thank you very much. We appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Well, moving right along here. We are going to move to continue with the subcommittee reports.
Cathey, could you come forward for that. Russ, you are on standby. Let's go ahead and do Cathey's, and then we will see where we are relative to the lunch and everything.

MS. EIDE: Good afternoon almost, everybody.

I think we had a really good meeting yesterday. The National Response Framework Subcommittee met in a brief conference call a couple of weeks ago, and so we also discussed some of those things. I am not going to review our charge.

So yesterday what we did, we had an opportunity to review the March 3 response letter relating to the NAC's NRF recommendations that we did receive from Acting Administrator Nancy Ward. I don’t see that it is in our packets, but all the National Response Framework Subcommittee members did receive that letter, that recommendation letter, the response to those letters.
We did review that letter and came up with some recommendations back to that response. So I will review our response to that in a minute. I'm a little congested. So excuse me.

We also received a staff update regarding the status of the NRF Partner Guides, and so we do have a response to that as well we will discuss in a few minutes.

We also received from Don Grant a discussion or an update on the relationship of the NRF to the other national preparedness documents, and there are quite a few, and we are going to come up with a strategic work plan to take a look at all those different documents and how they relate to the NRF.

We also had asked FEMA about the work plan for the revision or the revision process for the NRF. So Don gave us his new work plan with a timeline. We reviewed that, and would like to share with anyone else from the NAC, if you are interested in seeing that.
We also received a briefing on the National Level Exercise. The reason we did that is we were interested in determining how the National Level Exercise relates to the NRF. So it was kind of interesting as we received that briefing.

One of the things that I do in my regular position is an emergency planning coordinator. So one of the things that a lot of us wanted to do was see how the National Level Exercises are related to the NRF, and see if we can pull components out of that at NRF and actually see it in those National Level Exercises. So we will talk about the results of that in a few minutes as well.

Based on FEMA’s response letter to our recommendations, we have some additional recommendations. The Subcommittee recommends that the FEMA leadership provide the NAC with the implementation plan for the commitments agreed upon in FEMA’s March 3rd letter as a response.
They agreed to everything, all of our recommendations, but again we want to see the implementation process for those agreements.

The Subcommittee also recommends a more collaborative role for the NAC with FEMA in the development process of the NRF Partner Guides. The Partner Guides, again, are still in draft. We did not get a really solid response to the status of the Partner Guides other than that they are still in draft. So again, the Subcommittee recommends a more collaborative role during this development process as we go forward.

Also, we are wondering, as far as the NRF Partner Guides, the need for the clarity on the definition of what those Partner Guides’ purpose actually is.

I believe, you know, that is probably one of the problems with the Partner Guides, is the definition of what those Partner Guides’ purpose is. Keeps going
around in different circles, and nobody really knows what those Partner Guides are intended for.

Part of the Subcommittee action items is we are going to try to assist that by trying to clearly define what we feel that those Partner Guides should be.

Again, the Subcommittee recommends the NAC have a role in the national Level Exercises, starting with the NLE in 2011. I guess that is bumped back from the 2010 date.

The next steps for the Subcommittee: We will provide the comments on the NRF revision process work plan by conference call. As I said, Don Grant provided us with a work plan that had a timeline as well, and he did ask for some specific comments on that work plan.

The Subcommittee will meet toward the end of May, and on that conference call we will come together and put some comments together that we can forward to Don Grant.
regarding that work plan for the revision of the NRF.

We are also asking all the NRF Subcommittee members to provide suggestions for information on what should be in the Partner Guides. So taking a draft version of those Partner Guides, I have looked at them several times, and I certainly have my own opinion of what they should be and what they are not.

So I have asked each member of the NAC National Response Framework Subcommittee to provide me with three bullet points on each of the Partner Guides to let me know what they feel those Partner Guides' purpose should actually be.

Anyone else from the NAC, I would be more than happy to accept your bullet points as well, what you feel those Partner Guides should be. I will collect them all. I will put them all into a single document and forward them on to Don. So, hopefully, they
can take a look at that.

    Again, I think this is a good step
    in a process. A lot of people were
discussing, you know, how can we impact a
document before it is released, and so this is
a good way that the NRF Subcommittee is going
to be able to impact those Partner Guides and,
hopefully, get them going in the direction and
put some meat back into those Partner Guides
and get them going in the direction we feel
that they should be going in.

    One of the things that we also
looked at is the NRF, what it is and what it
isn’t, what it is missing. When you look at
the NRF and the NRF Resource Center, you can
see a lot of tools on there, but there’s still
a lot of components missing.

    When you compare it to a lot of
the other preparedness documents that are out
there, you can clearly see the things that
are missing, and what we are going to do is we
are going to develop a tool that supports an
analysis for the use of the NRF from the state and local level, somewhat of a matrix so you can see the gaps in the incident annexes, as compared to the ESFs and the rest of the National Response Framework compared to the NIMS incident, compared to the other documents that the National Preparedness Directorate is working on.

I will provide this tool to the rest of the National Response Framework Subcommittee as well as to the rest of the NAC. So you can take a look at it, and I have a basis for the tool that I developed just on my own when I was doing an analysis of our city's emergency operations plans in comparison to what existed, our incident annexes, California's emergency support functions, the Federal ESFs and so on and so forth.

So I came up with quite a matrix, and you can see a lot of the gaps. From there, I developed a kind of a gap analysis.
So we will be able to use that tool in the same process and see what is missing and the relationship that all these documents also have to each other, kind of like looking at a database and looking at each dataset and how each of these different documents relate to each other and relate back to the National Response Framework.

So that is our report-out. Did you have any questions for me? Yes?

MR. CONNORS: Cathey, with respect to the National Level Exercises, we had a briefing on that as well. In the past, we have had some fairly good exercises. The forthcoming exercise seems to be exercising information sharing, focusing on information sharing, which is a good thing. We all raised that as a major issue.

In the future, when you are saying that the NAC should get involved with the NLE, especially in 2011, are you saying focused on the NRF or are you -- because I think it is a
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broader issue. I mean, the NLE touches every single one of us in this room.

I think all of us want to have a little piece of that pie, not just on the NRF side. So I just want to hear your comments on exactly how that discussion went and what you are looking at.

MS. EIDE: And absolutely. That did get brought up: Why was the NRF Subcommittee being briefed on that? Number one, it is an exercise, and when you exercise something, you are generally going to exercise a plan, and then you can go back and you can take a look at your after action report and make your determinations. You know, what components of the plan were successful? Where do we need to fix it?

I think that originally when we looked at how -- looking at that National Level Exercise is how exactly does the NRF fit into that National Level Exercise, which to me is interesting, because as an emergency
planner, you know, I try to write a plan that
can be exercised, and a lot of times these
days what we do is we have an event. We have
an exercise in, oh, how does that fit back
into our plan. That is kind of backwards, really.

So, certainly, anyone on the NAC
would be more than welcome to participate. I
think we need a lot of help, and I think we
should have a lot of input into those National
Level Exercises. They are, I guess -- I don’t
know if they have changed from Topoff and now
they are called National Level Exercises and,
you know, Top Officials Exercises. But as we
know, all the exercises, all the events, start
at the local level, and they certainly affect
the local community as well.

So, hopefully, everybody will be
involved in those National Level Exercises,
and we will be able to provide some input.

Anyone else? Yes?

MR. KRUMPERMAN: I probably should
know this, but I don’t. Could you explain what the -- give an example of a Partner Guide and who the partners are?

MS. EIDE: Actually, I can show you a sample of what I was given. If you remember, at the last meeting in December I asked about the Partner Guides and was invited out in January and given a version of -- the latest version of FEMA’s Partner Guides.

I would love to be able to tell you exactly what they are, but I am really not sure. They have titles: The State Partner Guide, Federal Partner Guide, the Public-Private Sector Partner Guide. I wish off the top of my congested head what -- there’s two more? The Local Partner Guides.

So I certainly have my vision of what they should be, and I am not sure that’s where they are at right now. I am not sure FEMA really knows -- Anybody from FEMA here? I don’t think they are here -- knows what they should be.
When we first looked at them, they were like excerpts from the National Response Framework just pieced out, piecemealed out. You know, here's a Federal section, here is a state section, here is a local section, here is a public-private sector section, and really didn't say anything else. It was just a redundancy, you know, literally cut and past from the NRF.

Then I think they tried to add a little bit of meat to it, but as I hear, there is really not anything substantial in them.

My vision of what a partner guide would be, you know, as a local partner I would look at a local partner guide and it would tell me here is the things that you are going to need to provide to your local government in an emergency and how it is going to tie into the state, local and Federal.

I don't know. Nancy, you have looked at them many times.

MS. DRAGANI: Yes. I think the
original intent was, rather than a state
official having to look at the entire NRF,
which even in its entirety is not very long,
they could look at this six-page guide that
would in a nutshell tell the state official
what they needed to understand.

The challenge, in my mind, is we
grew from a very large document in the NRP to
a very small document in the NRF, and there is
a lack of robustness now to the plan that
needs to be fleshed out.

So you know, all the Partner Guide
does is parse down what is in the NRF. It is
only 70 pages to start with. Just pull out
the chapter on what state officials need to
know rather than releasing this separate
partner guide. But I believe that was the
original intent, which is one reason why we
had the discussion, we need to go back and
look at what is the intent of the Partner
Guide in order to have meaningful, I think,
input on what we think it should be.
MS. EIDE: Right.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Are you getting in your Subcommittee meeting -- I mean, will someone who is in charge of this from FEMA be addressing the Subcommittee to discuss exactly that?

MS. EIDE: Don Grant.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Okay.

MS. EIDE: And he has been very helpful, and he did ask for us to provide him some input. So one of our action items out of the Subcommittee is I have asked each of the Subcommittee members to provide me with three bullets on what they think that those Partner Guides should look like, what they should have in them.

I did pass around the version that I was given from January, but I am not sure that -- You know, it is like looking at a document, and I really don’t want people to go down that path, if that is not what we really want.
So just off of the top of the head, your own head, what do you feel should be in these documents? What would make it a worthwhile Partner Guide to you? Then based on each of those different categories, the Federal one is the Federal, but the state and local, private sector partnership is a very, very important one, and it really -- I can let you see it. It needs some work. Yes?

MR. DECKER: Cathey, it sounds like, from what you and Nancy are saying, that it is almost like a little executive summary for the way it stands right now for state and local.

I think maybe there will be some help down the road, because I know I was a part of the Steering Committee when the NRF was being developed, and so was Tim Manning who is coming on as the designee in Preparedness, and I know that that was not the Steering Committee's intention for those Partner Guides.
They were to be more meat for the local guy to be able to pull out and have more detail, not less detail, than the NRF had. So maybe once they get Tim on board and Tim sees what is happening, he may be also able to push them in the direction that I think the Steering Committee thought those guys were going to come out when we were drafting the NRF, to start with.

MS. EIDE: Yes, and this -- It is an opportunity for us to provide -- I mean, you know, if you want to put more than three bullet points, please do. I think at least three to start.

If you want to add a little meat of your own, you know, this is an opportunity that we have to influence the final document, and I think we should take that opportunity, and maybe we can have it as a precedent setting type of role in those partner guides, because I think they are very important.

I look to that NRF to help me and,
as I said, in that process I ended up definitely seeing gaps, areas that we needed to improve upon, and developed my own matrix to see where I needed to go to find the different types of tools and information to fill those gaps in myself.

I will provide that tool to the Subcommittee, so that we can go forward, and also compare the other National Preparedness doctrine documents that are out there, because there are some -- there is a lot of good information out there.

It is just trying to find it and where does it actually fit into the National Response Framework, and is that information available for those partner guides, and it is. It is out there. We just need to get it and put it in those partner guides and provide it to -- or help to provide it to FEMA so that they can move forward with this, and we can get a final product before 2011, which is the revision end date for the process for having
the NRF revised.

We had a strong response as far as the GAO report on the revision process for the NRF itself. But in that timeline, I did not notice that there was any reference to those Partner Guides in that timeline. So I was a little disappointed as far as that goes.

So, hopefully, we can provide some information, get those Partner Guides back on track, and going in the direction or at least give the suggestions to get them going in the directions we feel that those Partner Guides are really going to provide the stakeholders the tools that they need to be able to move forward and use the NRF for what it was, I think, intended for.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Okay. Well, it looks like, from what I am hearing then, relative to your first two bullets here about the recommendations, it sounds like there is some paths being created there to work those.

I had a question, though,
regarding the third bullet, the role -- I realize -- I believe it also talks in the Act which created this body about the National Exercise, but what do you see -- What is our role in that or what is the role that the Subcommittee sees for the NAC in there?

These are large scale, well planned, contracted out, so forth, exercises. So what is our role, other than advisory in the sense of knowing what is being exercised and seeing if those are the things that need to be exercised?

I would be interested in hearing the Subcommittee's feeling on -- or anyone else's -- definition of what is the role of the NAC in the National Exercise Program.

So I will just open it up. Has anybody got an answer, including FEMA?

MR. BRUNO: Kem, maybe the role could be, if we get involved, is in the after-action and looking at it and determining whether in the after-action is something we
see that might make the next one more relevant. That is the only thing I could see us doing.

So that is why -- Cathey is correct -- we should be involved, in the sense of being able to observe it and being able to comment back. That would be my thought.

MS. EIDE: Right, and a lot of the work that we do in the subcommittees -- I mean, and I have been involved in just one Topoff exercise myself, and looking at it from that perspective, I think that we do have an opportunity to at least take a look at that exercise and see how does it relate back to some of the projects that we are working on here, and especially the National Response Framework.

As I said, it is an exercise, and an exercise is designed to exercise a plan. We do have a National Response Framework with ESFs and target capabilities, and so we have the opportunity to maybe observe the National
Level Exercise and look back and see, you know, is FEMA doing what it says it is doing, based on all those doctrine and documents that they are putting out.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Okay. Another opinion, yes, please.

MR. MURPHY: Yes I would agree with Joe, you know, especially on the after-action end of it. You can always find out on the front end, to some extent, although you have to be careful what you ask for, because in doing Topoff two years ago, if you want a list of objectives when you consider we did in Arizona, Oregon and Guam, you could probably get four or five 5-inch binders full of objectives that relate to NIMS, NRF, any of the major documents that the NAC is involved in.

