



**NAVAL
POSTGRADUATE
SCHOOL**

MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

THESIS

**HOMELAND SECURITY COLLABORATION:
CATCH PHRASE OR PREEMINENT
ORGANIZATIONAL CONSTRUCT?**

by

Raymond L. Kay II

September 2009

Thesis Advisor:
Second Reader:

David Brannan
Glen Woodbury

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instruction, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188) Washington DC 20503.			
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)	2. REPORT DATE September 2009	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Master's Thesis	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Homeland Security Collaboration: Catch Phrase or Preeminent Organizational Construct?		5. FUNDING NUMBERS	
6. AUTHOR(S) Raymond L. Kay II			
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000		8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING /MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) N/A		10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES The views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of Defense or the U.S. government.			
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited		12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE A	
13. ABSTRACT (maximum 200 words) <p>Since September 11, 2001, numerous documents have been produced by various governmental agencies, and the private sector, addressing homeland security issues. Many of these publications identify a need to create multi-discipline, multi-agency cooperative environments at all levels of government and within the private sector in order to resolve homeland security problems. Although these cooperative environments are deemed collaboration, a common definition of collaboration is missing from the literature. More importantly, also missing from the literature is guidance on how to achieve collaboration.</p> <p>This project identifies a common, measurable definition for collaboration. The research identified existing organizations that address homeland security issues that do not meet the definition of collaboration but are successful in addressing current problems. Conclusions of this project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organizations can effectively manage homeland security issues although they have not reached true collaboration • Collaboration is the desired organizational structure as the most efficient organizational structure dealing with homeland security concerns. <p>Future homeland security publications need to include a definition of collaboration and guidance to achieve it.</p>			
14. SUBJECT TERMS Collaboration, guidance, smart practices, community based collaboration, Business Executives for National Security (BENS), ChicagoFIRST, Texas Association of Regional Councils (TARC), Responsibility, Authority, and Expertise (RAE)		15. NUMBER OF PAGES 127	
		16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UU

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

**HOMELAND SECURITY COLLABORATION:
CATCH PHRASE OR PREEMINENT ORGANIZATIONAL CONSTRUCT?**

Raymond L. Kay II
Battalion Chief, Orland Fire Protection District, Orland Park, Illinois
B.A., Southern Illinois University, 1991

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

**MASTER OF ARTS IN SECURITY STUDIES
(HOMELAND SECURITY AND DEFENSE)**

from the

**NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
September 2009**

Author: Raymond L. Kay II

Approved by: David Brannan
Thesis Advisor

Glen Woodbury
Second Reader

Harold A. Trinkunas, PhD
Chairman, Department of National Security Affairs

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ABSTRACT

Since September 11, 2001, numerous documents have been produced by various governmental agencies, and the private sector, addressing homeland security issues. Many of these publications identify a need to create multi-discipline, multi-agency cooperative environments at all levels of government and within the private sector in order to resolve homeland security problems. Although these cooperative environments are deemed collaboration, a common definition of collaboration is missing from the literature. More importantly, also missing from the literature is guidance on how to achieve collaboration.

This project identifies a common, measurable definition for collaboration. The research identified existing organizations that address homeland security issues that do not meet the definition of collaboration but are successful in addressing current problems. Conclusions of this project include:

- Organizations can effectively manage homeland security issues although they have not reached true collaboration
- Collaboration is the desired organizational structure as the most efficient organizational structure dealing with homeland security concerns.

Future homeland security publications need to include a definition of collaboration and guidance to achieve it.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
A.	THE PROBLEM STATEMENT.....	1
B.	RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	5
C.	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....	5
D.	SIGNIFICANCE OF RESEARCH.....	6
	1. Literature.....	6
	2. Future Research.....	6
	3. The Consumer.....	6
E.	LITERATURE REVIEW.....	7
	1. Call for Collaboration.....	7
	2. Why Collaboration.....	9
	3. Stakeholders and Governments Are Interdependent.....	11
	4. What Can We Learn from Others.....	13
	5. Conclusion.....	14
F.	AN OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECT.....	15
G.	SUMMARY.....	16
II.	HOMELAND SECURITY COLLABORATION.....	19
A.	INTRODUCTION.....	19
B.	COLLABORATION.....	20
C.	COMMUNITY LINKAGES IN DETAIL.....	22
D.	COMMUNITY LINKAGE EXAMPLES.....	28
E.	HOMELAND SECURITY ACCOUNTABILITY: A LOCAL ISSUE.....	29
F.	LOCAL ISSUE: LOCAL COLLABORATION.....	31
G.	LOCAL AGENCIES AND STAKEHOLDERS ARE INTERDEPENDENT.....	33
H.	HOMELAND SECURITY POLICIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS DO NOT OFFER GUIDANCE TO ESTABLISH COLLABORATION.....	35
I.	SUMMARY.....	37
III.	CASE STUDIES.....	39
A.	INTRODUCTION.....	39
B.	BUSINESS EXECUTIVES FOR NATIONAL SECURITY (BENS).....	41
	1. A Record of Achievement.....	42
	2. Today and Tomorrow.....	43
	3. The Case Study.....	44
C.	CHICAGOFIRST.....	45
	1. The Long-Term Strategy.....	47
	2. Overcoming Inertia.....	48
	3. Next Step—A Coalition of Partnerships.....	49
	4. The Case Study.....	50
D.	TEXAS ASSOCIATION OF REGIONAL COUNCILS (TARC).....	51

1.	Councils of Government Today	53
2.	The Need for Statewide Coordination.....	54
3.	The Case Study.....	55
E.	SELECTED CASE STUDIES COMPARED TO THE COMMUNITY BASED COLLABORATION, COMMUNITY WELLNESS MULTIPLIED—COMMUNITY LINKAGES CRITERIA	56
1.	Business Executives for National Security (BENS) Analysis	56
a.	<i>Purpose</i>	57
b.	<i>Structure</i>	57
c.	<i>Process</i>	58
d.	<i>Indicators of Success</i>	58
2.	ChicagoFIRST Analysis	59
a.	<i>Purpose</i>	59
b.	<i>Structure</i>	60
c.	<i>Process</i>	60
d.	<i>Indicators of Success</i>	61
3.	Texas Association of Regional Councils (TARC) Analysis	61
a.	<i>Purpose</i>	62
b.	<i>Structure</i>	62
c.	<i>Process</i>	63
d.	<i>Indicators of Success</i>	63
F.	CONCLUSION	63
IV.	SMART PRACTICES	69
A.	INTRODUCTION.....	69
1.	Collaborative Capacity	70
2.	Smart Practice versus Best Practice.....	70
B.	STRUCTURE-GOVERNANCE SMART PRACTICES	71
1.	Shared Vision and Shared Mission	72
2.	Top-Level Buy-In.....	74
3.	Ownership.....	75
4.	Responsibility, Authority, and Expertise (RAE).....	77
5.	Structure—Public, Private, Non-Governmental Organization, and Citizen Membership	80
C.	OPERATIONAL SMART PRACTICES	82
1.	Effective Communication	82
2.	Start with a Winnable Project	83
3.	Perform a Gap Analysis	83
4.	Develop Metrics to Gauge Performance	85
5.	Create a Funding System	85
D.	CONCLUSION	87
V.	FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND RESEARCH	89
A.	INTRODUCTION.....	89
B.	FINDINGS	89
1.	Call for Collaboration.....	89
2.	What is Collaboration and How Can You Get There?	92

3.	Why Collaboration and Not Other Structures?.....	93
4.	Case Studies Provided Insight	95
5.	Guidance is Needed.....	96
6.	Smart Practices Provide the Foundation for Collaboration Guidance.....	98
C.	RECOMMENDATIONS.....	100
D.	FUTURE RESEARCH.....	101
	LIST OF REFERENCES.....	103
	INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST	111

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Community Linkages.....	21
Table 2.	Community Linkages: Networking Segment.....	24
Table 3.	Community Linkages: Cooperation or Alliance Segment	25
Table 4.	Community Linkages: Coordination or Partnership Segment	26
Table 5.	Community Linkages: Coalition Segment	27
Table 6.	Community Linkages: Collaboration Segment	28
Table 7.	Analysis of BENS Case Study	56
Table 8.	Analysis of ChicagoFIRST Case Study	59
Table 9.	Analysis of TARC Case Study	62
Table 10.	Head-to-Head Comparison	66

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

As I started down the path on this project, I had no idea of the course it would take. Fortunately, I have had the support of my wife Catherine and my children Ray, Bridget, Patrick, and Andrew—without their support, I could have never completed the journey. You provided the opportunity for me to succeed. Reader, editor, and brainstorming listener are only a few of the roles that my wife played during the project. Catherine, I am especially grateful for all you have done to help me.

During the project, there were times in which I was away from the work, and when I returned, I was welcomed back as though I had never missed a step. A special thank you is order for Dr. Dave Brannan and Dr. Lauren Wollman for your support as I returned.

I am extremely grateful to the faculty and staff of the Center for Homeland Defense and Security, as you provided me the opportunity to grow and learn in an environment that I have never experienced. More to the point, you pushed me into areas that I had never been before and guided me to a successful outcome.

There is no doubt that my parents are proud of my accomplishment. If it were not for their views and perseverance with respect to education, I would have never applied myself. The journey has been long, but I found a way to make it. Thanks

Throughout my career, I have been influenced by friends, mentors and supporters, who encouraged me and helped me sustain my drive. In particular, I would like to thank Chief Phil Ruscetti, Deputy Fire Commissioner Gene Ryan, and Lieutenant Bill Lester for what seems to be a lifelong support group. Mrs. Nancy Mason offered me an opportunity to grow from the local level to a statewide platform; I will always be indebted to you for your support. Faith can sometimes be difficult to come by, but that is what you have always held for my abilities; thanks to Mr. Gary McConnell for believing in me.

Understanding theory is one thing, but having the opportunity to practice the theory is quite another. I offer thanks to Mike Chamness, Chairman of the Illinois

Terrorism Task Force; Richard Jaehne, Director of the Illinois Fire Service Institute; and Jay Reardon, President/CEO of the Mutual Aid Box Alarm System, for providing the opportunity to put theory into practice. In addition to allowing me to practice what I have learned, I wish to thank Inspector Kevin Eack for watching over me through the program.

To the members of the Orland Fire Protection District, where the theory is truly practiced, thank you for your support.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. THE PROBLEM STATEMENT

One of the outcomes from the attacks of 9/11 is an increase in the number of homeland security policies and guidance documents. President Bush produced 24 Homeland Security Presidential Directives (HSPDs) since September 2001, which in turn created numerous additional strategies and guidance documents. Key HSPDs include: HSPD 1 Coordination of Homeland Security Activities of the Federal Government (2001); HSPD 5 Management of Domestic Incidents (2003); and HSPD 8 National Preparedness (2003). Important national strategies that have resulted from HSPDs are: National Strategy for Homeland Security (2002, revised in 2007); National Strategy for Combating Terrorism (2003, revised in 2006); and National Strategy for Information Sharing (2007).