I would agree with Joe that that after-action piece is probably really important, because you will see -- Depending on the objectives of the level of government
or the private sector, you will start to see some of the weaknesses r the failings that some portion of a document or a plan did or didn't work.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: I wholeheartedly agree. I participated in Topoff I and II, and when you said binders, I thought back about it. Yes, I think Joe is spot on. Our role could be very -- will be very valuable in the after-action, and maybe there is a possibility to be involved in some of the observation. Being in the command center when they are doing that is very enlightening, and there might be a subgroup.

Obviously, we don't want everybody showing up, but I agree that that would be our role. I just wanted to hear what you were thinking, because I don't want people to think we are going to get involved in the details of that, as you say. That's the last thing they need. Yes, Lee?

MR. FELDMAN: Dr. Bennett, I also
think that there is opportunity on the front end in terms of planning for different subcommittees to have input on what issues they would like to see exercised.

For example, there may be something that the special needs community is interested in seeing incorporated into the exercise that we can then follow through and then report back out at the after-action point.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: I think that is an excellent way for the Committee to interact, if there are areas that we feel should be exercised. That is a really good point, Lee. Thank you. J.R.?

Any other comments?

MR. THOMAS: Cathey, I guess just to pick up on Lee's point, have the objectives already been determined, because I know the planning for the --

MS. EIDE: For the NLE, no, it is just starting for the 2011. I believe they
are just starting the planning process.

MR. THOMAS: I heard that they had already set some objectives already.

MS. EIDE: We have a -- We got a briefing in our meeting, and I can show you what we got. You know, it is in the early stages. The MSEL -- they are miles away from that. Any other questions? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: You had a comment?

MR. MURPHY: I just wanted to add, and dive back into my state hat, please be mindful of trying to interject more objectives from another body on a state. I can tell you from Topoff IV, daily phone calls from hundreds of public-private, nonprofit organizations say, hey, let's test this.

To some extent, you know, you have to be careful, because you will water down the exercise, because you just -- Unless you have done one of these National Level Exercises, there is just no comprehension of how many
people are going to call you, to include foreign countries that want you to test this or this objective.

So, you know, we need to be mindful of that city, county, state, tribal government and/or FEMA or Department of Homeland Security, because they will have objectives that they want or is placed upon them by Congress or Homeland Security Council or whomever.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Additional comments? Okay, I don't believe there was anything there we really needed to act on at this point. Sounds like that our -- or did you want us to, other than the fact that you had the recommendations. Seems like they are being addressed or will be when Manning comes on board and others. Is that correct?

MS. EIDE: Yes. Alyson, can everyone in the NAC get a copy of the response letter?

MS. PRICE: Yes.
MS. EIDE: I think that would be great, and I think that is all we are going to be looking for, is the implementation of those commitments that they made through that Nancy -- thank you very much -- made in that response letter for our recommendations.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Okay. And I am sure Bob and Alyson will carry that back. Okay, great.

We did get lunch moved up, I believe, in five minutes.

MS. PRICE: Yes. It is in the Montpelier Room, which is down the hall on the other side, I think, near the bathrooms on this level.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: We will adjourn for --

MS. DRAGANI: When will we reconvene?

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: That is where I was going to try to go here. Let’s see. If we are going to lunch at a quarter to, how
long were we planning on lunch before? An hour and 15 minutes?

So that would put us back here at one o’clock. Is that fine? Does that work? One o’clock, we will start again. Thank you very much.

(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the record at 11:41 a.m.)
AFTERNOON SESSION

Time: 1:10 p.m.

MS. PRICE: We are going to continue with our next presentation from Don Grant and Kevin Molloy with FEMA’s National Preparedness Directorate.

MR. GRANT: Okay, thanks, everyone, for having us here this afternoon. I am Don Grant. I am the Director of the Incident Management Systems Integration Division, which is under the National Integration Center, which is part of the National Preparedness Directorate. I got through that without stuttering. That’s good.

What we were asked to do was come and talk to you today about how we take NIMS updates, NIMS and NRF updates, and how do we turn that into training.

Rather than have me give you a brief on this, I thought it would be more appropriate to have my actual program manager come down from the Emergency Management
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Institute and talk to you all.

That person is Kevin Molloy. We are very fortunate, first of all, to have Kevin. He's got 37 years of experience on the ground. When Three Mile Island was melting down, he was the second person to receive a phone call and was the director of Emergency Management for his county, which Three Mile Island was in.

He brings a wealth of information and experience with him, and he is my person actually residing at EMI. So as we develop new doctrine in IMSI or incident management systems integration, he is intimately involved in knowing and participating in those updates.

Then he goes back to EMI, and he works with the folks up there to ensure that the concepts and new doctrine or changes to the doctrine that have been promulgated are then turned into viable training programs.

So without further ado, I will turn it over to Kevin. Thank you.
MR. MOLLOY: Thank you very much.

Good afternoon, folks. I appreciate the opportunity to be here.

This was a little bit of a difficult presentation for me to put together on short notice. I am trying not to get into the weeds and trying to keep it up here, but what I would like to do this afternoon is to provide you with an overview of NIMS training and NRF training, our methodology, the reasons why we do some of the things we do.

It is important for a couple of reasons. Number one, we spend millions and millions of dollars doing training, but number two, to this point as of April 5th, nearly 10 million people across this country in all disciplines, all levels of government, private sector, have taken our online training.

So as you can see, training is important and, obviously, it is very significant. If I get too far down in the weeds, I apologize in advance. As I say, I am
just trying to paint a good picture for you folks, and will talk specifically about some of the courses and how they tie into NIMS and the NRF directly.

Obviously, we are all familiar, certainly, with NIMS and the NRF document and how important they are and what their main goals and objectives are, and that is to produce a coherent response system, if you will, for any type of disaster and regardless of which type of discipline you are in.

One of the most critical and important tools, I feel, is the training. If we don't do the training properly, everything else we do -- it is just not going to go smoothly.

So our training program -- As I mentioned before, it is a very intense program, and it directly supports FEMA's National Training Program, and we tie it directly into NIMS and the NRF, and we will get into that.
The National Integration Center:

As you know, we are responsible for many things, but in Don's division, the area that I deal with specifically is training. We develop -- when I say we, it is a large we. It is not just IMSID.

These are working groups. These are individuals from all disciplines, law enforcement, fire, public works, Red Cross, religious organizations, travel organizations. It is a wide variety of people, and we develop training standards and training requirements for individuals involved in emergency response.

We also set the standards for instructors. You just can't have anybody get up and teach some of the materials that we are offering to the emergency management community, the entire emergency management community.

When we started out, our initial effort with NIMS was, obviously, to make
people aware of what is going on. That even goes back to the days of the National Response Plan before we changed it to the Framework.

So we are very clearly involved in an awareness level, and I will point that out a little bit more in depth.

We are also intimately involved with providing funding for the development of simulating capabilities, taking what we have learned and putting it into action, field based training; and we are now really starting to push the discipline specific training, as you see when I talk about the individual course.

We did make several assumptions when we started to get involved with the training process and, obviously, what we are trying to do -- and as we continue down our road, we are involved with a rewrite of the NIMS five-year plan now, but we are trying to develop very clear and concise and quantifiable performance measures, metrics and
outcomes.

Anybody can take a course and have a certificate, but -- and I believe this was actually mentioned at lunchtime today -- if you don't have the opportunity to take what you have learned in a class and put it to good use, you know, then what good does that training do? So part of the training that we are involved with also includes exercises and things of that nature there.

Since NIMS is a companion document for the National Response Framework, the other thing that we have been doing recently, we have really been tying in and keying the NRF with the NIMS. NIMS, obviously, isn't that big an issue, but with the release of the national Response Framework, we are starting to really hone in on that.

A perfect example is last week. One of the training programs that we fund is called an IEMC NRF, and that is an Integrated Emergency Management Course, and we are doing
one in each state.

These are state level exercises, and they are specifically designed to ensure that the individuals who operate at a state emergency operation center are familiar with the National Response Framework and how things should go.

As I say, we have done six of those already. I was in Kentucky last week overseeing one of the courses, just to make sure that we are on target, since our organization funds it. I am pleased to say it is going well.

We already have -- Seventeen additional states have signed up for these courses. EMI, the Emergency Management Institute, is the one that is running them for us. The good thing about this training is, once again, we are involving all levels of government, all disciplines, the private sector, and NGOs.

These are the type of goals that
we have. Obviously, we want to support training for all of our stakeholders. When I use the term emergency management, I know a lot of people automatically just think of, if you will, law enforcement, fire, things like that, the traditional things.

When I talk about emergency management -- and this just goes back to 30 years of experience, and Three Mile Island, in particular -- Emergency management is the community. It is churches. It is everybody, and I think we try to foster that and encourage that as we develop the training programs, and who can we get to participate.

In this day and age, you can't be in a vacuum anymore. We do a lot with the educational community. I don't think people understand that you can't have an event occur on a campus, as an example, that doesn't impact the community in one form or another. It is critical that they understand what each other is doing and how to interface and work
together.

So when we talk stakeholders, we are talking America in a very, very broad sense, every level of government and discipline and so forth.

The other thing that we are trying to do is we are trying to take those functional capabilities that have been defined in NIMS, and we want to make sure that we conduct our training and we develop our training and that this helps the stakeholders develop personal training and credentialing plans down at the local level based on the guidance that we provide and the documents we provide and so forth, so that they, in fact, are able to accomplish their goals and objectives.

One of our other branches or organizations within the IMSID deals with credentialing. We are also trying to make sure that the credentialing effort goes hand in hand with the training effort. You know,
what are the duties and responsibilities, and 
how does that tie into ensuring that you have 
the appropriate training and capabilities?

The NIMS functional capabilities, 
as you can see here -- and I am sure you are 
all intimately familiar with them, but our 
training really evolves around it:
Preparedness, communications, information 
management, resource management, and the 
command in management.

Probably the one that you are most 
familiar with is incident command, and that is 
the one that seems to drive folks crazy across 
the nation: Gee, do I have to take this? Do I have to do this? And I am the one that they 
call and yell at. So it works out well for 
those folks anyway.

What people don't understand is 
that NIMS is not ICS, and there is a notion 
across the nation, if you will, that if you 
just know ICS and you take these courses, that 
you are in compliance with the intent of NIMS,
and that is not the case at all.

That is the other thing that we are trying to do with our training, is to make sure that everybody understands, just because you took a couple of courses, that doesn’t mean you are NIMS compliant.

If your organization has not gone back and rewritten your plan, if you don’t have a good training and exercise program, if you don’t have a remedial program, if you don’t have a good resource management program -- there is a lot more to NIMS and the NRF than ICS, and that is a big goal that we have and, quite honestly, that is a struggle that we do have.

The foundation for our training plan: Once again, it is actually very simple, but we took a look at the core competencies that are required for typical positions in an emergency operations center, in an incident command system, a field operations unit, incident management teams, and so forth.
The national core curriculum for NIMS: We have developed that. As you will see, we have a large number of training programs that we have developed, but not all of them are required training. But, obviously, the NIMS overview, the NRF overview, ICS-100, because everybody, regardless of your position in emergency management or the organization, should have a basic understanding of that.

Training guidance for specific courses within the core curriculum: We are now at the point where we are getting into position specific training, which I will talk about very briefly. And as we get into requiring additional training for position specific training, that is going to assist personnel qualification guidelines.

If you want to be a member of a deployable incident management team, what do you have to do, and why do you have to do it, and how is that going to make you an effective
member of an any team?

   The intended audience: We are in
the process of rewriting the NIMS five-year
training plan. Once again, we took a look at
our audience, and we have just such a broad
audience, and their needs are so varied, once
again not only dependent upon discipline but
depending upon whether you are involved in
government or if you are involved in the
private sector or you are a nongovernmental
organization.

   So we really had to clearly,
clearly identify who are our stakeholders, who
are our audiences. Then there are secondary
audiences. An example of that might be the
principal at the local school, high school.
They have to have some type of training. Once
again, they have to have a clear understanding
of what is going to happen in a major event,
and where do they fit and their organization
fit into the plan.

   We have established specific
goals, objectives and action items to help us implement NIMS and the NIMS portion of the National Training Plan.

The NIMS five-year training plan was released in 2007. Part of the goal was to ensure that everybody had a picture, a roadmap, if you will, of where we are going, plus we hoped that this would afford people the opportunity when they were preparing their training budgets for the next five years.

It would assist them in accomplishing that task, because quite honestly, when we first started NIMS, every other week somebody was saying, well, what is this new thing you want me to do, and how am I supposed to plan anything. We address that as rapidly as we can, and we improve every day with that.

We are also defining the national core curriculum for NIMS. We have updated that. We will talk about that very briefly. This is applicable to all of our stakeholders.
We are providing national guidelines for emergency management response personnel qualifications. We are developing core competencies for NIMS defined incident management positions, and that ties into the credentialing, as I mentioned earlier.

The NIMS five-year training plan: It currently is posted online. As I say, we are in the process of revising it. Hopefully, we will have that out in the next several months. We’ve got to put it out for comment, and we are still making some corrections and changes to that. But we want the five-year plan -- We want any state training officer, any county training person or members of large law enforcement or fire agencies or public works departments, the people that are actually going to look at that document.

We wanted to make sure it is kind of a one-stop document. You can look in here and see where your organization should be as it relates to training. You can look in here
and see where certain select individuals in your organization should be. What should they have taken?

The original document: We use the term middle management should take 300, and what we are finding out is all of middle management shouldn't take 300, and we are trying to clarify that as we get involved with the update of the NIMS.

Once again, we go to great lengths with different working groups from different disciplines and so forth. We try to clearly define who needs what type of training. I think when the new five-year plan comes out, it will present a much clearer picture than we did in the past.

We are also tasked with developing a system to present NIMS and the NRF to all of our stakeholders. We do that in a variety of fashions, which we will talk about briefly.

One of the main thing that we have been trying to help different organizations
with is how do they institutionalize NIMS and NRF doctrines and concepts in their training programs? How do you get it into a state fire academy or a police academy at a state or other organizations.

We have worked very hard to try to help people institutionalize NIMS and the NRF and get it involved in their own training programs.

As I mentioned before, training is big. Just with what I deal with, as you can see, we provide nearly $5 million in funding up at the National Training Center where I work, which is where my duty station is.

Up at EMI, in case you are not familiar, we have the Emergency Management Institute, National Fire Academy, and the United States Fire Administration, and we provide them with a good deal of funds. These are the folks that we are using to help develop the online courses, the classroom courses that are taught up on campus, and the
IEMCs that we are doing in the states right now.

So as you can see, it involves a good deal of funding. We don’t just give them funding. Part of the reason why I am at Emmittsburg is I kind of personally oversee all of the projects that we are funding to make sure that they are actually going the way that we want things to go.

As I say, I was in Kentucky last week, because we fund that particular program, and every once in a while I would just like to check and make sure that it is going on.

Once a month, I sit in a room with EMI on one side and the fire folks, if you will, on the other side, and we take a look at, okay, you know, I gave you a dollar and you a dollar, what are you doing with it, if you will, just to make sure that we don’t have duplication of effort.

Many of you probably have taken some of the ICS courses and, as you know,
there was a fire-300 and a EMI-300 and so forth, and we've gotten it to the point where now there is one recognized 300 course, which saves everybody a lot of problems: Gee, which one do I take? It also takes the burden off of state officials: Which one do I recognize? We are doing it with the 400 and so forth.

So we do provide as much continuing oversight of the EMI and NFA efforts as we can.

Part of the other methodology: We go out and speak, as an example, my being here today. But in the past couple of years, I have probably gone out to 50 different organizations around the country, from National Institute of Government Procurers, the Airport Executives Association, to about 50 parish directors down in Louisiana, and so forth.

So wherever we get a chance and we are asked, we go out, and we do make these presentations. In May up at the Emergency
Management Institute, every year they do a training and exercise conference, and it is a three or four-day affair. We will be making several presentations at this conference. We do it every time.

In June up at EMI, they have a higher education conference. Once again, we participate in that.

We pay an awful lot for the development of the online IS courses, independent study courses. Once again, as of April 5th, over 9 million people have taken these courses. So as you can see, it is a gigantic effort. People take it for a variety of reasons, but it is just a very, very big effort.

Additionally, we do training at the regional and state level, to the best of our ability. One of the major things that we are involved with, and I understand was something that you folks were, of course, interested in, is when we update either NIMS...
or the NRF, we are right behind there providing funding for EMI to update the online courses.

The 800 course, which is the online overview to the NRF, is based on the current NRF. The same with NIMS. So we do try to stay current and so forth.

This will give you an example -- and I won't read the entire slide, but just to give you an idea of the progression of things here.

If you notice, obviously, we have the basic courses, which are your NIMS overview and your National Response Framework overview, but then we do get into the ICS courses, and we clearly spell out in the five-year plan -- and it will be, hopefully, clear when we get the new one out -- who should take ICS-100, 200, 300, 400.

We understand that people have limited budgets, regardless of the size of your municipality, department and so forth,
and we try to be very cognizant of that, and that is why we want to really clarify who should be taking the courses. Yes, ma'am?

MS. CATLETT: Something you said two slides ago confused me a little bit. As somebody who has taken most of those, I am a health care provider. So it was very helpful to us when you actually did develop the audience specific 100 and 200 HC for health care providers.

So my question for you is going to be: Are you considering doing that for 300 and 400, which are much more cumbersome. Obviously, they are one or two-day courses, but then you said you were doing away with the audience specific 300 and 400, I think.

MR. MOLLOY: The reality is there is Incident Command. Down at the 100 level, I know we have like Incident Command for Law Enforcement, Public Works, and that sort of thing. But if you looked at all of the courses, 95 percent of it is pretty much the
same. Okay? I do not foresee right now, and that is not to say it is going to happen, that we are going to have, if you will, a 300 for individual disciplines.

That is not to say it won't happen. Understand about 300 and 400. These are not online courses. Okay? These are traditionally delivered at the state level or, in some cases -- you take New York City, New York Police and some of the larger agencies and that sort of thing. They are the ones that present these programs.

The reason that we don't do them online is they require a good deal of interaction with the students. In other words, we actually make the students take what they have learned and put it into practice. So they are not going to be online courses.

So it is a little more difficult to make them discipline specific, if you will. The way to make it discipline specific is, if you are in the health field or something else,
as you are doing an exercise you ensure that your scenario is based on a health issue, a pandemic issue or that type of thing.

So that what you are participating in, even if you are working with other disciplines, involves injects that deal with that type of thing. Yes?

MR. CONNORS: Kevin, to follow up on her point, the feedback that I have gotten trying to encourage folks in the private sector, both in my company and outside my company, to take some of these courses, especially 700 and 800, is that they just don't get it. They don't see how that applies to them. It is so focused on the public sector.

It is something I am not -- I guess the recommendation is we need to take a closer look and see how we can apply this to the private sector, whether or not there are some tweaks or there is some completely different one training class that can give the
private sector their view of things, because it is completely different on that side, and we want to encourage them to be able to talk the same language when the first responders show up, but they are not seeing a lot of the connections here. It is so public sector focused.

MR. MOLLOY: Once again, we are very much aware. You know, the private sector, if you will, presents a unique situation. They are not required to do certain things and that type of thing, and yet -- you know, let's take a utility as an example. They are, obviously, intimately involved when we have a major catastrophic event.

I was up in Connecticut a few weeks ago. We were doing an exercise, and the utility individuals were in the state EOC. So they, obviously, have that relationship built.

It is happening in some places and not in others, and that is an area that we are
looking at and trying to improve on. When you
can't say you have to, sometimes it is
difficult. It's kind of like insurance, I
guess, would be the best way I can phrase
that.

The next slide here -- and once
again, I am not going to read it all, but as
you can see, we then get into the next level,
and that is where, if you take a look at the
NIMS document and you go back and you see
public information resource management.

What we have done is we have
created courses. These aren't mandatory
courses, but if you are involved with public
information, this course gives you a good
overview, a more in depth overview of how
public information fits into NIMS and the NRF.
So that is the intent of these courses.

We will be developing more
courses, but there are quite a few people
taking them.

Then let's get to the next step.
One of the big things that we are doing right now is position specific courses, and we have had quite a demand for this from the state and local level.

As you can see, these are the courses that we have developed. We are doing pilot projects right now. Our ultimate goal is these we are going to turn over to the states and let the states do the training.

We are funding to the tune of over a million dollars Train the Trainer Programs, and we are going to be doing a presentation in May. But as you can see, we cover all of the functions that you will find in an incident command organization.

MS. CATLETT: Those are available now?

MR. MOLLOY: I'm sorry, ma'am.

MS. CATLETT: Those are available now?

MR. MOLLOY: Oh, yes. Yes. Well, yes, they are available, but the biggest thing
that we are doing right now is we are going through the train-the-trainer process to make sure that we have the appropriate individuals doing the training.

Our goal is to -- when we turn it over to the states, is that they have a cadre of trained individuals who can further go out and train. We want to make sure that we are having the right people do the right training.

MS. CATLETT: I think I missed it. So those are not Internet courses. Those are in person performance level courses?

MR. MOLLOY: Yes, I'm sorry.

MR. GRANT: I would just like to add that these courses are the most sought after that we have heard from the community. These are the courses that they want to have come out sooner rather than later, and so we are making a concerted effort to work on these very closely.

The pilot programs have been done.

We weren't real happy with some of the
outcomes. So we have gone back and revamped, and Kevin is now working closely with the folks to ensure that when we go out with the next pilot test that it really does meet the community's needs. But these are courses that we continually get pushed on: When are they coming out? We want them sooner rather than later.

MR. CASSIDY: Excuse me. What mechanism, if any, do you have for getting feedback as you are giving these classes that would then be used to improve the courses? When you are doing an interactive class, you may find that you are getting feedback that maybe you never thought of, you know, in terms of thoughts from the other side.

So train-the-trainer and you go out into the field, and then, all of a sudden, you get some input or feedback and you were like, wow, we really didn't think about that. Is there a mechanism to upgrade these classes or to take feedback from rank and file people.
who are actually going to do the work to make slight modifications?

MR. MOLLOY: Yes. One of the things we do -- I'll just take the Integrated Emergency Management course that we do. Every student fills out an evaluation form. On that evaluation form there is a section where we encourage them to write how can we improve this course.

We are constantly striving to do it. Those sheets are taken. Everything is typed up, and it goes to the superintendent's office up at EMI. so everything is looked at. That is item number one.

Number two, with the independent study courses, it is a little more difficult, although I can assure you in any given week I will get probably 20 to 25 calls from every organization that you can think of or level of government that you can think of: Here is a better way to build that mousetrap.

Once again, when we get involved
with developing a course, it is not just FEMA people up at EMI. Traditionally, we will bring in a work group, and if we know it is going to involve multi-disciplines, we make sure that we have all of those disciplines represented from a large community, a small community.

So we are trying to make this as all inclusive as possible. The reality is -- and I don’t say this in a self-serving fashion, but having been the beneficiary of Federal programs back in the Seventies when I was a Civil Defense Director, I can’t think of any programs that have had a broader involvement from different levels of government and disciplines than what we have done with NIMS and NRF. This is, by far, been the most inclusive.

MR. CASSIDY: Well, that’s great. The training will be, I think, more productive when people believe they have input, and having input is going to draw more people to
it, and the back and forth dialogue will make the classes much more effective.

MR. MOLLOY: Thank you. Yes, input is an integral part of what we do.

The last couple of slides here dealing with courses. The NRF: I know, are we getting the message out with the NRF?

These courses here are under development at this point in time and, as you can see, we do have two courses that are online right now, but you can see some of the other ones that we are in the process of developing dealing with the support annexes and so forth.

So the -- the incident annexes. So as the NRF is being upgraded and updated, once again we are right behind, developing programs and getting them online as quickly as we can.

We also -- Most of you are probably familiar with ESFs, the emergency support functions. We have 15 of them. Right
now, we have 14 courses online. External Affairs is the only one we don’t have right now, and a lot of people are taking that. So we are also dealing with that.

Kind of in summary, our training plan is under rewrite at this point in time. I have another meeting. I believe it is next week over at Alexandria. We are bringing our group in. These are individuals from different disciplines from across the country and so forth to help us make additional changes. They’ve gotten input when they have gone back home.

When we get the new five-year training plan out, I think it will be a cleaner document. It will be easier to understand, hopefully make it easier for those training officials to get their programs together.

That is a quick summary, as quick as I could do. If I got down in the weeds, I apologize.
CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Cathey.

MS. EIDE: Yes. My question is regarding the handoff courses. As you train the trainer and these courses are handed off to the states, are they being handed off to consulting and contracting groups, too, that will turn around and charge tuition for these courses that, I believe, are not -- are tuition free at the EMI. Is that correct? And then the states are charging tuition, and the consulting groups that are getting this free training are turning around and charging local governments tuition?

MR. MOLLOY: The true, honest answer that I can give you: Obviously, in our country consulting organizations are certainly going to take advantage of materials that are produced and do that type of training.

That being said, once again, our initial concern is to make sure that the states are in the position that they perhaps have better leverage to say, if you are not
one of our approved instructors, we don't necessarily recognize that particular training. Therefore, you are not NIMS compliant.

I have dealt, quite honestly, with many, many calls from states and training organizations talking about consultants who go in and for $9.95 will teach you everything you ever want to know about anything.

I am not trying to put down anybody, because some of them do a great job, but it is a very, very difficult thing to handle. We do the best we can on it. That's not a great answer, but I can't stop somebody from doing it. I don't think we can.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: I could add to that, having had a state training organization. It is actually correct. they will go to the academies and, obviously, that material in every state has a state approved academy, depending on size, I think, of the communities.
Then there is also like certain entities are designated as state trainers, and those are generally -- the materials go to them, and they do them. But any consulting business or people can come along and do a training class.

Like you say, they may not be approved by that particular state. At least in Texas, we do that. Your class is either certified or it is not, and depending upon whether you have the appropriate credentials and materials.

MR. MOLLOY: One of the other things that we do to try is to keep reemphasizing to states and local folks, if there is free training available, why pay for it. I say that from my old role at the county level and state level and so forth.

MR. KRUMPERMAN: The question I have about NIMS compliance. The issue is that early on with NIMS there were -- the intent was that everyone would be trained at a
certain level. There would be a baseline, and somehow funding was going to be tied to compliance to that level of training.

I don't know if that has ever really been achieved or even measured. I was just wondering, what is the attitude or the position going forward in terms of having this baseline in training for different levels of responder, and how does that tie into credentialing?

MR. MOLLOY: Don?

MR. GRANT: Kevin is looking at me on this one. The compliance issue is what I am finding a tough one. We have -- You know, it is easy to say you are either NIMS compliant or you are not, an either/or. Well, that doesn't work.

We all here have had various courses that we have had to take or to be proficient in our disciplines and so forth, and so you have continual updates, and you have new courses and so forth. So it is not
an either/or situation.

What we are working on now, and I wish we were further along, but we are not, is that we are trying to come up with some metrics, because any fire department, any police department out there is never going to be 100 percent. You've got new people coming in. You've got people that have let their qualification lapse. You've got people that are out on sick leave. You can never achieve that 100 percent. We are understanding that.

So we are trying to go to a common sense approach. I don't know what the magic number will be. Is it 70 percent, 80 percent, or even is it a percentage? But we are trying to tackle that issue, because we know that 100 percent is not attainable. It is just not.

I don't know if that answers your question, but we are working closely on that one.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Nancy?

MR. KRUMPERMAN: Just to follow
up, I guess the issue, to some extent, is does it get it -- From an EMS perspective -- that is my background -- does it get involved into the baseline education, so everyone is, either through their original training or their continuing education? And I'm sure there is comparable things for other disciplines.

So that is the question. Is that the direction we are going to go? Right now, I don't think we have reached compliance as it was originally defined. We are not even close. So we need -- Obviously, you are trying to tackle the problem.

MR. GRANT: I just wish I had a better answer for you, but we recognize that. Within my division, we are -- I guess I will just say we are reassuming that role, and we are taking a more active interest in this, and this is very recent.

So I don't have an answer for you right now, but that is something we are very concerned about, and we are trying to work
forward.