These doctrine call for collaboration. but do not define what it is or how to establish a successful initiative. There are many paths that arrive at collaboration, but none are offered in these doctrine. The 2002 National Strategy for Homeland Security and the 2007 versions call for collaboration, coordination and engaged partnerships, but do not define any of these terms. Additionally, these documents provide little evidence that the collaboration model will always produce the most desirable outcomes. As an example, the Chandler Center for Community Leadership (CCCL) evaluated organizational structures including networks, alliances, partnerships, coalitions, and collaborations, concluding that each may be viable within a unique circumstance.¹

Homeland security today has a variety of definitions as a result of the events of September 11, 2001. Dr. Christopher Bellavita attempted to capture a single definition, but concluded that homeland security is defined by whoever is interpreting the issue.²

¹ Theresa Hogue, "Community Based Collaboration, Community Wellness Multiplied," Center for Rural Studies (University of Vermont), <http://crs.uvm.edu/ncco/collab/wellness.html#why> (accessed July 4, 2007).

² Christopher Bellavita. Changing Homeland Security: What is Homeland Security? *Homeland Security Affairs Journal* 4, no. 2 (2008).

Since 2001, there has been a significant increase in the volume of homeland security policies and guidance documents promulgated by both the public and the private sector. Private organizations like the Alliance for Regional Stewardship³ and Business Executives for National Security⁴ each support a collaborative approach. Collaboration is commonly recommended, or required, regardless of the specific topic or discipline. Furthermore, collaboration has been identified as the cornerstone of current and future homeland security initiatives. Although the term collaboration is cited frequently, the definition is not consistent between documents.

Frequent use of the term collaboration, without a consistent, clear definition, allows for a variety of interpretations and implementation strategies. The Centers for Regional Excellence program in Michigan embraces shared leadership and interdependency. At some level, this was successful because, in 2005, a conference was held to capture the best practices of the program supporting the idea of collaboration over less-defined terminology.⁵ The *National Preparedness Guidelines* describe collaboration as “Standardized structures and processes for regional collaboration enable entities collectively to manage and coordinate activities for operations and preparedness consistently and effectively.”⁶

This inconsistency between authors creates confusion, allowing competing documents to identify differing anticipated outcomes. Consistent in homeland security collaboration guidance is the inclusion of all levels of government; specifically listed are local agencies. An early example of including local government in homeland security is HSPD 3, which established a method of disseminating information regarding the risk of

³ William R. Dodge, “Regional Emergency Preparedness Compacts: Safeguarding the Nation’s Communities,” Alliance for Regional Stewardship (2002), <http://www.regionalstewardship.org/Documents/REPCSReport.pdf> (accessed February 10, 2008).

⁴ Business Executives for National Security (BENS), “BENS Business Force Partnership Criteria,” Business Executives for National Security, <http://www.bensbusinessforce.org/BENS%20BF%20Partnership%20Criteria.pdf> (accessed February 10, 2008).

⁵ Centers for Regional Excellence, “Building Models for Regional Collaboration-Best Practices,” State of Michigan, <http://www.michigan.gov/cre/0,1607,7-115--125792--,00.html> (accessed July 13, 2008).

⁶ U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS), *National Preparedness Guidelines* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2007), 12, Department of Homeland Security, http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/National_Preparedness_Guidelines.pdf (accessed March 24, 2008).

terrorist acts.⁷ Organizations that may not possess a great deal of resources, like local governments, are not likely to achieve collaboration without clarifying the definition. These same groups are not likely to achieve intended outcomes without guidance for building collaboration.

Once the scope of collaboration included the smallest units of government in homeland security policy and guidance documents, an additional concern emerged: capacity for collaboration. Not all agencies have the capacity to accomplish collaboration.⁸ Impediments that hamper potential capacity range from human capital to funding support. Fortunately, for some local agencies, the very doctrine that calls for collaboration offers funding to support the effort. A concern with grant funding to support collaborative efforts is the volatility of the funding. Urban Area Security Initiatives, for example, are intended to be collaborations that currently receive funding based in part on functioning as collaborations.⁹ Other organizations do not receive grants, which contributes to the impediment of funding to the already difficult task of organization.

The most concerning aspect of the collaboration discussion is the missing guidance describing how to accomplish collaboration. If the cornerstone of homeland security success is based upon collaboration, then including methods to achieve it is imperative. Hurricane Katrina offers a recent experience that emphasizes the importance of collaboration. Although the importance of collaboration was captured in the *Nationwide Plan Review* project, guidance has not been offered as to how to achieve it.¹⁰

⁷ White House, *Homeland Security Presidential Directive 3: Homeland Security Advisory System*, U.S. Department of Homeland Security (2002), http://www.dhs.gov/xabout/laws/gc_1214508631313.shtm#1 (accessed May 25, 2009).

⁸ Susan Hocevar, Erik Jansen, Gail F. Thomas, *Building Collaborative Capacity for Homeland Security* (Monterey, CA: Naval Postgraduate School, 2004), Homeland Security Digital Library, https://www.hsdl.org/homesec/docs/theses/04Nov_Hocevar.pdf&code=ae173351560410be5e2276a3347f2c04 (accessed July 14 2007).

⁹ U.S. Department of Homeland Security, *State and Urban Area Homeland Security Strategy: Guidance on Aligning Strategies with the National Preparedness Goal* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2005), U.S. Department of Justice, http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/odp/docs/StrategyGuidance_22JUL2005.pdf (accessed May 28, 2007).

¹⁰ U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and Department of Transportation (DOT), *Nationwide Plan Review: Phase 2 Report* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2006), http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/Prep_NationwidePlanReview.pdf (accessed May 22, 2007).

Education for achieving collaboration is important at all levels of public and private organizations, but smaller organizations place a higher value on assistance. Providing only a single guidance path to collaboration is not possible.

Best practices can provide such a framework, creating a menu of options to develop the path to collaboration. Unfortunately, best practices suggest that the identified actions or policies represent a vetted solution that cannot be improved upon. This may not always be the case.¹¹

Although not as significant as the path to achieve collaboration, determining membership, structure, and addressing funding issues, are also absent in doctrine. There is no differentiation between existing efforts and upstart initiatives in guidance. This is significant in that the needs of upstarts differ from sustained organizations as explored by the CCCL Wellness Multiplied project.¹² However, given that homeland security is an emerging discipline,¹³ assistance with sustaining, maintaining, and improving collaborative efforts is critical.

Evidence exists of multi-discipline organizations that are successful in the homeland security discipline but are not collaborations. Some of these groups have been in existence for many years before homeland security became a recognized name. In the state of Illinois, the Illinois Terrorism Task Force (ITTF) has been in place since May 2000. This group was created to: further disaster preparedness throughout the state; utilize expertise at local, state, and federal levels across different disciplines; and implement a comprehensive coordinated preparedness strategy.¹⁴ Can groups and organizations meet the intent of the policies and guidance documents and not achieve true collaboration? Should these organizations strive to function as a collaboration?

¹¹ Eugene Bardach, *A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis* (Washington, DC: CQ Press, 2005), 91.

¹² Hogue, "Community Based Collaboration."

¹³ Bellavita, "Changing Homeland Security," 2008.

¹⁴ Illinois Terrorism Task Force, "Organization," Illinois Terrorism Task Force, <http://www.ready.illinois.gov/ittf/Organization/> (accessed May 25, 2009).

B. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

One primary question drives this research. Given that a multi-discipline, multi-agency cooperative environment will enhance present and future homeland security initiatives, what is the optimum structure, and how do organizations achieve that structure?

Additional questions that impact the research include:

- Is it important that groups reach collaboration, or can other forms of cooperation be sufficient?
- What would be helpful to launch collaborative efforts to achieve success?
- How has the guidance since 2001 been interpreted by existing organizations?
- What is important to sustain a collaborative effort?

C. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research project utilized a modified case study methodology. The traditional case study method limits the available data associated with existing cooperative organizations. As the research question indicates, this project is evaluating the variety of structures, origins, smart practices, and growth through adaptability to achieve their current structure. One case alone does not provide sufficient information to analyze the research question.

Selecting this methodology and utilizing multiple, less in-depth case studies allows the reader to draw conclusions relating to common themes and trends. Utilizing the conclusions that the reader develops, he or she will be able to apply critical tenants from conclusions reached to additional situations. Cases selected to study have been successful within the homeland security discipline. Success is identified as a positive impact within the discipline, proven sustainability by longevity, and adaptation to the dynamically changing landscape of homeland security. Given that homeland security is an emerging discipline, the number of available cases to evaluate is limited. Cases that

have been selected further represent varying origins, purpose, initial membership, and structure. Diversity of cases in this narrow field is important to obtain quality data for analysis.

The research analysis conclusions offer a variety of smart practices that enhance the collaborative process for both upstart initiatives and existing, established organizations to explore as they apply these practices to their particular situation. The conclusions also argue that achieving the likely intent of homeland security policy and guidance can be accomplished by various structures in addition to collaborations.

D. SIGNIFICANCE OF RESEARCH

1. Literature

Homeland security documents advocate collaboration but are deficient in providing guidance to achieve it. This research serves as a starting point for local governments and other agencies that recognize the value of collaboration but lack the resources to extensively delve into research.

2. Future Research

It is impossible to capture all smart practices and all dimensions of collaboration in this project. Continuing to collect and analyze smart practices in homeland security collaboration is important as this is a potentially explosive arena. Moreover, publishing these findings is imperative in order to share these lessons among other collaborative efforts.

3. The Consumer

Several significant impediments may deter collaborative efforts. This research serves as a primer for a call to action with the confidence that impediments can be overcome. Furthermore, consumers should include would-be authors of future homeland

security doctrine. Future authors are needed to devote more time to collaborative guidance. Their work should include describing expected outcomes and methods to accomplish collaboration objectives.

E. LITERATURE REVIEW

Researching homeland security collaboration has proven to be a difficult task. One impediment in research is that homeland security itself is a dynamically changing discipline. Bellavita explored the definition of homeland security found that the definition is embraced differently dependent upon the discipline and the regional threats. Bellavita concluded that homeland security remains an emerging discipline.¹⁵

As the literature research expanded, four themes evolved that are aligned in homeland security collaboration. The first theme is based in a variety of public and private policies that call for homeland security collaboration but typically do not offer guidance on how to define or accomplish it. Another theme questions collaboration as the preferred method of coordination versus models like partnerships. The third theme examines the interdependency of the actors involved in homeland security collaboration. The final theme examines collaborative efforts outside of homeland security that have been successful as smart practices and provide examples to build on.

1. Call for Collaboration

The 2002 National Strategy for Homeland Security¹⁶ was one of the first public policies to call for collaboration. The need for collaboration remains in a more recent revision that was published in 2007.¹⁷ What is important in these documents is the use of

¹⁵ Bellavita, "Changing Homeland Security," 2008.

¹⁶ Office of Homeland Security, *National Strategy for Homeland Security* (Washington, DC: White House, 2002), White House, http://www.whitehouse.gov/homeland/book/nat_strat_hls.pdf (accessed April 17, 2007).

¹⁷ Homeland Security Council, *National Strategy for Homeland Security* (Washington, DC: White House, 2007), White House, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/infocus/homeland/nshs/NSHS.pdf> (accessed September 22, 2008).

the terms collaboration, coordination and engaged partnerships and the fact that none of these terms are defined. Each of these terms could be interpreted differently depending on the reader.

Released in 2003, Homeland Security Presidential Directive 5 (HSPD 5) Management of Domestic Incidents¹⁸ has identified the need for collaboration. One of the components of HSPD 5 framed the National Response Plan (NRP),¹⁹ which also depends on collaboration. Again, in the 2008 update to the NRP, the National Response Framework (NRF)²⁰ relies upon collaboration, but it is not defined.