Most of you probably are aware of NIMScast. It goes out to the states, and they are reporting to NIMScast. We are trying to make that a more interactive process, so it is not just a check the block kind of thing and move on, but to actually make it more common sense approach. So that is sort of our first step down the road working with the states. but we understand your concern.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Nancy has been waiting patiently.

MS. DRAGANI: Comment about that, and then a couple of questions.

Please understand that right now the grants do stipulate that we are NIMS compliant, and as an SAA that leaves all of the SAAs hanging, if GAO ever does an audit, and we can't prove that we did, in fact, meet that compliance standard.

So understand reluctance on the part of FEMA to ever actually put anything in
writing that we could hang our hats on, but we
are either bound to uphold that compliance
activity and, in fact, not release dollars to
sub-grantees that are not compliant, which is
a challenge for us to do, or we run the risk
of running afoul of an audit. So it is a
pretty big issue. That whole compliance issue
is pretty significant for us.

MR. GRANT: And believe me, in my
prior life I was involved in a grant program.
So I'm familiar with that and the compliance
issues that it entails. Again, we are fully
cognizant of that. I am personally very
cognizant of it. So we taking that into
account.

MS. DRAGANI: I had actually a
couple of more. Can I go ahead?

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Sure. You've
got the mic.

MS. DRAGANI: Okay. That was a
comment. Then just a couple of comments and
a question.
I understand -- and this is actually back to Kevin. I understand the challenge in tailoring training, particularly 300 and 400, to particular disciplines. The reality is, though, right now 300, 400 is very, very fire focused, and it is wild land fire focused.

So it is a difficult frame of reference for, for instance, the emergency management community to spend five days in the classroom learning how to set up a base camp when that is not really what the EOC is going to do.

So I guess my recommendation -- Hang on, because I do have a recommendation. Eighty percent of it is the same. What would be helpful for EMI to provide is the 20 percent difference in the form of exercises, a classroom specific information that would address the differences between fire community, emergency management community, emergency management community/health
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community, because right now we tend to get the standard classroom instruction.

MR. MOLLOY: I clearly understand what you are saying. Trust me, I get a ton of calls on that. The effort has been made, once again, between EMI and NFA, to de-smoke it, if you will. It is an ongoing effort. You know, it is difficult to take something that has existed for 40 years, if you will, in a particular discipline and then take it and really try to massage it perfectly the first time.

We are not there. We know we are not there, but we are, in fact, making efforts to do that. And I do get that comment. I get it from law enforcement, public works, every group that I go out and speak to. We do get that comment. We are aware of it, and we are trying to deal with that.

MS. DRAGANI: Okay. A recommendation as well: For those of us at the state emergency management level and
probably local, we tend to have joint field offices with some regularity, if you have any kind of disaster history.

Joint field offices are a great opportunity to do some Federal/state training, and I don't think we take advantage of it enough. I know in Ohio our FCO for a recent disaster, at my request, put together a two-day, I think, training session where he brought in his leadership from the JFO, I brought in my leadership from the state, and we actually worked through a disaster to try and help us collectively understand the NRF and some of the NIMS concepts.

I would really encourage that opportunity, because you've got state and Federal folks that are in one location, should be relative easy to accomplish.

Then the last question -- this is actually a question: I continue to hear from both state and local partners that our Federal -- other Federal agency partners are not only
not NIMS compliant, but as one director told
me, can't even spell NIMS.

So you know, that is a challenge,
when we are working very hard among our
disciplines to make sure that we are compliant
and that we are taking these trainings, and
then we go out and interface with other
Federal partners who are not.

MR. MOLLOY: I can assure you
that, when I am standing in front of an
audience as the person who is responsible for
NIMS training, and someone says to me, by the
way, so and so from whatever was in and didn't
know what I was talking about, it is at best
embarrassing.

I can tell you that over the past
year, year and a half, we have had greater
interface with Federal agencies who were
perhaps lax, but I mean they are really
improving their training, getting involved
with NIMS and so forth.

I have done a lot of work with the
Air Force, and we have been able to tie their program into NIMS and things of that nature there. So the Federal agencies were lax. Some of them perhaps could do better, but I think everybody is, in fact, cognizant of the fact that NIMS isn't a "gee, it's nice if you would." No, it is a requirement. Read the book, if you will.

So we at FEMA, I think, are aware of that, and we are pushing it.

MS. DRAGANI: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Okay. We have a question, John. Then we will go to Jim.

MR. STENSGAR: Mine is more of a comment, I guess, to digress a little bit back to an issue that Christina had brought up relative to health care 300, 400.

I will just relate a quick story that I was actually a part of. I was the lead EMT, and just a quick scenario is: We had a major wildland fire in our back countries on our reservation. We had a crew bus tip over
and roll down off a pretty steep embankment about 60 yards down, a crew of 25 plus the driver.

We flew two criticals -- we actually had to transport two out to an LSE, flew them out up to Spokane to a major trauma center. We transported three criticals to the nearest hospital. Keep in mind, we are 13 miles on dirt road just to get to the highways, and then to the nearest hospital.

That event was fine. When the ambulance arrived, they had all the doctors in the emergency rooms waiting, and everything was prepped and ready to go.

We took 16 what we called walking woundeds to the hospital that was further away, and it was very disconcerting. I just happened -- We finished up with all the work that I needed to get done, but they also needed an EMT to go with the last ambulance, which I went with.

The first crew arrived at that
hospital, and this was the really

disconcerting part, to me. They were actually
told that they were going to be getting the
critically wounded individuals. They had one
RN nurse there waiting.

So talking about NIMS compliance
or just the standardized health care to
address some of these issues -- I mean, I just
have this vivid picture in the back of my mind
when we talk about these types of issues.

Knowing the area, knowing the
hospital and knowing that they do have -- at
that particular time, they had five doctors on
staff, and not to have one of them there
waiting for when our ambulances starting
arriving there was very disconcerting.

I just wanted to share that story,
and in support of providing -- you know,
looking at the options of having health care
300, 400 so that -- and you know, this is out
in rural America, and these are the issues
that -- some of the issues that we face on a
day to day basis.

MR. MOLLOY: Right.

MR. STENSGAR: I just wanted to share that story. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Thank you.

Jim.

MR. PATURAS: Yes. My question is directed toward your comments regarding the five-year plan. I believe you said there is going to be revision going on; you are going to do some sort of a focus group that you are setting up. I think you said in Virginia or something.

MR. MOLLOY: It has been going on.

MR. PATURAS: It has been going on? I guess the question is: So what role do you see the NAC and specifically, let's say, the NIMS Subcommittee, playing on that now so that we are not looking at a document seven months from now? We've got people. We've got a committee established. It is actually part of the original legislation. What role do you
see us playing on that group now rather than later?

MR. GRANT: I would just -- You bring up an interesting point. I have not considered that. The training plan has been out there for a couple of years, and it is on an annual update basis.

I think, if you make a recommendation through your subcommittee and so forth that, you know, we can take a more concerted look at your request. Off the top of my head, I just don't know with an answer of how that would work or how we could involve the NAC in it, because I would want it -- If I had involvement from the NAC, I would want it more throughout the entire process, not at the end, because we want -- and we involve stakeholders, and maybe it is a member of the NAC Subcommittee to be designated as a member of the work group. I don't know.

I would recommend that you make a recommendation through your Chairman, and then
we can take a more concerted look at how we could involve. I just don't know off the top of my head.

MR. PATURAS: No, I appreciate that, Don. I think that is kind of where -- Your suggestion is kind of where we are going, and I believe that the Subcommittee Chair will be making something like that kind of a recommendation later, won't you?

MR. MOLLOY: And that, quite honestly, would not be a problem. You know, once again, we already have a group. If we have a designated individual, not several hundred designated individuals, but we certainly would welcome that. I wouldn't see that as a problem.

MS. CATLETT: Just one more 300, 400 question. We are struggling at the hospital level with who is going to need to take those courses. Did I hear you say that you are coming out with either updated or more specific recommendations on that; and if so,
what was the time frame?

MR. MOLLOY: Yes. It is very difficult, as you can imagine, to go discipline by discipline, who should be taking what. If you go back to the original guidance, it kind of said everybody takes 100. If you are at this level, you take 200; middle management, 300; senior, whatever.

Kind of as a result of that, I think a lot of people have taken the training that don’t need to take the training, on the one hand. The flip side is some people who probably should have it have not taken it.

What we are trying to do is to reemphasize this fact, particularly as it relates to 300 and 400. The hospital, the school, the police department, the whatever, take a look at your emergency response plans, and take a look at the staffing involved there, and when you activate a hospital plan, when you are involved in a catastrophic event, which individuals in your organization have
different roles in dealing with that particular event, that incident, that emergency?

You make your decision who has to take that training based on that individual's role in your organization during an emergency response.

One of the things that we tried to do, because always everybody always says, well, the Feds demand this, and the Feds demand that -- We certainly don't know everybody's organization or who is in it and so forth. That is why we've tried to give, if you will, some leeway by saying you make the determination who in your staff is mid-level management that would be involved.

New York State Police -- I'll kind of use them as an example, because I happened to talk to those folks one time, and sergeants, I guess, are kind of like mid-level people in their organization. Might have been sergeant or some other rank. Makes no
difference.

As their training officer said to me, you know, if we trained all -- we have 22,000 whatevers, and if we trained them all, it would have cost us this amount of money. So what we did is we took a look at everybody with a rank of sergeant. We said, okay, these 12 are going to retire in the next six months, and these really don’t have any major role when we activate our plan, and they made that call that, okay, these are the sergeants that we need to train, and they made that call, and they made that determination.

Perhaps we didn’t spell it out clearly enough when we came out with the original documents, but we are aware of that, and we are trying to make it as clear as we possibly can.

MR. FELDMAN: On that same note, as you are dealing with those courses, though, where everybody needs to take them, whether it is the 100 or 700 or 800, have you reconciled
that everybody doesn't necessarily have to be
everybody at this point?

I come from a local organization,
and it is hard to justify taking part-time
clerical people that will be at home during an
event, and just because they are an employee,
to run them through training evolutions. It
becomes difficult, especially when there is
high turnover in those types of situations.

MR. MOLLOY: The township I live
in is about 3,000 people, and the secretary
traditionally stays home. They don't have to
take it, because they are not involved in the
process. However, there are a couple of other
township employees who do, in fact, respond.
They drive the dumptruck with the snowplow, if
you will, that type of thing, and they are
involved in the response. Those are the types
of folks that we want to see.

When we say everybody, once again
it goes back to the people that are involved
in your emergency plan, in your response,
should have at least that basic understanding of the system, that there is a process and a system. And it is an online course, if you will, the IS-100. It takes 45 minutes to an hour.

MR. FELDMAN: I know. We have run 1,000 through it. But the point that I am trying to make is that the guidance right now does refer to everybody, and if that is not the intent, I think ultimately the guidance needs to be modified, because out of that 9 million that you have gone through the online courses, I think there a lot of those nonessential employees that have taken that, and it is worthwhile.

MR. MOLLOY: Yes.

MR. FELDMAN: I mean, it is good information, but when you have limited training opportunities, it is a matter of where do you put the focus.

MR. MOLLOY: Right.

MR. FELDMAN: Second question I
had goes back to the NIMS training and the credentialing. The credentialing process is moving forward. Is the training going to be there ahead of the credentialing or will the training -- do you see the training have to be developed in order to meet the credentialing requirements?

MR. MOLLOY: I can't give you a specific answer other than to say Kyle Blackman, who is also in IMSID, is primarily heading up credentialing issues and so forth, and he and I talk, and we work together.

So we are trying to tie things in as closely as we can. You know, one thing to understand: As we develop a course, you know, that is something, obviously, that isn't done in a week's time. It is a process. So that is why we do work with Kyle to try to identify potential needs as quickly as we can, get them into the system, fund them, and that type of thing.

MR. GRANT: I would just add that,
as we develop new courses within -- or I shouldn't say courses. When we look at developing new guidelines or what I classify as tools that support NIMS, if training courses are required or we think are required, our tie-in is that we have Kevin where he is. We know that coming down the road, and I can tailor my budget to support that initiative.

So from my standpoint, I feel like I have good connectivity with my training folks, because I've got a program manager where that person needs to be to oversee what I am contracting for, plus I can look down the road to ensure that we have those courses that are coming online either simultaneously with the new guidance or shortly thereafter. So we can synchronize.

That has always been an issue everywhere I have been, where new guidance comes out, but the training courses never follow suit. So we are cognizant of that. We try to minimize that.
MR. MOLLOY: Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen. I didn't want to be accused of running over, because I am talking too much.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: No, you are fine. Stay there.

MR. MOLLOY: Well, we Boston Irishmen always like a microphone.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Chuck?

MR. KMET: And I appreciate it. With family history of Alzheimer's and me having attention deficit disorder, I've been thinking of these several different things several times. The cool thing was that they were really good ideas every time I thought of them.

One real quick thing to what Nancy said. I really like what you were talking about with doing the training at JFOs and stuff like that during incidents, because that is one thing that wildland fire does do, is that they charge a lot of those things to
training and everything else. They will charge it to a fire.

A comment that I have on rural America -- and this is just rural American in general, whether it be tribes or just anywhere rural -- there are still, believe it or not, some places that don't have Internet access or much for Internet access beyond, what was it, 56k or whatever it was back in the day.

So I strongly encourage EMI to continue to do the outreach in the more traditional manners. I know that it gets tough. I've heard how much your budgeting costs are for sending stuff out, because of postage and what-not, but I still strongly encourage that.

Kind of the question that I have -- and it is not just for IMSI, but I think it is probably for NFA and for EMI, but it has come up more so now with the NIMS stuff -- is what is your role with regard to working with the states to ensure that, when someone takes
one of your train-the-trainer courses, that they are a trainer now, and it is not just for the FEMA stamp but for the state stamp as well?

We have run into that issue, and I know that there have been other folks in other states that talked about that, and that when it comes to the higher level courses like the 300 and 400, a state for NIMS compliance won't recognize just the FEMA stamp, which you would think would be the overarching stamp of the whole thing, but then they are saying that, in order to be considered NIMS compliant at that level, that you have a certificate that has a state stamp, which means also a state instructor as well.

I know that that can be a real issue with regard to training.