The trend of collaboration without guidance continues in additional federal documents. The Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) 2005 guidance on aligning strategies promotes collaboration without defining it.²¹ In addition, the *Nationwide Plan Review* (NPR) in 2006 evaluated individual states and UASI readiness in a post-Katrina world and determined that more collaboration was needed, but it does not describe how to accomplish collaboration.²²

Expanding regional collaboration is the highest priority in the country according to the *National Preparedness Guidelines* (NPG) that was published in 2007.²³ Of particular interest is the explanation of the “Expand Regional Collaboration” objective: “Standardized structures and processes for regional collaboration enable entities collectively to manage and coordinate activities for operations and preparedness consistently and effectively.”²⁴ The NPG goes on to describe some of the intended

¹⁸ White House, *Homeland Security Presidential Directive 5: Management of Domestic Incidents*, (Washington, DC: White House, 2003) White House, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/02/20030228-9.html> (accessed April 17, 2008).

¹⁹ U.S. Department of Homeland Security, *National Response Plan* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2004), 29, 327, 339, 351, State of Hawaii Civil Defense, <http://www.scd.state.hi.us/documents/nrp.pdf> (accessed March 1, 2008).

²⁰ U.S. Department of Homeland Security, *National Response Framework* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2008), Federal Emergency Management Agency, <http://www.fema.gov/pdf/emergency/nrf/nrf-core.pdf> (accessed January 25, 2008).

²¹ DHS, *State and Urban Area Homeland Security Strategy*, 2005.

²² DHS and DOT, *Nationwide Plan Review*, 2006, vii.

²³ *Ibid.*, 11.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 12.

outcomes and provide examples of structures like UASI program. This guidance is incomplete because it does not describe how to achieve collaboration.

Calling for collaboration in the private sector, members of the finance community in Chicago came together in 2003 to create an organization, ChicagoFIRST, to address common homeland security threats. Working without regulatory mandate, this group achieved collaboration exclusively among the private sector initially. As ChicagoFIRST grew, the collaboration expanded to include inviting public sector entities to join the group. Ultimately, the United States Treasury Department was so impressed by this initiative that it chronicled ChicagoFIRST in a case study report.²⁵ The report was intended to entice other financial districts throughout the country to organize utilizing the ChicagoFIRST model. Recognition of this group is important in that it grew and became successful through a bottom-up format, providing evidence that collaboration is a viable solution for the financial sector.

These guidance documents offer framework for government and the private sector to develop homeland security policy. However, these framework documents frequently leave policy writers to interpret collaboration, which individually negates the notion of standardization and consistency.

2. Why Collaboration

Can other models besides collaboration sufficiently address homeland security issues? Is this a current buzzword or is there a specific reason that a variety of guidance documents use collaboration to describe a group work effort? Terms like partnership and coordination are used throughout the literature. It is the supporting discussion that points to the intent of the authors. In the Alliance for Regional Stewardship publication, which focuses on regional emergency preparedness compacts, the term cooperation is used.²⁶ While the term cooperation is used, the expected outcomes discussed are similar to those

²⁵ U.S. Department of the Treasury, *Improving Business Continuity in the Financial Services Sector: A Model for Starting Regional Coalitions* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Treasury, 2004), U.S. Department of the Treasury, http://www.ustreas.gov/press/releases/reports/chicagofirst_handbook.pdf (accessed June 7, 2008).

²⁶ Dodge, "Regional Emergency Preparedness Compacts," 2002, 3–4.

listed in UASI guidance with respect to working together.²⁷ The UASI guidance lists collaboration as the method to engage multiple disciplines of both public and private sectors to work together. Expected outcomes in both of these documents describe similar frameworks. The use of differing terms to describe the generic outcome of disciplines working together is the prevailing trend throughout the literature. The question about the terminology is really about the outcome. That is, regardless of whatever one calls it, will the effort produce a better product because of the group effort?

The Chandler Center for Community Leadership (CCCL) evaluated the terminology issue more deeply as part of a project that began in 1992 to develop community leadership.²⁸ As part of the deeper evaluation, networks, alliances, partnerships coalitions, and collaboration are compared. CCCL describes five levels of interaction, attributing metrics of purpose, structure, and process to each. In this assessment, collaboration is listed as the highest functioning format. According to CCCL, collaboration provides the most amount of trust among the leadership, decision making is truly shared, and members are interdependent.²⁹

In 2003, Michigan Governor Granholm endorsed a program to create collaborative regions throughout the state of Michigan.³⁰ The goal of the program was to help communities grow economically. The Centers for Regional Excellence (CRE) program does not cite the CCCL work but does agree in principle that working toward shared leadership and multi-agency interdependency. At some level this was successful because in 2005, a conference was held to capture the best practices of the program supporting the idea of collaboration over less defined terminology.³¹

²⁷ DHS, *State and Urban Area Homeland Security Strategy*, 2005.

²⁸ Hogue, "Community Based Collaboration."

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ State of Michigan, "Michigan Communities Answer Governor's Call for Collaboration at Sold-Out 'Creating Cool' Conference," State of Michigan (2003), http://www.michigan.gov/dleg/0,1607,7-154-10573_11472-82827--,00.html (accessed September 10, 2008).

³¹ Centers for Regional Excellence, "Building Models."

At this stage in the new discipline of homeland security, the vehicle used to bring various disciplines in the both the private and public sectors together may not be as important as the results of the working group. The literature does support the idea as groups grow and refine their work that the model to work towards is that of collaboration.

Achieving collaboration may not be for everyone at least not today. The idea of possessing the capacity to collaborate is important. Research conducted by Susan Hocevar, Erik Jansen, and Gail Fann Thomas at the Naval Postgraduate School addresses the concept of collaborative capacity.³² This particular research group addressed the question of an agency's ability to collaborate with respect to human capital and available resources. Collaborative capacity is a large topic and utilizing the work of Hocevar et al. helps to keep this research appropriately focused. In order to move forward addressing the research question, the discussions presented in this research is based on the idea that organizations have collaborative capacity.

3. Stakeholders and Governments Are Interdependent

The private sector realized the importance of interdependency in order to achieve successful collaboration before the public sector. Additionally, the private sector has published this opinion more frequently than the public sector. In essence, the private sector realizes that it cannot address all of its homeland security issues alone due to limitations in resources and authorities. Business organizations like Business Executives for National Security (BENS) and the Infrastructure Security Partnership (TISP) have addressed homeland security issues within their respective areas of concern and have published guidance for their membership.

³² Hocevar, Jansen, and Thomas, *Building Collaborative Capacity*, 65.

BENS began in the National Capital Region, and it has since established organizations in various parts of the country. Initially, it included only private sector members, but the group has realized the value and importance of governmental partners. These values are represented in a condensed document that outlines criteria for membership, “BENS Business Force Partnership Criteria.”³³

In August of 2008, BENS published a report specifically addressing continuity of community. In the report entitled “BENS’ Regional Public-Private Partnerships: Building a Resilient Nation,”³⁴ the policy of supporting only critical infrastructure is challenged as a method of addressing resiliency. The argument in this report is that support is required for the comprehensive community during disaster, not just critical infrastructure. It takes a whole community recover from a disaster. In sum, this guidance prefers community collaboration to only narrowly focused preparedness.

TISP published a report, “Regional Disaster Resilience: A Guide for Developing an Action Plan,”³⁵ in which the focus is critical infrastructure planning. The report spends some time identifying cross discipline interdependencies. In this case, the regional concept described drives toward collaboration by the CCCL definition.

The National League of Cities and the Alliance for Regional Stewardship produced a guide in 2006 that offers an expansive index of possible structures focused on achieving collaborative like results. A key element of the report indicates that one format does not fit all situations. The “Guide to Successful Local Government Collaboration in

³³ BENS, “BENS Business Force Partnership Criteria.”

³⁴ Business Executives for National Security (BENS), “Regional Public-Private Partnerships: Building a Resilient Nation,” Business Executives for National Security, http://www.bens.org/mis_support/BENS%20Regional%20Partnership%20White%20Paper%2008_08_08.pdf (accessed August 23, 2008).

³⁵ The Infrastructure Security Partnership (TISP), *Regional Disaster Resilience: A Guide for Developing an Action Plan* (Reston, VA, American Society for Civil Engineers, 2006), 6, The Infrastructure Security Partnership (2006), <http://tisp.org/index.cfm?cdid=10962&pid=10261> (accessed June 6, 2008).

America's Regions"³⁶ identifies the interdependencies between members of the community. These interdependencies may help to form a common vision providing a rallying cry to initiate collaboration.

4. What Can We Learn from Others

The term "best practices" is used to describe what can be learned from others as examples of excellence. The term "best practices" implies that regardless of the example, it has been vetted and proven to be superior to all others. A closer look at this concept reveals that different terminology to express this idea is appropriate.

In his book, *A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis*,³⁷ Eugene Bardach challenges the "best practice" concept. In place of best practices, Bardach argues that a more suitable term would be "smart practices." Bardach defines smart practices as adding value to an action or theory. Defining value-added actions and theories offers newly formed and existing collaborations common ground to build their efforts.

Collaborative efforts have existed for many years in a wide variety of disciplines. The principles that are effective for disciplines outside of homeland security are likely to be effective for the homeland security discipline.

Although not defined as lessons learned or helpful hints, the David Straus book, *How to Make Collaboration Work*,³⁸ offers guidance on the power of collaboration, the involvement of stakeholders, consensus, and leadership. These topics are discussed in the context of organizations and in the context of community application. What Straus has to offer may not be well received by every group working toward collaboration, but it can be a starting point.

³⁶ John Parr, Joan Riehm, and Christiana McFarland, *Guide to Successful Government Collaboration in America's Regions* (Washington, DC: National League of Cities, 2006).

³⁷ Bardach, *A Practical Guide*, 2005.

³⁸ David Straus, *How to Make Collaboration Work: Powerful Ways to Build Consensus, Solve Problems, and Make Decisions* (San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, 2002), 178–179.

Through a series of case studies, David Chrislip³⁹ utilized a sample model to offer readers illustrations of existing collaborations. In particular, the Joint Venture Silicon Valley (JVSV) case study contained applicable data to this research. The JVSV organization had been successful for a number of years but found itself in danger of collapsing when global economic conditions changed. The organization had to re-invent itself to survive. The JVSV example reinforces what Chrislip outlined throughout his book with respect to civic and business leaders collaborating for success.⁴⁰ Building a framework for collaboration, including macro and micro implications, is presented. Utilizing a story to highlight key principles of collaboration uniquely offers guidance through smart practices. While the smart practices speak to the business sector, they can also be evaluated and applied when building homeland security collaboration.

5. Conclusion

After analyzing the literature, several key findings are evident:

- Since the increase of homeland security publications after 9/11, the public sector and the private sector have both identified a collaborative environment as a critical component in addressing threat issues.
- The collaborative environment is either not defined or poorly defined in many guidance documents, allowing a wide variety of interpretations by policy writers.
- Regardless of a collaboration definition, a major stumbling block remains as guidance documents do not provide direction to accomplish collaboration.
- Some organizations have been successful for many years without reaching a collaborative state in disciplines outside of homeland security.
- Collaborative smart practices have existed long before homeland security became a discipline. These smart practices can serve as the impetus to initiate collaboration.

³⁹ David D. Chrislip, *Collaborative Leadership Fieldbook* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2002), 135.

⁴⁰ Chrislip, *Collaborative Leadership Fieldbook*, 2002,

Guidance calling for more cooperation among disparate disciplines from public and private sectors, clearly support the value of the construct. Defining one organizational state may be important for consistency but may not be the only solution as some groups have proven success utilizing other structures. Specifically, a metric defining different organizations is explored in Chapter II and offers alternate structures to collaboration that are considered successful.⁴¹

The main issue in the literature is a gap, not a review of what is stated. Guidance to accomplish greater cooperation and interoperability is missing. Also missing is how to collaborate. This is a complicated issue potentially requiring years of effort to achieve, yet it warrants study especially in the homeland security arena.

A minimal number of collaboration best practices are available in the literature from generic business models. The idea of a best practice versus a smart practice as the appropriate structure should be challenged. Smart practices are available to initiate the collaborative process but have not been collected and published in one document. A number of smart practices can serve as the foundational building blocks of future guidance documents. Collecting smart practices will be an ongoing project as new ideas and applications will likely continue to grow.

F. AN OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECT

This chapter set the framework for the entire project. Additional chapters present detail dissecting the research question, discussing the research method, offering smart practices and culminate with findings and recommendations.

Chapter II Homeland Security Collaboration:

- Sets parameters for collaboration compared to other coordination structures and processes.
- Homeland security is a local issue.
- Stakeholders and local governments are interdependent.
- Homeland security documents do not offer guidance on how to collaborate.

⁴¹ Centers for Regional Excellence, “Building Models.”

Chapter III Research Methodology:

- Modified Case Study Method is utilized, allowing a narrowed focus on a larger data set.
- Successful organizations are profiled and categorized according to organizational definitions presented in Chapter II.
- Analysis of organizational purpose, structure and process is offered for each case discussed.

Chapter IV Smart Practices:

- The concept of smart practices is introduced versus best practices.
- Smart practices are presented in two categories: structure-governance smart practices and operational smart practices.

Chapter V Findings, Recommendations, and Future Research:

- The project is summarized bringing all components together creating a cohesive view of the research.
- The findings link key issues surrounding homeland security collaboration to recommendations supported by case studies and smart practices.
- Recommendations are presented based on the analysis of the findings, which sets the stage for future research.

G. SUMMARY

This chapter has addressed the format of the project by exploring; the problem statement, research questions, and the significance of the research. The most challenging aspect of this chapter was the literature review. It would have been a much easier task to research an aspect of literature that exists rather than what is missing from homeland security doctrine. The scope of the research was expanded to conduct a rigorous literature review.

Although the research path expanded, it provided for a much greater understanding of the problem. Literature directly pertaining to collaboration in the homeland security arena is scarce. The research path included information about the call for collaboration within homeland security and the practices of collaborative organizations not associated with homeland security. The difficulty of the literature

review is to support the interrelation of the desire to collaborate within homeland security and the facts of collaborative efforts outside of homeland security, which leaves a gap that needs to be filled.

The foundation to address the research questions presented has been established in this chapter. Throughout the remainder of this research project, more detail is unpacked from the literature providing possible resolutions to the research questions.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

II. HOMELAND SECURITY COLLABORATION

The United States, with its 30,000 units of local government, 18,000 local police organizations, 30,000 fire departments, 3,400 county governments, and 15,000 school districts, is in the process of 'preparing' for mass casualty attacks...on hundreds of thousands potentials targets.⁴²

William V. Pelfrey

A. INTRODUCTION

Homeland security incidents physically take place at a specific location. Regardless of where that location is, it is incumbent upon local agencies and organizations to mitigate the incident. The above quotation from William V. Pelfrey identifies the sheer volume of local governmental agencies that need to be prepared for a homeland security event. These statistics cannot encompass the number of additional number of stakeholders that are also charged with homeland security responsibilities. Simple examples of additional organizations include fire protection districts, ambulance districts, and sanitation authorities. The expansive work required here favors collaboration with respect to homeland security preparedness.

Collaboration has been a desired structure in homeland security since the earliest HSPD, HSPD 1 (2001) and the first National Strategy for Homeland Security (2002). Directly tied to the concept of collaboration at the local governmental and stakeholder level is the interdependency of organizations. Although interdependency is a reality, some organizations cannot create and maintain working relationships.

The discussion further examines the availability of guidance for stakeholders and governments to accomplish collaboration. Interdependencies of governments and stakeholders, at the local level, are highlighted. This chapter builds on the idea of changing relationships of local entities.

⁴² William V. Pelfrey, "Cycle of Preparedness: Establishing a Framework to Prepare for Terrorist Threats," *Journal of Homeland Security and Emergency Management* 2, no. 1 (2005): 1.

B. COLLABORATION

What is collaboration? It is not important to define collaboration for all possible applications, but it is imperative to have a working knowledge of the term in the context of homeland security. The concept of collaboration is used in a great number of homeland security publications. These range from private sector driven organizations like Business Executives for National Security (BENS)⁴³ to the 2007 National Strategy for Homeland Security.⁴⁴ At issue is the common understanding of the term. In some documents, the sense is that the framers might have intended a group to create an information-sharing network. Others may have been driving towards a partnership instead of a collaborative effort.

The Chandler Center for Community Leadership⁴⁵ unpacked the idea of organizations working together by identifying a variety of structures. In doing so, the dimensions of purpose, structure, and process are used to offer clarity to the respective levels of interaction. Applying these metrics within the context of the various publications in which collaborations are encouraged is useful to understand the various authors' intent. In short, the term collaboration is used inconsistently among documents that purport the use of collaboration, suggesting a variety of definitions.

Table 1 explores five levels of organizational interaction (Community Linkages) as described in the Chandler Center for Community Leadership literature. This analysis may best capture the intention of homeland security publications that call for collaboration.

⁴³Business Executives for National Security, "What is the BENS Business Force?" North Carolina Institute for Public Health Grand Rounds (2006), http://www.publichealthgrandrounds.unc.edu/pandemic/handout_bens.pdf (accessed September 22, 2008).

⁴⁴ Homeland Security Council, *National Strategy for Homeland Security*, 2007.

⁴⁵ Hogue, "Community Based Collaboration."

Table 1. Community Linkages⁴⁶

Levels	Purpose	Structure	Process
Networking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dialogue and common understanding • Clearinghouse for information • Create base of support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-hierarchical • Loose/flexible links • Roles loosely defined • Communication is primary link among members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low key leadership • Minimal decision making • Little conflict • Informal communication
Cooperation or Alliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Match needs and provide coordination • Limit duplication of services • Ensure tasks are done 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central body of people as communication hub • Semi-formal links • Roles somewhat defined • Links are advisory • Little or no new financial resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitative leaders • Complex decision making • Some conflict • Formal communication within the central group
Coordination or Partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share resources to address common issues • Merge resource base to create something new 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central body of people consists of decision makers • Roles defined • Links formalized • Group leverages/raises money 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Autonomous leadership but focus is on issue • Group decision making in central and subgroups • Communication is frequent and clear

⁴⁶ Hogue, "Community Based Collaboration."

Levels	Purpose	Structure	Process
Coalition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share ideas and be willing to pull resources from existing systems • Develop commitment for a minimum of three years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All members involved in decision making • Roles and time defined • Links formal with written agreement • Group develops new resources and joint budget 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shared leadership • Decision making formal with all members • Communication is common and prioritized
Collaboration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accomplish shared vision and impact benchmarks • Build interdependent system to address issues and opportunities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consensus used in shared decision making • Roles, time and evaluation formalized • Links are formal and written in work assignments • Resources and joint budgets are developed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership high, trust level high, productivity high • Ideas and decisions equally shared • Highly developed communication systems

Getting to an understanding of collaboration is important. The Community Linkages analysis offers a metric to evaluate relationships among homeland security actors and to gauge how close to collaboration are they functioning. The purpose, structure, and process offer simple views to evaluate each level of function. Exploring this analysis model in more detail provides clarity to the framework of collaboration.

C. COMMUNITY LINKAGES IN DETAIL

The five levels of collaboration: networking, cooperation or alliance, coordination or partnership, coalition, and collaboration are increasingly intensive levels of intentional

cooperation and shared action among agencies.⁴⁷ According to Wendy Wheeler, they represent conventional thinking in regard to collaboration. The superficial level of networking consists of a non-hierarchical and informal arrangement designed to share information without the need for formal leadership structures. Subsequent levels require increasingly more formal structure, commitment, decision making, and shared resources among agencies.⁴⁸ Wheeler further identifies the fifth level, collaboration, as “characterized by highly structured and explicit systems, commitments, decision-making structures and intended outcomes supported by written agreements and defined accountability for interdependent outcomes and results.”⁴⁹

In a publication unrelated to homeland security, Harriet Moyer captured in a concise fashion the key elements of each level in Table 1. Moyer focused on community and economic development in her publication, but her narrative descriptions are applicable expanding on the core ideas of each level.

In order to better understand the information contained in Table 1, each segment is explored, offering detail to support the bulleted items that define each level of interaction. Segments are presented in table form followed by expanded details as defined by Harriet Moyer and each segment is discussed as it relates to the bigger picture of the comprehensive system.

Networking—Major purposes of networking are to dialogue and reach common understanding, serve as a clearinghouse for information, and help create a base of support. A network is non-hierarchical in structure with loose flexible links. Roles in a network are loosely defined and community action is the primary link among members. Process in a network is characterized by low-key leadership, minimal decision-making, little conflict, and informal communication.⁵⁰

⁴⁷ Wendy Wheeler, *Encircling Institutions: Surrounding Youth in Crisis with Mutual Engagement, Commitment and Trust* (Takoma Park, MD: Innovation Center for Community and Youth Development, 2007), Roca, <http://www.rocainc.org/pdf/pubs/EncirclingInstitutions.pdf> (accessed June 15, 2009).

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Harriet Moyer, “What We Mean by Working Together,” Center for Community and Economic Development, University of Wisconsin Extension, (June 1997), www.uwex.edu/CES/CCED/leaders/lgc197.cfm (accessed May 25 2009).

As this level of cooperation, members engaged in networking operate at the lowest common denominator position seeking the minimum effort and achieving the lowest output (Table 2).

Table 2. Community Linkages: Networking Segment⁵¹

Levels	Purpose	Structure	Process
Networking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dialogue and common understanding • Clearinghouse for information • Create base of support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-hierarchical • Loose/flexible links • Roles loosely defined • Communication is primary link among members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low key leadership • Minimal decision making • Little conflict • Informal communication

Alliance—Purposes of forming an alliance include matching needs and providing coordination on a project, limiting duplication of services, and ensuring that tasks are done. The basic structure of an alliance is a central body of people acting as a communication hub. Links among the people are semi-formal and advisory; roles are somewhat defined. The group leverages activity. Process in an alliance is characterized by facilitative leaders, complex decision making, some conflict, and formal communications within the central group.⁵²

Intensity increases at the level of alliance, introducing some efficiency and accountability to the interactions (Table 3). This level of participation is moving in a positive direction.

⁵¹ Hogue, “Community Based Collaboration.”

⁵² Moyer, “What We Mean by Working Together,” 1997.