MR. MOLLOY: I get calls about that all the time. I can tell you that in the existing NIMS five-year plan and in the new one, we do address instructor credentials. In
order to be a lead instructor versus a unit
instructor, you should have this level of
training.

All of the state training
officers, and I deal with them all the time --
they are aware of these requirements. When a
state level course is delivered, they are the
ones that give a certificate, and most of the
states -- not all of the states, but most of
the states, in fact, have their own lists.

The train-the-trainer programs
that we are doing now or that we are going to
be doing shortly for the position specific
training -- the requirement that we are giving
the states is, for the first go-round, or the
regions is we will take three or four from
each region, because we don't want the classes
too huge.

Here is how you will submit your
75-5, your general application. The state and
the region training people will take a look to
see if your credentials are good enough to
take the course, in the first place. So we are involving them in the process as quickly as we can.

A reality here: You are always going to run into a situation where, for whatever reason, somebody doesn't, quote-unquote, want to "recognize" somebody else's. This is why we are striving to get away from the is it an EMI this or an NFA this or such and such this, and why we are trying to make sure that it is a 300 course or it is a whatever.

I get, once again, calls all the time: Well, this state won't recognize it, and we do try to deal with that on an individual basis. It's a tough nut to crack sometimes.

In reference to your other question, just very quickly, in Pennsylvania it is a very rural state where I live, like 2,561 local elected municipalities, and some of them don't have Internet, and we are aware...
of that. That is a situation where we encourage the state folks at PEMA and their region people to go to Snowshoe Volunteer Fire Company and do the training in-house and that type of thing. So we do encourage that.

I do get a lot of calls from local folks directly. Everybody’s got my number, I think.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Okay. Did we exhaust our questions? We could probably go all day, but I think you are probably ready to leave.

MR. MOLLOY: No, my wife knows I could, too. It makes her nervous.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: We do have one quick one. You are not quite off the hook.

VICE CHAIRMAN GOUGELET: This is actually not a question. I just wanted to say that, in regards to charging for courses and things, that we make every effort to make sure that they are available for free to everybody.

Most of the people are
volunteering, and this is one of the things that helps build motivation, of course, gives the whole organization credibility. But you know, they dedicate all of this time for free. So the least that we should do is give them free training for what we need them for.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Okay. Thank you very much. We appreciate it, and thank you.

MR. MOLLOY: And thank you, folks. Appreciate your courtesy.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Thank you. Okay. Next, we are going to go to Russ Decker for the report.

Just so -- After Russ's report, which he says is about five minutes or more, we will then take a break, and we are going to go ahead and ask Joe Bruno to come forward with the report-out of his Task Force Working Group. So we will move that ahead on the agenda, since we have time. We will move up to that point. All right, Russ.
MR. DECKER: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Got a new topic, NIMS. Thought we would talk about that for a little bit.

The Subcommittee charge, I think, certainly hasn’t changed, and I would encourage you to look at it in your handout, but I want to talk a little bit about what the Subcommittee did yesterday.

We met first thing in the morning for two and a half hours, and it was a full two and a half hours, I think, for the committee.

The first thing we did was we looked at the new revised NIMS document that came out in December of 2008, and we certainly publicly wanted to pass along to Don and everybody at FEMA that we appreciated the fact that they did listen to the NAC when we sent up some comments on the revised NIMS and implemented some of the changes that we had requested when the final document came out.
So we appreciate that. It was nice to know that not only did we send things up, but they actually listened to what the NAC had to say, and we appreciate that.

The next issue that we spent a lot of time on is what we have been talking about a lot in the last few minutes, and that is this whole compliance thing. I think it was the feeling of the committee that compliance, just the word compliance, is something FEMA may want to take a second look at.

You know, I found it interesting. Acting Director Ward this morning talking to us, and she talked about morale. I think nothing could probably hurt FEMA morale more than if they started being viewed like the EPA and some of the other regulatory agencies that are out there, and I am afraid that is where you are going to get if you keep harping on compliance.

What we would like to see are NIMS goals or NIMS projections or something
else that doesn't sound as harsh as compliance. Really, I think one of the committee members -- I don't remember who it was, but talked about substantial. If they were going to keep the word compliance, then have substantially compliant as one of the requirements, so that you allow for this flexibility of people coming and going and changing positions and those types of things.

One of the things we also talked about is that it has to be flexible, and we are talking about the requirements. An example that I gave is in Ohio, for instance, we get the SERC, which is our State Emergency Response Commission -- our counties get some grant monies to help run their LEPCs.

One of the things that they have to do every year to get that money is they have to fill out a survey or a grant application.

On that application it asks the county to determine, specifically to Hazmat,
how many responders do you have in your community; how many are trained at awareness level; how many are trained at Ops level; how many are trained at technician level; how many would you like to see trained at those levels.

So that it is the local jurisdiction trying to set their benchmark and not trying to use a cookie cutter approach where the benchmark needs to be the same, as we say, in New York City or Topeka. It doesn’t make a lot of sense. There’s a wide difference of how those communities function and operate, and we just think it has to be taken into account.

We came up with some tools in our discussion. By the way, Don was there. Don Grant was at our committee meeting. So we had a chance to share this with him directly. But some of the things we talked about is: We have a lot of communities and states as well trying to update their emergency operations plans or their disaster plans for their
communities, and trying to use the ESF language and get away from the old annex language.

We think there needs to be a standard, consistent type of a NIMS crosswalk so that, if somebody walks in and says who is doing ESF-3, and somebody is still on the old annex format that we used for years, you would be able to understand what they are talking about and be able to quickly see what we are doing here.

For those communities that want to go to ESF -- it is not a requirement yet, but for those who want to on their local plans, certainly, it would give them consistency across the country. So that everybody would be converting it the same way, and we would be talking apples and apples.

One of the things that came out of our discussion as well -- and I saw this on a couple of the other subcommittee reports; so it is interesting. There are some common
tunes out there. That is a common depository for lessons learned and best practices.

Our committee's suggestion was that that might be a good project for EMI, that maybe that could be something EMI could be the depository for all that information.

Certainly, EMI is the -- should be the focal point for where we go for emergency management best practices and what our colleagues are doing, and it would make sense to maybe house it out there.

Then we also talked about the fact that, with this revision of NIMS in 2008, one of the things that was included in that is the fact that the NIMS document is going to be revised and revisited every two years.

We asked that the Subcommittee be brought along throughout the entire process, so that, unlike some of the other things we talked about earlier today, the housing strategy and some other things where we get in at the last minute and then just get to look
at the final product, that to involve us in
the discussions and the process throughout --
you know, if we know it is coming up in two
years, then it is not a mystery.

So this summer when we meet, we
are 18 months away. So we ought to be -- At
some point we have asked them if they could
come back and show us a timeline on how are
they going to go about revising the NIMS
document, and keep us apprised along the
timeline of where we can have some input, so
that it is not just a big shock to us that it
is coming up every two years.

We didn't talk about this in the
Subcommittee, but taking it from the remarks
that were just made, I would add any of those
projects that are NIMS related where there is
a specific timeline on an ongoing basis, it
would be nice if that were shared with the
Subcommittee, such as the training guidelines
and things.

Those are an ongoing document that
is constantly under review, and certainly there should be time in that process somewhere for the NAC to be involved in taking a look at what is being talked about for changes, and possibly we might have some changes we would like to have some input as well.

That was pretty much it. We really were stressing, I think, in our committee a common sense approach to NIMS implementation.

We made the comment in the committee that, you know, we can't get 535 members of Congress to take 100 and 800. How do you expect on a local level that we are going to get county commissioners, mayors, city council members, towns and trustees to take 100 and 800. It is not going to fly.

There has got to be some common sense approach to what is NIMS compliance, which is why we said we got to get rid of the word. Just take the whole word out, and talk about these are our NIMS goals for local
communities or NIMS goals by disciplines or regions, but not necessarily you are either compliant or you are not compliant, because we are fooling ourselves.

If you check the box and say you are NIMS compliant and you know you got a county commissioner who said I am not taking a crazy course, then you just know you are checking the box and you probably shouldn’t have done that.

I’m looking at Nancy. She is smiling, because the states get the information from the locals, and they just have to take it at face value. So we are really self-evaluating right now anyway. So I think we just need to be more honest with the nation about what we are doing with NIMS.

If any of the other committee members or Vice Chair, Jim, if you’ve got anything that I missed. You don’t have anything to add.

MR. PATURAS: I think it goes back
to some of the discussion we had earlier with Kevin and Don. You know, how strong do we want to make a pitch, at least on the NIMS side -- there are plenty of other initiatives going on around this table that could say the same thing -- at least a strong recommendation from this group through the NAC that says, you know, we would like to be involved in some of that process at an earlier stage, and make it more of a recommendation that goes on behalf of the NAC, if everyone agrees to that, so that if it is the five-year plan, as you said, or it is the NIMS plan every two years, you know, we will be involved at an earlier stage and be able to give input, bring that back to the NAC so NAC has the ability to also react to that.

MR. DECKER: Yes. I think, if you read what PKEMRA, which created us, I think the Congress was pretty clear that this is the kind of thing they expected the NAC to work on, was NIMS and the National Response
Framework.

So I think there has got to be a way that we are included in that process, because I think that is what Congress is expecting us to do.

Any other comments or questions?

MR. DIDION: Thanks, Russ. I think the key issue for our committee and for many of the small agencies throughout the country is the state of the economy. That makes the compliance issue even more critical.

I am listening, and I haven't heard -- You know, I have heard different versions of where we are going from different people, and I think one of the most important things we need to do is listen to what is happening.

As all disasters are local, no one will argue against that, we need to be sure to include that flexibility, so the people in the teeth of the storm can pre-plan and have whatever resources that they are going to
prioritize, because our budgets are getting slashed all over the country.

At least in our area, emergency management services, you know, are going. The Sheriff in the county next to mine -- they did away with their emergency management division, which was like three people, and transferred that authority to him, no funding.

I think that, you know, we will be able to respond. We will always do our best, but it is absolutely key that there is coordination at Federal, state and local level, and just so we can get ahead of the curve, so we can do everything we possibly can and receive all the help that we need from the Federal government.

I guess I would reinforce Russ's words. We are very, very happy with the steps we have taken so far. It seems as if folks are listening, and I hope we can continue to do that. Thanks.

MR. DECKER: Any other questions?
CHAIRMAN BENNETT: I would just make a comment. We have some of our team members that have to go out on disasters, Federal and around, and the good reports I get back is that the framework is being put into place.

So that's the good news. We have a lot of training, a lot of things to do, but it is being utilized now, which is really good to hear back.

Are there any other questions? Okay. Why don't we take a break for, what -- Joe, how long is it going to take you to get ready to go? Fifteen, 10? Ten minutes, okay.

If we could take a 10-minute break, and then we will resume or come back together.

(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the record at 2:29 p.m. and went back on the record at 2:45 p.m.)

MS. PRICE: We are getting ready to move on with the meeting, and it looks like
we are going to end a little bit early today.
We are going to have one more presentation
after Mr. Buckley provides his briefing.

MR. BUCKLEY: Well, you are about
to witness the best part of your program over
the last couple of days, mitigation.
Mitigation is such a key component to what
FEMA does.

My name is Mike Buckley. I am the
Acting Assistant Administrator for the
Mitigation Directorate, also serve as the
Deputy Assistant Administrator. Mr.
Morristead, a political appointee, left, I
guess, last September and has moved on, and I
have been in that position since that time.
But I have been in mitigation all my career in
one form or another, with FEMA 28 1/2 years,
and so I understand the mitigation, and I am
certainly a strong advocate for it.

I always say that, once a
mitigator, always a mitigator, but it is an
extremely important part of the entire
emergency management cycle. You've got recovery. You've got response. You've got preparedness, but you also need to have a mitigation component in that cycle.

Without mitigation, you are going to continue to see the same damages over and over and over again, and mitigation does work. We have conducted studies that show that, for every dollar spent on mitigation, there is a return of four dollars in reduced damages in the future. That is a good investment, certainly a whole lot better than the stock market is doing these days. But mitigation does truly work.

One of the first things that should come to mind at all levels of government when they are starting to recover from a disaster, they need to ask the question, how can we do it better so this doesn't happen again?

It is an opportune moment.

funding is available from a number of
different sources. We will talk a little bit about those a little bit later on, but you've got to ask that question. If you don't ask the question, then you are really missing the big opportunity.

Outside the context of a disaster, we also have funding that is available as well. So you need to think about mitigation on a continual basis.

We estimate that all of our grant programs, mitigation grant programs, and the activities that are taken at the local level to participate in the National Flood Insurance Program, the annualized savings in losses avoided from all of those programs is approximately $2.5 billion, and this is on an annualized basis, and it continues to increase over time.

So mitigation has got to be a strong component, certainly at the local level. We have great programs that encourage that. We've got funding that is available to
implement projects, and so forth. So mitigation is key.

About three years ago, we took a look at how the Mitigation directorate was organized, and we really identified what our lines of businesses were and the value that we are providing to society as a whole. So we tried to align our businesses with those values, and we came up with three main business lines.

One is risk analysis. Doug Bellomo, who is going to get up after I sit down in a couple of minutes, is the Division Director for our Risk Analysis Division. He is going to talk a bit about that.

Risk Reduction Division -- That is where a lot of the grant programs are. We also manage the National Earthquake Hazard Reduction Program in there. We have a very strong building science component in that division as well.

Finally, risk insurance.
Insurance is a key component in the recovery process. If you get flooded and you don’t have insurance, you are going to get some money from the Federal government, from FEMA, a limited amount. You may be able to get a loan that you have to pay back, but if you have insurance, you don’t have to pay that back.

I have to tell you, insurance is a tough sell. A lot of people say, of course, you should have insurance, flood insurance. It’s a tough sell. We are going through a remapping process right now, map modernization process right now.

Doug and I were talking on the way over here, that we are coming across some of the older maps for communities that had levees and before we had a real levee policy on how we were going to treat those in terms of mapping. We had accredited levees on our old maps that we are finding that really should not have been or do not conform to the current
requirements for accreditation, and we are
getting all kinds of resistance: Oh, please
don't put these people in the floodplain,
because they have to buy insurance.