Table 3. Community Linkages: Cooperation or Alliance Segment ⁵³

Levels	Purpose	Structure	Process
Cooperation or Alliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Match needs and provide coordination • Limit duplication of services • Ensure tasks are done 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central body of people as communication hub • Semi-formal links • Roles somewhat defined • Links are advisory • Little or no new financial resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitative leaders • Complex decision making • Some conflict • Formal communication within the central group

Partnership—Sharing resources to address common issues and merging resource bases to create something new are the main purposes of a partnership. In terms of structure, the central body of people consists of decision-makers. Roles are defined and links formalized. The group develops new resources and a joint budget. Process is carried out by autonomous leadership but the focus is on the issue. Group decision-making is done in the central and subgroups. Communication is frequent and clear.⁵⁴

Key aspects of partnership level include creating new outcomes from shared resources, formalizing links and communications (Table 4). This is the highest functioning level short of formalized written agreements.

⁵³ Hogue, “Community Based Collaboration.”

⁵⁴ Moyer, “What We Mean by Working Together,” 1997.

Table 4. Community Linkages: Coordination or Partnership Segment ⁵⁵

Levels	Purpose	Structure	Process
Coordination or Partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share resources to address common issues • Merge resource base to create something new 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central body of people consists of decision makers • Roles defined • Links formalized • Group leverages/raises money 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Autonomous leadership but focus is on issue • Group decision making in central and subgroups • Communication is frequent and clear

Coalition—Central purposes of a coalition are to share ideas and be willing to pull resources from existing systems. Commitment to the coalition should be for a minimum of three years. Structurally, all members are involved in the decision-making. Roles and time are defined; links are formalized with a written agreement. A coalition also develops new resources and a joint budget. Process is done through shared leadership. Decision-making is formal with all members and communication is common and prioritized.⁵⁶

One step away from the highest level of intensity, coalition breaches the written accountability and dedication point (Table 5). Critical at this level is the creation of new resources and new funding. Up to this point, resources and funding remained under the domain of the organization representatives, although they may have shared these assets with other organizations.

⁵⁵ Hogue, “Community Based Collaboration.”

⁵⁶ Moyer, “What We Mean by Working Together,” 1997.

Table 5. Community Linkages: Coalition Segment ⁵⁷

Levels	Purpose	Structure	Process
Coalition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share ideas and be willing to pull resources from existing systems • Develop commitment for a minimum of three years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All members involved in decision making • Roles and time defined • Links formal with written agreement • Group develops new resources and joint budget 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shared leadership • Decision making formal with all members • Communication is common and prioritized

Collaboration—Purpose of a collaboration is to accomplish a shared vision and impact benchmarks. It is geared to build an interdependent system to address issues and opportunities. Structural characteristics include: use of consensus in shared decision making; formalized roles, time and evaluation; formal links written into work assignments. Process involves high levels of leadership, high trust level, and high productivity. Ideas and decisions are equally shared and there is highly developed communication.⁵⁸

At the level of collaboration, the group has reached interdependency and accountability (Table 6). Leadership is high, resources are created, and the group works from a shared vision. Perhaps these are the qualities that are intended when collaboration is prescribed in homeland security policy and guidance.

⁵⁷ Hogue, “Community Based Collaboration.”

⁵⁸ Moyer, “What We Mean by Working Together,” 1997.

Table 6. Community Linkages: Collaboration Segment ⁵⁹

Levels	Purpose	Structure	Process
Collaboration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accomplish shared vision and impact benchmarks • Build interdependent system to address issues and opportunities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consensus used in shared decision making • Roles, time and evaluation formalized • Links are formal and written in work assignments • Resources and joint budgets are developed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership high, trust level high, productivity high • Ideas and decisions equally shared • Highly developed communication systems

D. COMMUNITY LINKAGE EXAMPLES

The Intelligence Community Information Sharing Strategy (ICISS), distributed by the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, calls for collaboration. Applying the metrics listed in community linkages discussion, the framework described more closely resembles coordination or a partnership. Strategic Goal 4, Enhance Collaboration Across the Community in the ICISS, calls for sharing of information by changing a “need-to-know” mentality to a “responsibility to provide” culture. The strategy further desires to enable the intelligence community to connect to each other on a time-imperative basis.⁶⁰

These key dimensions of sharing information, merging resources, and formalizing links more closely align with coordination and partnership as described in the community linkages tables than the aspects of collaboration.

⁵⁹ Hogue, “Community Based Collaboration.”

⁶⁰ Office of the Director of National Intelligence, *Intelligence Community Information Sharing Strategy* (Washington, DC: Office of the Director of National Intelligence, 2008), 14.

The case study of the Seattle-King County, Washington Community Security and Preparedness Practices⁶¹ provides another example; it identifies its model as a collaboration. Under closer scrutiny, by applying the metrics of Table 1, this construct is more aligned with coordination or a partnership than a collaboration. Key items associated with a partnership are defined roles, decision-making leadership in attendance, and shared resources for the greater good. These dimensions fall short of the definition of collaboration as presented in Table 1, but they are still termed collaboration in the report.

Regardless of the level of interaction as defined in the Table 1,⁶² the common goal of homeland security guidance literature is for disparate organizations to work together. Identifying the differences in organizational purpose, structure and process is central to determining the ability to reach collaboration.

Throughout this project, the term collaboration is intended to encompass the ideals of: shared vision, interdependent systems, consensus, formal linkages, and high trust as dimensions. The description of collaboration in Table 1 represents the most complex form of the five dimensions listed and serves as the context for this project.

E. HOMELAND SECURITY ACCOUNTABILITY: A LOCAL ISSUE

The responsibility for homeland security protection has been considered by many local governments as belonging to the federal government. The reality in homeland security is that everyone, including public agencies and stakeholders, shares the responsibility at all levels of government. Disastrous events take place somewhere not ambiguously “in the nation” or “in the state of Illinois.” These events always begin in a

⁶¹Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Office of Water, *Seattle-King County, Washington Community Case Study Report, Security and Preparedness Practices: A collaborative Approach to Water Sector Resiliency*, (Washington, DC: Environmental Protection Agency Office of Water, 2007), v, Environmental Protection Agency, <http://cfpub.epa.gov/safewater/watersecurity/publications.cfm?view=all> (accessed July 26, 2008).

⁶² Hogue, “Community Based Collaboration.”

locality.⁶³ A collaboration of financial institutions, ChicagoFIRST, captured the essence of the issue in their statement “incidents occur in specific locations,”⁶⁴ which makes them local events. The International Association of Chiefs of Police recognizes that homeland security incidents may have national or international repercussions but are inherently local issues that require immediate response.⁶⁵

Yes, the state and federal governments have their respective roles in such an event, but it always begins and ends as a local event.⁶⁶ Local governments and stakeholders have been referred to as first preventers and first defenders appropriately as they are truly both. Local governments and stakeholders are the first affected by an incident, they are first to respond and they are first to help resolve the problem. These same people are the last to leave, the last to recover, and the last to normalize.

The course of an incident can begin with response from local entities and organizations. When the local resources have been expended, the incident is likely to be supplemented by regional or county resources. Once regional manpower, supplies, and equipment have been exceeded, the next level of support is by the state government. The federal response can be initiated when the state’s resources have been exhausted. This succession represents a possible response format during an incident. Exceptions exist when specialized resources are requested that various levels of government do not possess.⁶⁷

⁶³ U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, *Statement of F. Duane Ackerman to the Subcommittee on State, Local, and Private Sector Preparedness and Integration*, 110th Cong, 1 sess., 2007, 2 .

⁶⁴ Brian Tishuk, “The ChicagoFIRST Experience,” presented at 2005, Infragard Conference, Washington, DC, November 30, 2005, Infragard, http://www.infragard.net/library/congress_05/financial_sec/chicago_first_exp.ppt (accessed August 24, 2008).

⁶⁵ International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), *From Hometown Security to Homeland Security: IACP Principles for a Locally Designed and Nationally Coordinated National Homeland Security*, (Alexandria, VA: International Association of Chiefs of Police, n.d.) International Association of Chiefs of Police (2005), <http://www.theiacp.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=78X8uKjLa0U%3D&tabid=392> (accessed April 10, 2008).

⁶⁶ DHS, *National Response Framework*, 2008, 10.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 10, 21, 24.

Once the emergency phase of an incident has been controlled and the incident is in a declining mode, the reverse of response becomes the order in which resources are returned. That is, the federal assets are some of the first to leave, followed by the state resources. Regional and county resources are next to depart the area. Local organizations and agencies are the last to leave the scene.⁶⁸ Through the entire escalation and de-escalation, locals have been on the scene and engaged in the incident.

Responsibility and accountability for homeland security is clearly stated in the 2007 National Strategy for Homeland Security, “Federal, State, local, and Tribal governments, the private and non-profit sectors, communities, and individual citizens all share common goals and responsibilities—as well as accountability—for protecting and defending the Homeland.”⁶⁹ In a 2003 presentation to the American Society for Public Administration, Jonathan Breul added to the national strategy discussion: “Homeland security is a national mission not just a federal mission.”⁷⁰ Breul further identified homeland security as a shared responsibility among state agencies, local agencies, the private sector, and the American citizens. Important in the findings of Breul is the inclusion of local agencies, the private sector, and citizens.

F. LOCAL ISSUE: LOCAL COLLABORATION

Homeland security collaboration at the local level is encouraged in a number of documents by a variety of agencies. The 2007 *National Preparedness Guidelines* of September address this issue as “All levels of government should integrate into their preparedness and response plans the capacity of community, faith based, and other nongovernmental organizations.”⁷¹ The *National Preparedness Guidelines* further identifies expanding regional collaboration as the number one priority of the plan.⁷²

⁶⁸ DHS, *National Response Framework*, 2008, 10, 21, 24.

⁶⁹ Homeland Security Council, *National Strategy for Homeland Security*, 2007, 4.

⁷⁰ Jonathan Breul, “Managing Homeland Security,” presented at American Society for Public Administration National Conference, Portland, OR, March 18, 2003, National Academy of Public Administration, http://www.napawash.org/si/si_homeland_papers.html (accessed July 12, 2008).

⁷¹ DHS, *National Preparedness Guidelines*, 2007, 4.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 11.

The Homeland Security Presidential Directive on Management of Domestic Incidents (HSPD 5) speaks of the need to collaborate, “The objective of the United States Government is to ensure that all levels of government across the Nation have the capability to work efficiently and effectively together.”⁷³ HSPD 5 gives direction to the establishment of the National Incident Management System (NIMS), which includes the Incident Command System (ICS). ICS is built entirely upon the idea of collaboration especially with respect to unified command. Additionally HSPD 5 gives direction to modify the National Response Plan (NRP), which has been succeeded by the National Response Framework (NRF), to include more collaboration. Both the NRP and the NRF were framed upon the ability of governments and stakeholders to collaborate.

Urban Area Security Initiatives (UASI) and states were issued guidance on homeland security strategies in 2005. The guidance discusses the importance of collaboration as “success (of National Preparedness) depends upon robust and adaptive collaboration—between the public and private sector...and agencies within a single jurisdiction.”⁷⁴ The document is not clear if the grant award process was dependent upon collaboration but does clearly indicate that collaboration is required as part of a required, revised strategic plan. The promise of funding has historically been a catalyst for cooperative efforts but does necessarily not support long-term relationships or collaborations.

A network of regional leaders, the Alliance for Regional Stewardship (ARS), has been studying the idea of collaboration for many years. They also have concluded that collaborating at a more refined level than the county level or state level is imperative to safeguard the citizens, businesses and institutions of the country.⁷⁵ While the ARS does not specifically identify local organizations as the refined level for collaboration, it is the next level in succession. The ARS advocates a public-private collaborative structure.⁷⁶

⁷³ White House, *HSPD 5: Management of Domestic Incidents*, 2003, 1.

⁷⁴ DHS, *State and Urban Area Homeland Security Strategy*, 2005, 4

⁷⁵ Dodge, “Regional Emergency Preparedness Compacts,” 2002, 3–4.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

Representing the critical infrastructure component of homeland security, The Infrastructure Security Partnership (TISP) identifies that “creating regional cooperative initiatives or partnerships”⁷⁷ is the first step in their guide to develop a regional action plan. Like ARS, TISP supports a public–private model of collaboration.

G. LOCAL AGENCIES AND STAKEHOLDERS ARE INTERDEPENDENT

Understanding interdependency in a collaborative effort is critical. The core of interdependency is captured in part of the definition of synergism offered by Merriam Webster as “the total effect is greater than the sum of the individual effects.”⁷⁸ In other words, members of the community have a greater capacity to maintain continuity of community working together than working individually.

Continuity of community is a key concept of interdependency and is the common goal of the public sector agencies and stakeholders alike.⁷⁹ For purposes of this discussion, continuity of community is considered to be the physical and social framework that supports an affected area allowing those functions of daily life to continue.

Homeland security incidents are complex in nature. Due to this complexity, there is no single organization or agency that possesses the capacity to mitigate a homeland security incident alone.⁸⁰ The BENS collaboration captures a view of interdependency from the private perspective, “Government and business know intuitively that they need to work together during crisis.”⁸¹ As the BENS report indicated, intuitive relationships exist during crisis; but what is the relationship during pre- and post-crisis phases?

⁷⁷ TISP, *Regional Disaster Resilience*, 2006, 23.

⁷⁸ *Merriam-Webster*, s.v. “synergism,” <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/synergism>, (accessed July 26, 2008).

⁷⁹ Senate, *F. Duane Ackerman*, 2007, 2.

⁸⁰ Partnership for Public Service, “Collaboration in Times of Crisis,” Partnership for Public Service (2008), www.ourpublicservice.org/OPS/publications/viewcontentdetails.php?id=127 (accessed June 7, 2008).

⁸¹ Business Executives for National Security (BENS), *Getting Down to Business: An Action Plan for Public-Private Disaster Response Coordination* (Washington, DC: Business Executives for National Security, 2007), 14.

Governments are expected to provide general safety, security, and the ability for residents and businesses to function. The governments are further expected to ensure that elements of critical infrastructure will function. Of the critical services, electricity is a common need for all communities in the country. Dependent upon the particular area involved in an incident, fresh water, human waste sanitation, and natural gas are considered elements of critical infrastructure. Regardless of the area in the nation, each of these critical infrastructures is important for safety and survival.

The telephone system is defined as part of the telecommunications sector of critical infrastructure (CI).⁸² While not all members of society may understand the full scope of the CI telecommunications sector, the telephone is more than a convenience. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, in 2006, one out of every eight households in America did not have a land-based telephone.⁸³ Alternative telephone users depend upon the cellular telephone system and internet based systems.

Ensuring that these critical services are being provided is a difficult task, especially when governments typically do not own or have direct control of the sector. Nonetheless, the expectation is that these services will be provided. In this construct then, governments serve as facilitators for those who have direct control of the particular critical infrastructure.

Governments also have expectations of the business community. Providing shelter and food top the list of business activities that governments rely on for help. Without fulfilling basic needs, the government agencies would be unable to carry out their missions. According to Newt Gingrich, the private community has the ability to provide more speed, more resources, and more capability (with respect to disaster response planning and execution) than government has internally.⁸⁴ What the private community

⁸² Ted G. Lewis, *Critical Infrastructure in Homeland Security: Defending a Networked Nation*, (Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Interscience, 2006), 3.

⁸³ Stephen J. Blumberg and Julian V. Luke, "Wireless Substitution: Preliminary Data from the January–June 2006 National Health Interview Survey," Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics (2007), <http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/products/pubs/pubd/hestats/wireless2006/wireless2006.htm> (accessed July 17, 2008).

⁸⁴ BENS, *Getting Down to Business*, 2007, 36.

is lacking in this discussion is the framework in which to coordinate the resources that they have to offer. Mr. Duane Ackerman of BENS Business Response Task Force identified that “public-private partnerships are vital to filling gaps...that neither government nor business can manage alone.”⁸⁵ The BENS contribution acknowledges the interdependency issue by business.

Government-government,⁸⁶ private-private,⁸⁷ and public-private⁸⁸ interdependency has been measured in areas outside of disaster response and homeland security. Successful collaborations have recognized their interdependencies in areas such as economics, community development, special services, and transportation. Local governments, businesses, and stakeholders recognize that the actions of one segment has an impact on the others segments of a community. Additionally, they recognize that the action of one locality affects the region, and the actions of one region affects additional regions, and so on.

H. HOMELAND SECURITY POLICIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS DO NOT OFFER GUIDANCE TO ESTABLISH COLLABORATION

Providing a “one size fits all” scheme for collaboration is an impossible task. It is not a silver bullet that is missing, rather simple steps to overcome inertia for local governments and stakeholders to initiate collaborative discussions is missing. Determining and building collaborative capacity is important to this discussion, but impossible to thoroughly cover in this project. Given the complexity of determining collaborative capacity and that local governments and stakeholders do not typically possess the resources to determine capacity, they are not likely to act without basic guidance. Thus, far the basic guidance on how to collaborate has been missing from important homeland security doctrine.

⁸⁵ BENS, *Getting Down to Business*, 2007, 6.

⁸⁶ Texas Association of Regional Councils (TARC), “About TARC,” Texas Association of Regional Councils, http://www.txregionalcouncil.org/display.php?page=about_tarc.php (accessed April 12, 2008).

⁸⁷ Tishuk, “The ChicagoFIRST Experience,” 2005, slide 4.

⁸⁸ BENS, “Regional Public-Private Partnerships,” 2.

The National Strategy for Physical Protection of Critical Infrastructures and Key Assets, published in 2003 identifies the value of collaboration over 20 times in the document.⁸⁹ The strategy describes the intended outcomes of the collaborations such as; producing effective and efficient information sharing, identifying a uniform methodology to identify threats, and to increase detection and testing capabilities in the agricultural and food networks. This guidance does not define collaboration or how to establish it; only the anticipated outcomes are described. Accomplishing these goals may be difficult.

In 2005, UASI guidance clearly calls for collaboration from local entities “success (of National Preparedness) depends upon robust and adaptive collaboration—between the public and private sector...and agencies within a single jurisdiction.”⁹⁰ This is, however, where direction on how to accomplish the collaboration stops. The document falls short of guidance to initiate and falls short on guidance to sustain collaboration. UASI agencies include local governments that may not have the resources devoted to develop collaboration. These agencies would greatly benefit from collaboration guidance.

Collaboration and partnership are used interchangeably in the National Strategy for Homeland Security. Several references are made extolling the benefits of these working models, but guidance on how to accomplish these goals is not provided. In this case, the terminology itself should be consistent in selecting one term. The Community Based Collaboration, Community Wellness Multiplied publication (CBCCWM) provides different metrics for collaboration and partnership.⁹¹

Collaboration will occur is the simple message portrayed in the recently released National Response Framework. The message in this document is that collaboration will occur between department and agency heads, non-governmental agencies, and between levels of governmental agencies. Neither the expected outcomes nor the method of how to accomplish these actions is provided in the document. Given the various meanings of

⁸⁹ White House, *The National Strategy for Physical Protection of Critical Infrastructures and Key Assets* (Washington, DC: White House, 2003), Department of Homeland Security, http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/Physical_Strategy.pdf (accessed December 15, 2007).

⁹⁰ DHS, *State and Urban Area Homeland Security Strategy*, 2005, 4.

⁹¹ Hogue, “Community Based Collaboration.”

collaboration already discussed here, the recentness of this document, and the importance placed upon all levels of government to adopting this framework, the lack of guidance is concerning. Again, this is a significant publication that leaves interpretation of how to collaborate to the reader.

I. SUMMARY

Documents, like the National Strategy for Homeland Security, that support collaborative efforts leave questions about the meaning of collaboration. This particular doctrine interchanges partnership and collaboration regularly raising the question of intent. It is unclear if the intent of the document is collaboration as defined by Community Wellness Multiplied report or that relationships should just be improved in some non-specific fashion.⁹² Given the urgency for improved preparedness in a post-9/11 world and the speed in which these documents were promulgated, the exact definition is irrelevant. What is important is the change from working exclusively within an organization to more open working arrangements spanning disciplines and public-private barriers. The Community Wellness Multiplied work offers a systematic analysis to evaluate current relationships, and provides one example of a model that may achieve what the framers of homeland security doctrine might have been striving for.

Since homeland security events take place somewhere specific, local entities are first to respond and subsequently first to prevent. The National Strategy for Homeland Security clearly outlines the importance of local governments in planning, “We will continue to base our Federal planning and response efforts on the premise that the vast majority of incidents will be handled at the lowest jurisdictional level possible.”⁹³ Furthermore, because local entities are interdependent with each other, all that exist in the community are subject to risk and therefore are concerned to support continuity of community.

⁹² Hogue, “Community Based Collaboration.”

⁹³ Homeland Security Council, *National Strategy for Homeland Security*, 2007, 32.

Given that homeland security issues are a local responsibility and that the entire community has a vested interest in mitigating these events, local entities, public and private should engage in collaboration. A great concern is that although the call for collaboration is clear, the guidance to accomplish it is absent. Although not necessarily homeland security centric, the next chapter evaluates through content analysis how groups have come to work together successfully.

III. CASE STUDIES

A. INTRODUCTION

Evaluating the application of homeland security guidance that cites collaboration as the desired organizational framework can be accomplished through the case study methodology. However, in an effort to appropriately limit the scope of the research, a modified case study method was utilized in this project. The standard case study methodology construct was refined to focus on: the type of organizational structure utilized as defined by the Community Wellness Multiplied Report (presented in the previous chapter),⁹⁴ evidence of success, participating member type (government/public only or public-private), and smart practices of thriving organizations. Smart practices that were identified as a result of the case study methodology are discussed in detail in the next chapter.

A narrowed focus in the case study methodology allowed a larger data set to be utilized in this research. The analysis of a number of cases is important in determining how collaboration has been achieved as it is stated in various homeland security guidance documents. This modified case study method provided less extensive detail per case but by exploring a greater volume of cases, the organizational structure can be identified and the effectiveness of each group was explored.

Several collaborative examples could be studied in this modified case study research. Locating cases though that successfully affect the homeland security arena is however more difficult. Three cases are explored in this chapter: Business Executives for National Security, ChicagoFIRST (Fostering Industry Resilience and Security through Teamwork),⁹⁵ and the Texas Association for Regional Councils. Two of the cases began

⁹⁴ Hogue, "Community Based Collaboration."

⁹⁵ ChicagoFIRST, "ChicagoFIRST: Fostering Industry Resilience and Security through Teamwork," ChicagoFIRST, <https://www.chicagofirst.org/> (accessed July 5, 2009).

strictly as private enterprises but realized that government interaction was imperative for success. The last case began as a government centric project and has migrated over a number of years to include the private sector.