You know, New Orleans should have
been a wake-up call for all levee owners.
Unfortunately, it wasn't. The '93 floods in
the Midwest should have been a wake-up call
for levee owners, and it wasn't.

What is waking these people up are
the fact that we are coming in with our maps,
and we are going to be showing flood zones
behind the levees that don't meet our
criteria, and people are going to have to buy
flood insurance.

Levee owners should be thinking
about safety, but the feedback we are getting
is we don't want our citizens in these
economic times to have to buy flood insurance.
If that is the only way that we can get some
improvements to the levees so they are a
little bit safer or a lot safer, you know, let
them use the excuse of flood insurance. Whatever it is that starts that discussion is what is important.

Just a few -- Let me just mention a few outputs of the national Flood Insurance Program. There are 5.5 million policies nationwide insuring over a trillion dollars in property, revenues on the order of $3 billion a year in premiums.

As a result of Katrina, I'm sure some of you know this, where we experienced really significant losses, more losses during that event than were experienced in the program in its entire history, and currently we are $19 billion in debt. We are working with the Hill, with the administration, and the Department on legislation that we can deal with that, but that is a major program that is in Mitigation.

Our flood mapping program: Of course, that supports the Flood Insurance program, but it supports a lot of other
activities as well. We are launching -- moving from a map modernization initiative into a more integrated mapping program where we bring in planning, risk assessment into the equation. Doug will talk a bit about that.

Flood plain management: I talked about the benefits that we are deriving from enforcement of local ordinances when it comes to building in and near the floodplain.

Disaster resistant building practices: One of the great programs that -- I think it gets recognized, but maybe a lot of people don't know about it. That is, after a major disaster, we go in and do some forensic engineering.

We want to find out what worked and what didn't work, and we produce publications. We have meetings with the local building trades, local officials, to explain to them better ways to build, to build back, and get them to understand why things didn't work the way they did.
Hazard mitigation assistance projects: I mentioned we have several grant programs. Over the last 20 years of funding that has been made available for all of our grant programs totals about $9 billion. If you do the math on that, for every dollar you spend, you avoid four dollars in the future of losses, $36 billion in losses avoided for that investment.

We also in Mitigation have the environmental planning and historic preservation function for the entire agency. Organizationally, it is in Mitigation, but it is an important function for the entire agency.

Let me stop right there and turn it over to Doug. We do want to leave some time for questions, and we know we are a little bit ahead of schedule, and we will try and get through the discussions so that there is enough time for questions, but thank you.

MR. BELLOMO: Good afternoon. I
am Doug Bellomo. I am a professional engineer. I am the Director of the Risk Analysis Division within the Mitigation Directorate. I have not been with FEMA for 28 years, but I have been for about 12.

You know, Mike said, once you are a mitigator, you are always a mitigator. I consider myself in that category of probably always being a mitigator.

Albert Einstein said the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over and expecting a different result. So if you are not insane, then you are a mitigator, too, because you understand that issue, and you know that, if you want to make things better, you’ve got to change the way you are doing it today.

With that, within our Division -- and I will just punch through all of these real quick. Within the Risk Analysis Division, we identify hazards. The primary hazard we identify, really, is the flood
hazard under the National Flood Insurance Program, but we do identify other hazards by providing some tools.

We assess risks, meaning we overlay that flood hazard on top of the built environment to sort of quantify what is it that is exposed, whether it is to flooding, whether it is to earthquakes, wind. We have some tools to do that.

So we identify hazards. We assess the risks. We have tools to assess those risks. Then we work with state and local governments to plan to mitigate those threats.

So after they have been identified, after we have quantified the risk, we work to reduce them by engaging state and local governments.

There are some requirements to have these mitigation plans, if you will, in place in order to receive funding after disasters, and the plans that are generated are also updated on a cyclical process, three
years, five years, depending on whether it is a state or local mitigation plan, and we provide some technical assistance and tools to move communities through this mitigation planning process.

As Mike mentioned, we are essentially wrapping up a $1 billion investment to update the nation’s flood maps, the maps that are used as part of the National Flood Insurance Program. Those maps are accessed some 30-40 million times a year.

We have converted the -- will by the end of the initiative converted all the flood insurance rate maps to a GIS modern, 21st Century mapping platform. We will have built a program management infrastructure, but we are in the process now of going to the next level, if you will.

So now that we’ve got all this data and information and we are working to analyze the risks, what is next for us? We are kicking off this risk MAP initiative, if
you will. MAP is an acronym for Mapping, Analysis and Planning.

Essentially, the cycle you see here on the left is one where we identify the threats, primarily flooding in terms of the National Flood Insurance program. We go the next step and really analyze and quantify that threat, if you will, from a dollar perspective, perhaps from a loss of life perspective, showing communities these are specifically where your risks are.

So there is a very distinction between a hazard and a risk. So we go that next step. We assess the risks, and then the really critical part is communicating that.

I think where we have suffered in the past is that we have really not communicated the risk as well as we could have. So we are really pushing to make sure we communicate it appropriately.

Then -- and Deb is going to talk about this -- the last part of that circle
there at about seven or eight o’clock is to mitigate the risk, which is now that you have identified the risk, you have assessed it, you have effectively communicated it to state and local governments or citizens or business owners or property owners or whoever the case may be, and you have planned to reduce it, it is time to take action.

That is where Deb’s group comes in. The vision for Risk MAP is noted here. There are basically three main pieces.

Good quality data: What we found in going through map modernization is that, if you don’t have good, sound science, engineering and data, you might as well stop right there. State and local government expect to see good data, and we intend to deliver that.

Public Awareness is the other big piece. We want to make sure we are effectively communicating this risk information. Importantly, we want to make
sure what it is we are communicating is having an effect. It is actually leading to action to reduce the risk to life and property.

So those are the three main pieces of our vision statement. I am going to step through about five goals that we have identified for Risk MAP. I will touch on them very briefly.

The first goal is to address gaps. We know we have gaps in the flood hazard data, and our intent is to address those head-on. So the first goal is really to have the right science and engineering and data so that, when we do these risk assessments and we roll out these products, people can have comfort that they are, in fact, the best science and engineering.

The second goal is around the part of the vision statement that talks about increasing awareness and leading to action. These goals are somewhat in order of priority. So being number two means it is very important
to us.

            We really do want to see communities go from a state of unawareness, really, if you will, at the very bottom left intersection of these two lines to a state of awareness, but then importantly, to an understanding that this is, in fact, the case, and then preferably all the way up through to taking action and changing behavior.

            The third goal, if you will, out of the five that we have identified is planning. We've got to make sure that we get good, sound mitigation plans in place.

            Mike mentioned the opportunities that disasters present from a mitigation perspective. They are very significant. What we have also seen, however, is that after big disasters, there is a lot of activity, heat, political pressure, media, intensity in terms of recovery, and sometimes speed can be the issue that people want to see first. They want to see recovery come quick, and
mitigation sometimes doesn't necessarily rise
to the level of importance that maybe it
should be.

By having a mitigation plan in
place prior to a disaster, you can meet that
requirement of actually being quick. You have
a plan to recover. You know what you are
going to do, if your community is damaged
significantly. You know how you are going to
rebuild back that community. You know what
building standards you are going to put in
place. You know what requirements you are
going to have.

So having a good, strong
mitigation plan in place prior to a disaster
is a significant output, if you will, of what
we are planning in Risk MAP.

The fourth and fifth are almost
facilitators, if you will, for the other three
goals. Technology is moving so quickly, we
didn't think we could afford not to address it
some way in our goals.
So we want to stay apace, keep up pace with technology, if you will. We want to enhance our digital platform. We want to take the enhancements and the technology of today and use it to more effectively communicate what the risks are and the sharing of the data, give people different views into the information so that they can use it and take action and really facilitate that at all levels of government, from the state and local all the way to the homeowner or business owner or land speculator, if you will.

The fifth goal is, I think, one that kind of goes without saying, but it is important that we keep our eye on it, which is why we have listed it in terms of being a priority.

We want to make sure that FEMA is not getting crosswise with, say, the Army Corps of Engineers. The Army Corps of Engineers goes out. They do a lot of flood control projects. We want to make sure that
the policies and practices and procedures we have in place for identifying flood hazards is properly aligned with what the Corps is doing.

NOAA is another example. They are going out. They are doing vulnerability assessments for coastal communities. We want to make sure that what we are doing lines up with them.

Importantly, you know, externally, that makes a lot of sense, but also internally. Within FEMA, we want to make sure that the different components within the agency understand that the data is available to help them do their jobs as well. So synergies in alignment is another important piece of what we are doing.

So in terms of the solutions and what we have planned for the future, the vast majority of the resources we get for this program do go out into the world.

They go out into the hands of state and local governments who help us
identify these flood hazards, who help us communicate flood risk. They go out to engineering, architectural and engineering firms to help us out into the private sector.

So there is a stimulus of the economy, to some degree. Again, 95 percent of the money we get, either through appropriations or through fees collected under the National Flood Insurance Program, go out into the hands of people other than FEMA.

We want to make sure that we fully engage state and local communities to develop these mitigation plans. This is, again, a very key part of our future.

Really, getting beyond simple awareness of flood hazards to the public actually understanding what those flood hazards are and, equally important, understanding what steps they can take as individuals or as communities to reduce the risk and costs over the long term to floods and other threats.
So with that, I will turn it over to Deb.

MS. INGRAM: Thanks, Don. Good afternoon. I am Deb Ingram. I am the Director of the Risk Reduction Division within the Mitigation Directorate, and it is within my Division that we provide the tools and the funds to assist states and communities to take the actions that Mike and Doug have been talking about.

We do that through three major programs: The Floodplain Management Program, our building sciences program which works with disaster resistant building practices, and then our five grant programs.

Floodplain management: Let me just talk about that. First, we have -- Actually, this is a little bit outdated -- currently over 21,000 participating communities in the National Flood Insurance Program.

These are communities that have
received maps. They have identified -- We have identified on the maps for them their special flood hazard areas, and they choose to join into the NFIP. Through that, their agreement is that they will adopt local ordinances that will control the building in those floodplains, and in return for that, they have the ability to receive insurance under the National Flood Insurance Program.

So this is one of our major programs. Mike talked about that earlier, and we receive -- I believe it is just over $1.3 billion in annual losses avoided through this program alone, through the adoption of local ordinances and building codes that strengthen building practices and make communities more disaster resistant. Yes?

MS. CATLETT: When you say they can get insurance, are you talking about the community purchases it as a group or individuals are purchasing it?

MS. INGRAM: Individuals.
MS. CATLETT: Thank you.

MS. DRAGANI: Deb, you may want to then clarify the flip side. If an individual isn’t a participating member of NFIP -- I mean, if the community is not participating or sanctioned, there is an impact on individuals’ ability to purchase. Correct?

MS. INGRAM: That is correct.

MS. DRAGANI: It is a two-way street, I guess.

MS. INGRAM: It is a two-way street, and if the community is not participating and they have been mapped, and their flood hazard has been identified, they also are not eligible for certain types of disaster assistance.

So it is very important -- It is a very important program, not only gets to that third business line for us which is insuring your residual risk when you can’t take an action, but there is also some sanctions to try to enforce that as well.
MS. CATLETT: Thank you.

MS. INGRAM: I just want to mention the Executive Order 11988. This has been around for, I think, about 30 years now. As the National Flood Insurance Program, FEMA has primary responsibility for implementation of this Executive Order, and we serve as a consulting agency to other Federal agencies to assist them in their implementation of the Executive Order.

The intent here is to avoid, to the extent possible, the long and short term adverse impacts associated with occupancy of the floodplain, and it is not to totally limit building there, but where Federal dollars are concerned, we want to minimize the impact of what is done there and to create consistent policies for how to do that. So I just wanted to bring that to your attention.

Every Federal agency has responsibility to develop regulations on how they are going to implement this program.
I want to move over into building sciences. This is a group of engineers. Mike referred to them earlier. We do a lot of work on building codes. We work with a variety of experts, with the building community, with the International Code Council.

We do our forensic work in a post-disaster situation. We identify what worked and what didn’t work. We share that information. We produce a number of documents, some of which you see here, that assist in the recovery process, but then also go forward to be adopted into the International Code Council and adopted there by states and local communities, again to strengthen their building codes and make them more disaster resistant.

We also -- Just to get away from flood for a second, and Mike mentioned this, we have responsibility for the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program or NEHRP. We are one of four Federal agencies that have
statutory responsibility for NEHRP.

NIST, as you see here, conducts the R&D. NSF does basic research and, of course, USGS has targeted research on seismic maps, monitoring and reporting on earthquakes.

We work together very collaboratively. FEMA's role is to take all those research and development results and turn them into loss reduction measures. Again, this is through our building sciences group.

What you see here are several publications. We have a lot of publications that provide outreach, education and training efforts. These are available for everything from private homeowners to very detailed guidance for building owners or for architects and engineers who are designing buildings. So a great deal.

We take great effort to take all of the information that we can pull together and learn about what the best building
practices are and put those into tools that can be used at any level.

I want to talk now quickly about our five mitigation grant programs. We have programs that have different funding triggers, different statutory authorities, but they all work together to give funds to states and communities to assist them to actually reduce their losses to future actions based on the risk analysis that they have done in the past, the planning that Doug talked about.

This is the opportunity to take some Federal dollars. Of course, that is not the only opportunity. States and locals use their own dollars, and private citizens can take action as well, but these are some Federal funds that are made available on a cost share basis to assist communities.

The Hazard Mitigation Grant Program is our oldest program. It is the post-disaster program. Funds are made available to states and communities on a
formula basis after an event.

As Doug talked about, and Mike, too, this is really the opportunity during the post-recovery process to take a look at what your damages were, try to ascertain what your vulnerabilities are to future hazards, and try to, as you rebuild, do it in a way that you will reduce those vulnerabilities.

We also have a pre-disaster mitigation grant program. This is a nationally competitive program. It is available to all states and communities, whether or not they have had a disaster declaration.

So it gives an opportunity to those who haven't had a declaration recently or perhaps to communities who have had a small disaster that would be large for them but not enough to qualify for a Presidential declaration to have access to some mitigation funds.

Then through the National Flood
Insurance Program, we have three different flood insurance mitigation programs: The Flood Mitigation Assistance Program, the Repetitive Floodplains, and the Severe Repetitive Loss.