Each group organized for different reasons. These reasons range from planning concerns over 40 years ago to the need for security following the events of September 11, 2001. The key is the sustainability that each have demonstrated over time. Using the CBCCWM information in Table 1,⁹⁶ as a comparison standard, none of the cases studied achieve the level of collaboration as described in the table. Each case proves that the organization can be effective without meeting the collaboration definition detailed in Table 1.

Defining success can become very subjective. For the purposes of this project, success encompasses several attributes of the case studies presented. All cases enjoy durability and sustainability in that they have continued to exist and move towards new goals objectives. In the ChicagoFIRST and Business Executives for National Security examples, each were evaluated by entities and replicated throughout the country. The fact that these structures and functions were copied and implemented indicates a degree of success. Evolving since 1965, the Regional Planning Commissions in Texas⁹⁷ have adapted to address current issues but have still maintained the collaborative like structure. Success as defined in this project includes sustainability, replication, and adaptability of the case studies presented.

Since homeland security is an emerging discipline,⁹⁸ the available number of discipline specific cases to study is limited. By definition, homeland security organizations are not overly transparent, which further limits the available information. However, principles associated with organizations that have impacted their targeted environment are universally applicable to the more narrow discipline of homeland security.

⁹⁶ Hogue, "Community Based Collaboration."

⁹⁷ Texas Statutes, Local Government Code, Regional Planning Commissions, (1965), Title 12, Subtitle C, Chapter 391, § 391.001 (a), (<http://www.statutes.legis.state.tx.us/?link=LG> (accessed August 29, 2008)).

⁹⁸ Bellavita, "Changing Homeland Security," 2008.

B. BUSINESS EXECUTIVES FOR NATIONAL SECURITY (BENS)

As Hurricanes Katrina and Rita have demonstrated, government cannot 'do' homeland security by itself. Private sector initiatives—such as BENS' Business Force Initiative—accordingly offer the Department a valuable opportunity to leverage the private sector's vast resources and talents for the good of the nation.⁹⁹

U.S. Representative Bennie Thompson (D-MS), House Homeland Security Committee Chairman

Founded by business executive and entrepreneur Stanley A. Weiss, BENS provides a forum to address national security issues with a business perspective. Senior executives from a broad range of business sectors and diverse political orientation have been assembling as part of BENS since 1982 in order to utilize their experience to find practical solutions to national security challenges. Members of BENS have long been committed to a strong, effective affordable national defense. Furthermore, BENS has been committed to preventing the use of weapons of mass destruction (WMD).¹⁰⁰

Clearly national security, the original focus of BENS, and homeland security are different concepts by definition each with unique objectives and associated actors. At the time the organization was founded, the concept of homeland security was not widespread but has since adapted to meet the needs of today. Regardless of the cause of the disaster, businesses have a vested interest in a positive outcome. According to BENS criteria, core characteristic of a successful regional partnership places “Continuity of Community” above parochial interests.¹⁰¹ This root philosophy transcends the cause of the problem and focuses on recovery. BENS is not only focused on recovery, it focuses on response. Taking a proactive posture and responding during crisis has been a long-time function of the organization.

⁹⁹ Business Executives for National Security (BENS), “What They Say about BENS,” Business Executives for National Security, <http://www.bens.org/about-us/what-they-say-about-bens.html> (accessed August 23, 2008).

¹⁰⁰ Business Executives for National Security (BENS), “Business Executives for National Security History,” Business Executives for National Security, <http://www.bens.org/about-us/history.html> (accessed August 23, 2008).

¹⁰¹ BENS, “BENS Business Force Partnership Criteria.”

As collaborative efforts, BENS organizations across the country are best characterized as a public-private form of partnerships according to the CBCCWM. “A central body of decision makers sharing resources, defining roles and focusing on one issue” is the main criteria that Table 1 uses to distinguish partnerships.¹⁰² Additionally, frequent and clear communication is a component of partnerships identified by the CBCCWM that the BENS organizations strive for.¹⁰³

1. A Record of Achievement

The record of accomplishments goes well beyond recent history setting the foundation for the homeland security work of today. BENS was involved in the process that was utilized to close obsolete military bases. These closures allowed local communities to utilize these unneeded military sites more productively.¹⁰⁴ As an early advocate for the Pentagon five-year business plan, BENS positively impacted national defense. When funding was needed to dismantle Russian nuclear weapons, BENS was instrumental in gathering support for the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program.¹⁰⁵

Recently, the BENS Business Force focused on creating public-private partnerships specifically to address homeland security. The historical integrity of BENS was a key factor when in a post-Katrina environment; Congress invited the organization to better define the role of business in catastrophic events. The Business Response Task Force was chartered and presented a report in late 2006 entitled “Getting down to Business: an Action Plan for Public-Private Disaster Response Coordination¹⁰⁶”

One of several key findings of this task force recommends public-private collaboration as a remedy to the events that took place during Katrina.¹⁰⁷ Lessons learned and smart practices were identified in the report from the business perspective

¹⁰² Hogue, “Community Based Collaboration.”

¹⁰³ Ibid.

¹⁰⁴ BENS, “Business Executives for National Security History.”

¹⁰⁵ Ibid.

¹⁰⁶ BENS, *Getting Down to Business*, 2007.

¹⁰⁷ BENS, “Regional Public-Private Partnerships,” 2.

making this document important to the public sector. It is difficult for government to appreciate the business view as it does not follow the same operational plans as businesses do. Appreciating the business view is critical in successful public-private partnerships.

Building on the work of the Business Response Task Force, the Department of State's Bureau of Intelligence and Research requested help from BENS in assessing business practices that evaluate analytic programs. That is, how does a business perform analysis and more importantly, how does it measure the efficiency of the process?¹⁰⁸ For purposes of this discussion, the outcomes of the project are not as important as the request from the intelligence community to the private sector for help and the capacity of BENS to deliver.

These interactions with the federal government, especially the traditionally closed intelligence community (IC), demonstrate the success of the BENS collaborative organization. In both the report to Congress and the project for the IC, groups of business executives worked collaboratively and focused on the mission of protecting the country.

2. Today and Tomorrow

Since 2002, BENS has facilitated homeland security partnerships in eight regions throughout the country, each with unique economical and political environments.¹⁰⁹ While resources and programs differ in the eight regions, constant are the informational exchanges, funding, and the use of human capital in the form of sharing education and experiences. Examples of programs and initiatives include:

- New Jersey Business Force provides a Web-based clearinghouse of locally available resources valued at over \$300 million dollars for emergency managers to call upon. This business force further provides emergency secure communications as a backup to government systems.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁸ Business Executives for National Security (BENS), *Intelligence Community Analysis Project* (Alexandria, VA: Business Executives for National Security, 2008), 3, http://bens.org/mis_support/ICAP-Rprt.pdf (accessed August 23, 2008).

¹⁰⁹ BENS, "Regional Public-Private Partnerships," 2.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*

- The Georgia Business Force (GBF) distinguishes itself with the creation of a Business Operations Center (BOC). The BOC functions in the same fashion as the state Emergency Operations Center (EOC) except that it is designed to communicate across business sectors. Leveraging the value of the BOC, the GBF has been invited to occupy seats in the state EOC to function as liaisons between the public and private sectors.¹¹¹
- The GBF has been instrumental in the Distribution of the Strategic National Stockpile. Businesses help state and local officials with the distribution of medication in the event of a pandemic or terrorism related event.¹¹²
- The Massachusetts BENS group worked with the state emergency management agency to develop a clearinghouse of resources much like the New Jersey model.
- In the metro Kansas City region, the focus of the collaboration has been on information sharing in co-developing the charter for a fusion center and in creating educational seminars and exercises for both business and the public. The metro Kansas City region group is known as the Mid-America Business Force, which was formed in 2004.¹¹³
- Regions in California and Colorado collaborate focusing on availing resources, information sharing and establishing a BOC.¹¹⁴ In addition to the types of collaborations discussed, the Safeguard Iowa Partnership (SIP) was able to dynamically adapt to a new mission during the historic floods of 2008. SIP was asked to be the lead in establishing the software to manage donations from across the state.¹¹⁵

3. The Case Study

All of the work in the BENS organization has been historically collaborative in nature and no signs of altering that formula are evident. By excluding partisanship and cutting across both private business and government alike, BENS has proven the value of partnership. Initially focused on national defense and now including homeland security, the organization has demonstrated the ability to transform and adapt to current issues while remaining focused on the most important objective: continuity of community.

¹¹¹ BENS, “Regional Public-Private Partnerships,” 2.

¹¹² Ibid.

¹¹³ Ibid.

¹¹⁴ Ibid., 3–5.

¹¹⁵ Ibid., 4.

The CBCCWM Table identifies critical components of true collaboration including: interdependent systems, joint budgets and consensus in shared decision making.¹¹⁶ The literature indicated that BENS best is defined as a partnership form of collaboration. The BENS model clearly illustrates that true collaboration by the CBCCWM definition is not required to be an effective organization.

C. CHICAGOFIRST

*ChicagoFIRST is exemplary. It shows what a creative, dedicated group of individuals and organizations can do, working together, to protect and strengthen the critical financial services infrastructure on a regional basis. These 'lessons learned' serve as a model for other regional coalitions.*¹¹⁷

Wayne A. Abernathy, Assistant Secretary for Financial Institutions, U.S.
Department of Treasury

At first glance, the ChicagoFIRST name might imply that the group believes that Chicago is the most important homeland security target to protect. While the members of the collaboration might believe that Chicago is the highest priority, it is not the intent of the name. FIRST is actually an acronym which represents: Financial, Industry, Resilience, Security, and Teamwork. The group began in Chicago in 2003 after many business sectors began to strengthen their disaster plans resulting from the events of September 11, 2001.¹¹⁸ Unlike many other collaborative efforts, this began strictly within the financial institutions of Chicago. Formation of the collaboration can be attributed to senior executives asking some basic questions about homeland security. Early questions that required answers involved:

- How to protect employees
- How to provide business continuity
- How to acquire accurate information

¹¹⁶ Hogue, "Community Based Collaboration."

¹¹⁷ Department of the Treasury, *Improving Business Continuity*, 2004, 4.

¹¹⁸ Center for Technology in Government (CTG), "Exploring Regional Telecommunication Incident Response Coordination," State University of New York at Albany (2007), www.ctg.albany.edu/publications/reports/exploring_regional?chapter=9 (accessed June 7, 2008).

- How to provide entry to the affected for essential personnel in order to begin the recovery process¹¹⁹

These questions initially did not have answers but needed to be addressed.

The natural question to ask that may solve all of the inquiries by the financial sector is, “Shouldn’t the government assume this role (to protect, to inform, and to recover)?”¹²⁰ In his presentation at the 2005 Infragard National Conference, Brian Tishuk of ChicagoFIRST answered this question. Tishuk pointed out that first responders do not necessarily understand how prevention, preparation, and response affects critical infrastructure or can best serve critical infrastructure (the financial sector).

Initially, beginning as a private sector program, the goal was not to work independently, but to form strategic partnerships in a public-private construct. This pathway quickly engaged the city of Chicago, the state of Illinois, the U.S. Department of the Treasury, and the Department of Homeland Security.¹²¹ The organization motto grew from the sentiment of proactive ownership, “A crisis is not time to exchange business cards.”¹²²

Respect for success came quickly for ChicagoFIRST as the U.S. Treasury Department released a case study in December of 2004 reviewing the ChicagoFIRST model. The report lists this model as a best practice and encourages other financial centers to apply the model in their regions.¹²³ Since that time, regional partnerships have embraced this model in; Minnesota, California, Texas, Florida, Hawaii, Arizona, the National Capitol Region, Missouri, Tennessee, and Pennsylvania.¹²⁴

¹¹⁹ Department of the Treasury, *Improving Business Continuity*, 2004, 6.