Each has a little bit of a different nuance there, but as you can see, we have a lot of programs and a lot of dollars that are available to states and communities to assist them in taking actions, and these funds can be used to mitigate public structures as well as private structures.

When we provide funding under the Hazard Mitigation -- any of the hazard mitigation assistance programs, we do them based on risk. We use benefit cost analysis to ensure that the dollars, the Federal dollars as well as the state and local dollars, the match dollars, are being put to good use.

We look at the history of damages to the structure, and we project what those
would be in the future based on past severity
and frequency of the events, and we conduct a
cost/benefit analysis.

FEMA provides tools to assist
communities and states to do this, and we
calculate them, and we only fund projects when
they are cost effective, when at least we will
see the projected losses avoided to equal or
exceed the investment of the grant.

As Mike said, and I will show you
in a minute, we have some documented studies
that show that our cost/benefit return
investment really far exceeds what we would
have anticipated.

This is just a breakdown of our
projects from our predecessor mitigation
program for '08, just to show you that there
is a variety of hazards that we address here,
everything from flooding to seismic, wildfire,
landslide, a whole host of things.

Some of the typical projects that
we fund are things like acquisition of
floodplain properties from the floodplain and remove them, either destroy them or relocate them to another location that is not flood prone, elevation of structures, structural and nonstructural, retrofits including seismic retrofits, projection for utilities, perhaps a localized flood control project to protect a piece of critical infrastructure, and we also fund mitigation planning, and there are some others as well, but those are some of the main ones.

I already mentioned the studies. Oh, I think we’ve got a couple here. We’ve got a four-to-one from the Multi-Hazard Mitigation Council for several years ago that said four-to-one. For every dollar you spent, four dollars was saved.

Recently, the Congressional Budget Office did a study of our predecessor Mitigation Program and found in that program alone that we have an average of three dollars saved for every dollar invested in mitigation.
So we have got good outside investigation into our grant programs that really documents the savings.

I want to stop there with the risk reduction and just turn to a second for the environmental and historic preservation aspects of our program that Mike talked about earlier.

We do have responsibility for ensuring compliance with over a dozen Federal laws and regulations concerning environmental and historic preservation concerns, and these are things that we have to address for all of FEMA’s grant programs, not just the mitigation grant programs but the preparedness, recovery programs as well.

The opportunity here is to help communities and states as they consider their mitigation alternatives or consider their recovery alternatives to think about building into them environmental planning and historic preservation so that they can preserve their
communities and preserve their wetlands and other endangered species or whatever.

So we work with them. Sometimes this is looked as something that keeps things from moving forward, but really we try to build this into the planning process as an opportunity to comprehensively look at the situation in your community and make good, sound decisions that involve not just that immediate decision, for example, on the recovery, but some of the longer term impacts of that that are associated with the environmental and historic preservation.

So I will stop there and see if you have any questions. Yes?

MR. DIDION: Is coastal flooding -
- Is that in reference to tsunamis? Is that included in coastal flooding? Is that a different category?

MR. BUCKLEY: Some of our maps do include a tsunami component in the establishment of flood elevations. I know in
Hawaii we have done that, also on certain sections of the coast of California, Oregon. So we do take tsunamis into consideration.

MS. COLLINS: Are there some additional benefits to use mitigation dollars when you are building or rebuilding a facility to hardshell it?

MR. BUCKLEY: Absolutely. You know, you saw the numbers, four to one, benefits for four to one, and we do have, as Deb mentioned, numerous publications. We do have outreach. We have training for local officials and so forth.

So there is an opportunity for mitigation, not just after a disaster but when you are building or rebuilding something.

MS. CATLETT: I thought this was really interesting, and I wondered if you could put it in context for us and talk about New Orleans for a second.

Did New Orleans undergo your Risk MAP assessment prior to 2005 or since 2005,
and are those people that are rebuilding, you know, essentially below sea level, eligible for the NFIP, knowing it is a repetitive zone and high dollar damages?

MR. BUCKLEY: Boy, that was --

MS. CATLETT: An easy question.

MR. BUCKLEY: Let's see. There is a residual flood risk in New Orleans, even with the levees. They are only going to build the levees back to the, quote, "100-year flood level," but there is a probability of a larger hurricane coming through, and the same thing could happen again, quite frankly.

The Corps is rebuilding the levees now. We are right into, I guess, a critical point in our remapping. The levees won't be completed until 2011. So we are trying to work that into our mapping process, but ultimately the maps will show, for insurance purposes, that the levees do provide sufficient protection.

Now does that mean there is no
flood problem in New Orleans? No. There is residual flooding from rainfall, which is quite a bit. If you are below sea level, that is where that water is going to flow when it rains, and close to 80 percent of the areas within the levees were shown as a high risk flood zone due to rainfall. That is going to remain there.

They are making some improvements to the pumps. So there may be some areas that don't see as much of a flood zone after that is completed, but New Orleans -- it's a tough situation.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: I am going to have to start identifying. We've got quite a few hands here. So let me start right here and work down the table. J.R.?

MR. BUCKLEY: Before I answer that, let me just follow up. Doug reminded me that what we did in Mississippi and Louisiana right after Katrina, we knew or came to realize soon thereafter that our flood maps
greatly underestimated the flood hazards, particularly in Mississippi.

So for the first time, we issued what we called advisory base flood elevations, and we encouraged the communities to adopt those as they were in the rebuilding process. We also are going to be using those for our grant programs for mitigation as well as public assistance.

So that we were going to be applying a higher standard. Many of the communities did adopt those or some variation of those advisories. So we stepped in there right away. We know the existing maps are greatly underestimating.

The maps in Mississippi are on the verge of becoming effective. The communities are adopting flood elevations that are going from 10 feet to 20 feet. So it is an involved process.

MR. KRUPPERMAN: My question was about things that I have heard related to
building levees along rivers and whether, particularly the Mississippi and its tributaries, all that does is push the problem downstream. So that my question is: How about coordination on a national level? Is there a national plan on how to build a complete levee system that doesn't push the problem downstream or allows some sort of adjustment to that? And is that true?

MR. BUCKLEY: Well, in certain circumstances, yes. You can find that water, and it moves faster, faster downstream; and if you don't have -- and it raises the water level, and if you don't have levees downstream, then you are causing problems.

Is there a coordinated effort? On the major rivers, the Corps of Engineers -- We work very closely with the Corps of Engineers in dealing with levees. We have established a group. We were having a meeting up in Anchorage, Alaska, two days before Hurricane Katrina hit specifically to strengthen our
collaboration in dealing with flood risk in
general, but levees more specifically.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: J.R.?

MR. THOMAS: Thanks, Kem. I am
going to go back a few years when the -- Maps
used to be updated periodically or
episodically, based upon an incident taking
place.

I am assuming that is still
somewhat the case, but I am also looking at
building within areas upstream. At what point
do you decide to remap an area based upon the
building or based upon the episodes, and then
are you using the same land based technologies
or are you able to use some satellite
technologies to help you plan?

MR. BUCKLEY; I am going to let
Doug come up here. He is the expert.

MR. BELLOMO: A couple of lines of
thought, I guess, with regard to your
questions.

We essentially decide where to
invest in updated flood hazards in cooperation
with state and local governments. So it is
sort of a layered process. We did a national
flood risk assessment, and so we take the
mapping budget that we have, and we allocate
it to our 10 regional offices -- formula
based, but it is all flood risk based.

Our regional offices then reach
out to state and local governments and ask
them to review that flood risk data, but also
make informed decisions, details they know
about their state, particularly from a
methodology or data perspective.

They may say, you know what, there
is a lot of flood risk over here, but we are
going to be collecting some really great data
that would make a really great flood map, but
not for another year and a half; so we think
you should invest some resources over here
where we don't have any ongoing data.

So we collaborate through the
planning process to do that. So that is the
first thing, is that while it is a risk based or risk informed decision making process, it is not a vacuum, and it is not totally formula driven. We do take into consideration what state and local governments are doing.

We then sit down specifically with local governments, once we have coordinated with the state to some degree, and scope out each specific study. Where is it in your community that you think we need to be investing dollars to make sure we get the hazard information right?

There's generally three main factors that we look at, three main reasons a flood hazard will change, either up or down. The first is physical changes. I mean, you had mentioned development in the upper end of the watershed. Levees might get put in. Dams might get put in or taken out.

So there are things people can see, and they understand, yes, that is going to affect the flow of water. So these
physical changes are things that we look for.

The other is changes in methodology. So academia often is updating the way we calculate the flood hazards, that models, numerical models we use. So there are advances in technology. So to the degree that we see advances in technology that are appropriate to incorporate and we incorporate then, even if the data is all the same, the methodology will change the flood hazard to some degree.

Then the last is really the climate data. So every year we get another year’s worth of rainfall data or another year’s worth of storm gauge information, and that changes the statistics.

So it is really those physical changes, the methodology changes, and what we are seeing the climate deliver over time that changes the answer.

From a technology perspective, while we use imagery from the USGS, we have
built our standards around theirs. So from a Federal government perspective, we don’t re-buy imagery just because we have a different standard. We use what the USGS has available.

Often state and local governments will have good aerial borne imagery, very detailed imagery, and we will use that as long as it meets the specifications and is public domain.

We use IFSAR in some limited applications. It is a plane-based radar to get ground elevation information. Then we use LIDAR, which is a laser technology. Again, it is an airborne technology.

We don’t use a lot of satellite imagery, frankly. We are aware that NASA has capability to get certain ground elevation information and other things, but largely we build our standards around those of existing Federal agencies or we just take the data that local governments have. Often the data they have from an imagery perspective exceeds our
standards, and some of the ground elevation
information as well.

MS. HAYES-WHITE: Thank you for
the presentation. With regard to your work on
the earthquake hazard prevention program, have
you taken an official position on the use of
utility -- automatic utility shutoffs for
residential structures or new construction?

MS. INGRAM: I don’t know that we
have taken a position on that, but we do have
some documents that would assist with that.
I don’t know that we have an official position
on that.

MS. HAYES-WHITE: Okay. Thank
you.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Joe?

MR. BRUNO: I am sure you have
been getting similar type questions. We in
New York many times get questions about the
FEMA maps, the FEMA flood maps, and SLOSH
maps. You know, SLOSH maps are the surge maps
for hurricanes that might be coming in.
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So lots of folks want to know why we are not using -- For example, a number of elected officials want to know why we have these two standards. They don't quite understand how they work.

How do you deal with that question?

MR. BELLOMO: That is a great question. We get it more than we think we should be getting it, but we do get it frequently enough.

The SLOSH modeling, Sea, Land, Over water -- don't know exactly, but it is basically a model where --

MR. BRUNO: It's called SLOSH.

MR. BELLOMO: Yes, SLOSH, where they take a series of scenarios. It is very scenario driven. So they will take a category 1 with this track, and then they will take a category 2 and a 3 and a 4 and a 5, and then they will move the track a little bit north or south, and they will run it, and they will get
essentially flood elevations from that.

What they don't have, where they haven't done -- and they are doing it for emergency evacuation purposes. Okay, where are people living? Where would they have to evacuate, if these different scenarios unfolded?

So from an emergency management perspective, they are great tools, but they don't have probabilities associated with them. So you don't know what the probability of that event tracking that way at that intensity is.

The flood insurance rate maps are largely about probabilities, and so we are looking for that 100-year -- we call it the one percent annual chance flood. So you don't get the same answer. You wouldn't expect to get the same answer.

So when you do comparisons of the SLOSH mapping, these different hurricane scenarios, to the flood map, you will see strange things that generally lead to these
questions, which is: Well, this FEMA flood
map for the NFIP doesn't match the Category 1.
It doesn't match the Category 2. It sort of
matches the 3 over here, but it is over here
and it is under over there.

That is because they are very --
They are different. One is statistically
different, and one is scenario driven.

MR. BRUNO: All right. Very good.
I do have one other question. With regard to
the hazard mitigation plans, the approved
plans, is it the region that signs off on
these plans and then ultimately you all review
the plan that comes in from, for example, New
York City? Is that what happens or is it
region driven?

MR. BELLOMO: The regional offices
are involved as well as the Headquarters
office in reviewing those plans. We also pull
in externals to help us review the plans. So
it is not just FEMA staff. We will bring in
other state governments to review them as
well, from an enhanced plan perspective and a standard plan perspective, both:

So we’ve got a process there where we pull in different resources, but it starts in the regional office, and Headquarters gets it, and we’ve got others.

MR. BRUNO: Okay. I get it.

MR. BELLOMO: Do you want to add anything to that? Yes, the Regional Administrator is ultimately the one who signs the approval letter, but we at a Headquarters level work with the regions.

MR. BRUNO: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Additional questions? Hearing none, well, thank you very much for an informative presentation. We appreciate it.

We will now move to Joe Bruno for the US&R Working Group update.

MR. BRUNO: I have to take some time, because Joe is very nervous. Rebecca thought she might have to do his presentation.
He is not well prepared. So I am going to just have to drag this out a bit. You know, he could be rough on me also. So don’t think I am the only rough guy here.

I wanted to start. This is really relatively straightforward with, I think, a good result, and ultimately I am going to need -- I am going to present a recommendation which, hopefully we will vote on before we close up shop here tomorrow.

We put together the Urban Search and Rescue Working Group. The names of the folks are there: myself; Ken Miller serves as Vice Chair; Joanne Hayes-White; Angelia Elgin; Cathey Eide; Lee Feldman; James Paturas; Suzie Torriente.

Then we added three folks who are not NAC members. We added Bob McKee from the TEEX program, Texas A&M, Director of US&R there. We added Mike Arras, Chief of Special Ops at St. Louis Fire Department, and I added Calvin Drayton, First Deputy Commissioner at
New York City OEM, since he supervises our Task Force One.

I want to just say a word. These folks treated me very nicely. I kind of took the approach, which was that we were going to try to resolve this rather than come up with a recommendation. We were going to come to consensus, which we ultimately did.

So, unfortunately, to do that sometimes you act on your own a little bit, and you get back to the group, and you fill them in, and then you do more and you get back to the group. So I appreciate the support the group gave me to allow me to kind of put this thing together and see if I could make it work. If it didn’t, then we would just have to hop in there and see what we could do.

You all remember on August 14th Chief Endrikat, who is the National US&R Task Force representative, came before the group and gave us a very nice presentation. He asked for a number of things, but these are
essentially what he asked for.

He wanted more direct contact.

The line folks, the chiefs as well as the line people running the program out in the field, wanted more contact, as they had in the past, with the US&R office.

They wanted to reestablish this advisory committee that they felt allowed them the opportunity to talk more directly to the Office about important matters which they thought they were not having much contact, and at some points they were frustrated about that. So that was his kind of primary thing.

He also was very interested in rekindling strong partnerships that they had with FEMA through the Advisory Committee, but also with the sponsoring agencies, with other Federal agencies, and he mentioned a couple. They were DHS Rescue. It was Department of Interior, the Coast Guard, DoD, NASA, the Air Force, and the state US&R programs.

They wanted assistance from the
NAC through regularized funding, because funding in the US&R program can't be predicted; and because of that, it is very hard to build your program as you go forward. You are never quite sure what it is you are going to get.

Lastly, they wanted -- This is kind of a telling point. They wanted the NAC to stay involved with them so that they would not kind of have this thing start up again, then lose it again, which really indicated a little bit of frustration on their part and concern that -- well, my concern when we first got involved in this, that the relationship wasn't there between the line folks and the program office.

As you will see, things worked out very nicely, and there is quite a good relationship. It just needed the prompting of this group, which really tells you a bit more about what some people have said, Nancy included, that this group has kind of gained
cache -- you know, importance -- in the business, and it has.

It was very important for them to get the NAC involved. I talked to all these guys and all these folks, and they were thrilled that they could get the NAC to consider this issue, and the same way on the other side. The FEMA folks are equally happy with that involvement.

It kind of allowed kind of a neutral party to talk for a little bit and come to a very easily achieved accommodation.

So on the 24th -- and I tell you, on the 8th of August Kem asked me to chair this group, but about two months later it took me to get the group together, for a lot of reasons. On October 24th we actually created the group. We had talked before that.

I had, as you can see, 11 people on this group. There were a lot of folks who wanted to be involved, and we took firstly anyone who did want to be involved, but we
tried to stay within Kem's guidelines.

I put together an agenda based upon Chief Endrikat's first conversation with us, and the agenda was very similar to what he asked for, discussing senior level leaderships and coordination between the sponsoring agency chiefs and the FEMA, the Program Office; assess the communication between the sponsoring agency chiefs and the partners they wanted to have; consider the ability to regularize funding; foster some development of a relationship between the national program and the state programs, the US&R programs; and ensure that the NAC would maintain a relationship, whatever we did, that we would kind of stay on top of it and keep an eye on it.

I took that agenda, and I sent it to the folks I was going to talk to, who are the line people. I let them look at that agenda and decide who was going to talk to our committee, our working group, on the first
time we would have it.

So they had ample opportunity to review everything, come up with who would speak for the four of them. By the way, we had the national. We had Fred Endrikat. From the East, we had Steve Cover. From Central, we had Robert Kahn. These are the sponsoring agency chiefs, the last three, Steve Cover from the East. Central was Robert Kahn, and West was Chip Prather.

They are the main people who run this program throughout the United States. Gave them all that information. They decided -- They looked at the agenda. They had some comments on the agenda. They sent back notes: Could we talk a little bit about this also? Could you change this point that you are trying to make?

Once they were set on what they wanted to talk about, we opened up a conference call on November 11, 2008. We had the meeting. All of our folks were on it, and
we went through, line by line, each of these, 
and they answered each of them. They spelled 
it out. They gave us more thoughts. 

By the time they had given me 
their initial thinking, all their thinking was 
in the agenda. So everything they really 
wanted was in the agenda, and it was pretty 
straightforward. 

The meeting we had didn’t take all 
that long. There weren’t a heck of a lot of 
questions. I pretty much went through the 
agenda, and they answered what I assumed they 
would, and that was great. 

So I took what they said to us, 
put it into a summary, and sent it over to the 
program office, and the program office there 
had designated Deputy Administrator Powers, 
Director Tamillow, US&R Branch Chief Webb, and 
Program Management Specialist Wanda Casey to 
sit down with us. 

We gave them everything in 
advance. We said look at this; come up with
how you see this. These are the questions we are going to go over with you. This is what we want to talk about.

When we talked to them with the entire working group on the 16th of December, we went through their response and their additional issues that they had placed in the agenda.

So we shared everything, agenda, minutes, with everyone. So in the end we basically had everyone knowing what each other was saying, and kind of tweaking it, tweaking it through my office and me, saying, well, if you did this, we could really live with that and, if you try to get the other guys to think this, can we do it a different way, can we call it something else, can we organize this a little bit differently, can we add other people to this advisory group that ultimately we are going to recommend?

We did all that, and it just came together. Consensus was reached on 2/27/09,
and we created some recommendations. The recommendations are:

That we create a US&R strategic group rather than an advisory committee. It was important. Actually, it was important to the FEMA program office. They were more interested in having that. They wanted kind of a more significant role than simply an advisory committee.

There was another issue, and that was when you call something advisory committee, there are other legal issues that the Federal government has to deal with. So we went to a Strategic Group.

This was a consensus. They wanted to change the membership. This was both the program office and the sponsoring agency chiefs. They wanted a FEMA program office representative on the strategic group, and that was fine. Three sponsoring agency chiefs from the three zones, the national task force leader representative, three task force
leaders, three line people who are out in the field, and the US&R Operations Work Group Chair. That is essentially a program group person, a FEMA person, but comes out of the line people.

So our recommendation is we create this Strategic Group and have that membership, which all parties want.

Secondly, they wanted to establish regular meetings between -- We recommend we establish regular meetings between the Strategic Group, ESF-9 partners and DoD. This is agreed upon by both sides, but not really part of the Strategic Group. It is kind of something they will do together, not necessarily a part of the -- It would be part of the recommendation, but it is not part of any Strategic Group operation, simply that they will agree that that is what they will do. That is what the sponsoring agency chiefs wanted, and FEMA thinks that is a good idea.

The third would be to continue
US&R representatives meeting with state US&R alliance representatives at various conferences.

That will be supported by the funding through the FEMA program office. So that is a program that the line folks wanted to continue, and that will be supported by FEMA. It has really nothing to do with the Strategic Group, but that was agreed upon, and we recommend that FEMA do that.

Fourth, the sponsor agencies are encouraged to independently continue their legislative efforts.

We pretty much went around on this with Alyson and the FEMA folks, and it was fairly clear that, as a group, we cannot engage in legislative lobbying, and that the US&R line folks are pretty good at it, and FEMA essentially takes the position you should continue to do that; and when good things come out, we will do the best to ensure we incorporate that in the program, and that was
acceptable to the line folks.

Then lastly, that the NAC would provide some oversight on the formation and the initial operations of the Strategic Group. So we would retain some oversight for a while, and then kind of the Working Group would then evaporate, and they would go on. If there was another issue, they could always come back to us.

So those are our recommendations, but the most important part of this presentation is really the next sheet. That is -- I don't know if you all can read it. You have a copy of it, but it is a little hard to read. So I can't read that one, but I could read a little larger copy.

What it does in the top box, it says the Strategic Group will provide direction to the Operations Group regarding policies, strategic goals, budgets, and issues impacting costs.

Those are the important issues,
according to the sponsoring agency chiefs that the program faces. So at the very start of any process, the Strategic Group can recommend to the Operations Group that they look at these issues of concern to the line people. So they have a way of getting issues, important issues, on the table and having them reviewed by the program office.

The other part, which is very important, is that box right above the last box, the lower box. It is off to the left a little bit.

That is where the Strategic Group will review higher level recommendations. The same issues that they can put into the system, they have a right to review and to kind of kick back that to the Operations Group to take a look at it again.

So they have a real opportunity to impact the decision making at the Program Office. Quite apart from just being an advisory group, they really are now in the
decision making process. This part that you see there really is headed "FEMA-US&R Decision Process."

So you now see the Strategic Group actually in the middle of the decision making process, which is really a very important role. That is really, in my view, where the rubber hits the road. That is what these guys wanted.

They actually got, I think, more based upon this program that we put together and this discussion than they would have had, had they simply had an advisory committee which would have been, well, we think we should do this. Off to the side, you talk to someone in the program office.

Here they are right in the way the program office operates. They could kick stuff back up to the Operations Group and say we don’t like this; that’s all right, you can do that, we’ll take another look at it.

So they can really get in the way
of something they really don't want, and can really influence it. As long as this holds true, which I think it will, they will be exactly where they have to be, even more so than they probably thought they could have.

They are extremely happy about this outcome. I have gotten more calls from them, from all the folks who participated, and have gotten calls from the FEMA office as well. They are all very happy with it, all looking forward to implementing this. They have already started to figure out how it will work logically, how it will work in process, and chatting.

I looked at an example that we were looking at in our office. There is an issue of involvement of US&R program and WMD incidents. US&R teams may be asked to respond to WMD incidents.

Our position from Task Force 1 is we don't have equipment which is ready to go for that response. It is either outdated or
it is not adequate.

So we have a real problem with that, and they are being ordered to do that, but our people and all the teams are saying we are not quite ready to do this; we don’t want to put people in harm’s way, if we don’t have what we need.

So under this new model, for one, the US&R Strategic Group could bring this issue up right now under that process and say this is a real problem. You are asking us to do this, but you have not supported the program requirement.

Certainly, they could at the lower box, if it came through, kick it back and say we can’t do this, because we don’t have proper equipment. We cannot safeguard it.

So I think this is real progress, and I strongly suggest we approve these recommendations which, I agree both the FEMA office and the sponsoring agency chiefs want.

So that is essentially what we
did, and I do appreciate very much the cooperation of the people who were on the working group. Lots of people were interested in doing it. Those that signed on helped an awful lot. It was very important that so many people were involved. Yes?

MS. DRAGANI: I think it is a great outcome, and I do agree that they got more than they would have if it had just been formed under the National Advisory Council.

A question about the need to have regular meetings with the other ESF-9 partners and DoD. What drove that statement? What were they -- I'm trying to figure out why that actually needed to be pulled out as a separate action item. What wasn't happening that needed to happen?

MR. BRUNO: Chief Endrikat said that his issue was they are all doing similar stuff. For example, DHS has a rescue team, and the Department of Interior has the wildfire groups. Coast Guard, clearly, does.
I don’t recall which the others were.

They do similar work, and they want to coordinate. DoD, in particular, they want to coordinate, because, obviously, military assets coming in anywhere is going to do much of the work they are doing.

They want to be able to coordinate. They want to be able to train a little bit with each other, get to know each other, and for some reason, they were having difficulty getting that done. They need FEMA to help them do that.

They need FEMA to bring these groups to the table. This was very important to them, but it wasn’t exactly their role in the Strategic Group, but it was something they wanted, and FEMA said we want to do that. We want to bring it here. We will have regular meetings, regular monthly meetings where we will talk about the issues that are important to the US&R program and these Federal agencies. They can get to know each other,
and have this nice basis.

I think that is the reason.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: I can just kind of second that. I have talked to several of them, and I believe that is the case.

For example, one of the things that we learned, I think, from Katrina was because of DoD assistance, too. The coordination really needs -- and people need to be talking.

For example, when Ike hit Texas, we coordinated all air assets from the Task Force team, including the military and the Coast Guard and everybody else. They were willing to come together and pull all the air operations, and it made the world of difference, because everybody was working together with one person, one organization, in control of those assets.

I think what they want to do is they want official -- let's open the door, so we can talk better and do that better in all
the disaster coordination that needs to take place. I think that is very definitely what it was.

MR. BRUNO: I would also like to just mention one other thing. Ken Miller, the Vice Chair and also very, very helpful in this process -- In the first meeting we had where we chatted about this he, probably a few minutes after we had our first call, put together an e-mail which kind of crystallized a lot of this thinking and gave us a roadmap to follow.

I just wanted to tell Ken I appreciate that very much. I wrote him a note when it first happened, but it was very important, because he has good experience in this area, and it was helpful to me.

I also used some of my own staff people who run the US&R program to assist, to make a lot of the contacts, and they were very helpful as well.

Okay? Thank you very much.
CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Any other questions? Joe, I would really like to thank you for the way you handled this. I really do believe that we found a solution. I think the other way, hanging it off the NAC or just forming a separate committee and saying, FEMA, please talk to me, was not the solution. I think this definitely can be a solution for us.

So I would entertain a motion. I think we have one.

MR. FELDMAN: I so move.

MS. DRAGANI: Second.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: We have a move to adopt the recommendations by Lee, and a second by Nancy, and I assume no word lobbying will appear in any words we draft. Right? I know they can lobby at the state level and local level, but we don’t want that in any recommendations we send forward to FEMA.

So we have a motion, a second.

Any discussion? All those in favor of the
motion, signify by saying Aye. All those opposed, like sign? Carries unanimously.
Thank you again, Joe. Well done.

Are we ready to wrap up for the day?

MR. SHEA: I think so.

CHAIRMAN BENNETT: Okay.

MS. PRICE: Obviously, we are ahead of schedule. We think we may be ahead of schedule tomorrow. So we are trying to plan ahead for that.

I am going to ask that any members of the public who are attending tomorrow and have plans to make public comments that you be in your seats no later than 1:00 p.m., in case it does look like that we will be wrapping up early.

Ideally, you would be here, you know, from the very beginning to listen to everything that is going on. So if you do have a public comment tomorrow, please let us know so that we can plan for you and make sure
that we are taking you into account.

   Additionally, it looks like we are
going to move dinner ahead a little bit again.
So I think we will be able to make dinner no
later than 6:00 p.m. If you would like to
meet in the lobby at 5:45, it is two and a
half blocks, and I think it is pouring rain.
So I hope you have umbrellas, but it is not
very far away. It is Johnny's Half-Shell. It
is over on Capitol, North Capitol, and it will
be a quick walk, a soggy and quick walk.

   With that, tomorrow we will have
rolls and coffee out here at eight o'clock.
We will start together at 8:30 a.m. tomorrow,
and the meeting is -- Today's business is
concluded. Thank you very much.

   (Whereupon, the foregoing matter
went off the record at 3:55 p.m.)
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