¹²⁰ Tishuk, “The ChicagoFIRST Experience,” 2005, slide 4.

¹²¹ CTG, “Exploring Regional Telecommunication,” 2007.

¹²² ChicagoFIRST. “Chicago Financial Industry Resilience and Security through Teamwork, 2006 Annual Report.” ChicagoFIRST. https://www.chicagofirst.org/resources/2006_Accomplishments.pdf (accessed August 23, 2008).

¹²³ ChicagoFIRST, “ChicagoFIRST Paves the Way,” 2006.

¹²⁴ RPCfirst, “RPCfirst Regional Partnership Council, Partnership Information,” Regional Partnership Council, <http://www.rpcfirst.org/partnerships/default.asp> (accessed August 24, 2008).

ChicagoFIRST describes the form of governance that they employ as a partnership. Key indicators contained in Table 1, are consistent with the partnership criteria. Table 1 identifies that sharing resources are a component of partnerships. Louis Rosenthal, a cofounder of ChicagoFIRST and executive vice-president of LaSalle Bank offered that sharing resources was an unexpected benefit of the collaboration.¹²⁵ Rosenthal explained how surprised he was when during a significant fire in 2004 in his Chicago facility; other members were calling him offering the use of their facilities and space for the LaSalle Bank to work.¹²⁶

Shortly after forming the organization in 2003, the group realized that to reach the desired level of success that full-time help would be required in addition to the volunteer work offered by the members. At that time, dues were initiated and have remained the same since.¹²⁷ Raising money for full-time employees and other projects is an identified structure of a partnership according to the CBCCWM.¹²⁸

1. The Long-Term Strategy

Solutions for homeland security issues in the larger, more comprehensive schema can involve legislative activity. ChicagoFIRST has embraced the legislative strategy in providing presentations and written statements to Congress. In the first of several inputs, ChicagoFIRST testified before the U.S. House Financial Services Committee on Protecting Our Financial Infrastructure: Preparation and Vigilance in September 2004.¹²⁹

¹²⁵ Ken Sternberg, "Taking Care of Business," *Homeland Protection Professional* (October 2006): 27, ChicagoFIRST, https://www.chicagofirst.org/press/2006/Taking_Care_of_Business.pdf (accessed August 26, 2008).

¹²⁶ Sternberg, "Taking Care of Business," 2006.

¹²⁷ ChicagoFIRST, "Frequently Asked Questions," ChicagoFIRST, <https://www.chicagofirst.org/resources/faq.jsp> (accessed June 12, 2008).

¹²⁸ Hogue, "Community Based Collaboration."

¹²⁹ ChicagoFIRST, "Legislative Activity," ChicagoFIRST, http://www.chicagofirst.org/legislative_activity.jsp (accessed June 12, 2008).

The Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Act of 2004 specifically identified ChicagoFIRST as a model public-private regional partnership for regional partnerships that wish to protect employees and critical infrastructure by enhancing communications, coordinating disaster preparedness, and business continuity.¹³⁰

In the summer of 2006, Congress invited ChicagoFIRST to again to testify and to submit a statement on pandemic preparedness to the U.S. House of Representatives Financial Services Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.¹³¹ Receiving an invitation to testify before Congress and being referenced in the Intelligence Reform Act as a model construct are clear signals that the collaboration has experienced success.

2. Overcoming Inertia

Further citations of success lie in the initiatives that the collaboration executed. In 2006, a tabletop exercise was held evaluating resilience of the private sector to a pandemic scenario. The tabletop mobilized the financial community, power, communications, law enforcement, and all levels of government to participate.¹³²

Most impressively, the organization assisted in planning and execution of the first in the entire country evacuation drill conducted in a major city. Nearly 3,000 workers from the Central Business District participated on a voluntary basis in the exercise in September of 2006.¹³³

It is unclear if the execution of this exercise was sparked by the findings presented in the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) *Nationwide Plan Review Phase 2* that was completed in the summer of 2006. It is important to note that the DHS report identified “Significant weaknesses in evacuation planning are an area of profound concern.”¹³⁴ The report goes further to point out that there are serious shortcomings in evacuation planning at the state and urban area levels. In the peer review process, teams

¹³⁰ ChicagoFIRST, “Legislative Activity.”

¹³¹ Ibid.

¹³² ChicagoFIRST, “2006 Annual Report.”

¹³³ Ibid.

¹³⁴ DHS and DOT, *Nationwide Plan Review*, 2006, 67.

reported that less than 20 percent of state and 10 percent of urban area plans as sufficient for evacuation.¹³⁵ It is unclear if the DHS report influenced the timing of the evacuation exercise. Regardless of coincidence, ChicagoFIRST overcame the rhetoric of disaster planning and accomplished a monumental hurdle when they actually evacuated 3,000 people.

An initial goal identified when ChicagoFIRST organized involved communicating critical information during a crisis. This goal was achieved late in 2003 when the group obtained a permanent seat in the Chicago Emergency Operations Center. Vital and accurate information can now be communicated to the financial community during a crisis and the city government can receive timely information from the financial community.¹³⁶

3. Next Step—A Coalition of Partnerships

As the principals of collaboration were identified in Chicago and embraced in other population centers throughout the country, it became evident that a larger overarching structure was required to coordinate the national strategy. The Regional Partnership Council first (RPCfirst) formed in 2007 as a coalition of regional partnerships.¹³⁷

In addition to the organizations that formed strongly based on the ChicagoFIRST model, this coalition includes existing programs that meet the needs of their community. Examples of groups that find utility in the coalition, but are not modeled after the ChicagoFIRST plan, include: Financial Recovery Coalition of North Carolina, which is a

¹³⁵ DHS and DOT, *Nationwide Plan Review*, 2006, 67.

¹³⁶ Brian S. Tishuk, "Participating in a Regional Public-Private Emergency Partnership—Why do it and How do you Make it Work?" *Journal of Business Continuity & Emergency Planning* 1, no. 4 (2007): 395.

¹³⁷ RPCfirst, "About RPCfirst," RPCfirst, <http://www.rpcfirst.org/default.asp> (accessed August 24, 2008).

steering committee; Pacific Northwest Regional Coalition for Finance, a working committee; and the Louisiana Bankers Emergency Preparedness Coalition, which is not incorporated as a separate entity.¹³⁸

Exactly how effective RPCfirst will become is yet to be determined. However, given that the coalition has adopted much of what ChicagoFIRST has developed, it has a good historical record that predicts a positive outcome. Key issues that are common in the coalition mission and the regional partnership mission include: coordinating with local and state governments, participation in the national homeland security policy making process and leverage member relationships to achieve effective business continuity and coordinated homeland security efforts.¹³⁹

4. The Case Study

ChicagoFIRST began as a private stakeholder organization concerned for the safety of its workers well-being and has grown into a model partnership. Functioning at the partnership level of community interaction has proven to be successful for ChicagoFIRST. ChicagoFIRST has been engaged in the national legislative process, accomplishing tangible objectives not just paper planning. A tangible result is the integration of ChicagoFIRST into the Chicago EOC. As part of a critical communication network.

On a larger scale, the model was adopted by the U.S. Treasury Department and additional organizations grew in a number of big cities throughout the country. Furthermore, a coalition of partnerships was formed, RPCfirst, to coordinate the groups that had similar structures and to include other interested organizations.

Utilizing Table 1 once again to identify critical components of true collaboration, the following are included: interdependent systems, joint budgets, and consensus in shared decision making.¹⁴⁰

¹³⁸ RPCfirst. "RPCfirst Regional Partnership Council."

¹³⁹ RPCfirst, "Mission," RPCfirst, <http://www.rpcfirst.org/mission/default.asp> (accessed August 24, 2008).

¹⁴⁰ Hogue, "Community Based Collaboration."

In a similar fashion to the BENS model, ChicagoFIRST has been able to employ a successful partnership form of collaborating. In comparing BENS and ChicagoFIRST, it is evident that both have achieved organizational objectives without achieving true collaboration by the CBCCWM definition.

D. TEXAS ASSOCIATION OF REGIONAL COUNCILS (TARC)

Founded in 1973, the Texas Association of Regional Councils (TARC) functions as a networking oriented collaborative organization connecting the 24 regional planning groups.¹⁴¹ The regional planning groups encompass the entire state and have been functioning for about 40 years.

Originating with the passage of the Texas Regional Planning Act in 1965 (TRPA 1965),¹⁴² the state of Texas began its long history of supporting collaborative organizations. The TRPA 1965 was subsequently codified under the Local Government Code within the Texas Statutes. Chapter 391 in the Local Government Code details the creation and purpose of Regional Planning Commissions.¹⁴³ The mission and the names of the planning commissions have evolved since they were created in order to meet the constantly changing issues that confronted them.

Initially the purposes of the planning commissions were to perform studies and create plans, to guide the development of the region, promote efficiency, and the economy in the coordinated development in the region.¹⁴⁴ Important in this legislation is the identification of the commissions as a “political subdivision of the state.”¹⁴⁵

There are several aspects relating to the creation of the planning commissions that are unusual. The first unusual concept is that state legislation was utilized to create the

¹⁴¹TARC, “About TARC.”

¹⁴² Thomas R. Dye, “Local Government in Texas Cities, Towns, Counties, and Special Districts” in *Politics in America*. 5th ed. (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2002), Prentice Hall Companion Web site. http://wps.prenhall.com/hss_dye_politics_5/7/1867/478180.cw/index.html (accessed August 29, 2008).

¹⁴³ Texas Statutes, Local Government Code, Regional Planning Commissions, 1965.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid.

regional organizations. Collaborative groups organize for a variety of reasons, usually not at the direction of state statute. Thomas R. Dye offers some insight into the status of the planning commissions in his book *Politics in America*. Dye describes county governments in Texas as “administrative subdivisions” of the state¹⁴⁶ leaving smaller units of government with little authority but a great deal of responsibility. According to Dye, Texas has some 254 counties, the most of any state in the country.¹⁴⁷ If each county functions as an agent of the state then it is understandable that the 24 regional planning commissions function in the same way.

An equally unusual aspect of the statute is the limitation of membership to only include the local governmental units, but inclusion in the region is voluntary.¹⁴⁸ Under this construct, only local municipalities and special districts are eligible participants. Again, according to Dye, Texas has some 3,300 special districts.¹⁴⁹ He refers to this type of agency as “invisible” because most people know little about their jurisdiction, structure, and function.¹⁵⁰ Special districts address a wide variety of needs including drainage districts, school districts, navigations districts, fresh water supply districts, river authorities, housing authorities, and sanitation districts.¹⁵¹

Over time, the regional planning commissions evolved expanding their mission and changing their name to become Councils of Government (COG). Not all of the planning commissions became COGs. Some regions maintained the planning commission moniker and others became development councils.¹⁵² Regardless of the actual name, the structures will be referred to as COGs in this discussion.

¹⁴⁶ Dye, “Local Government in Texas,” 2002.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid.

¹⁴⁸ Texas Statutes, Local Government Code, Regional Planning Commissions, 1965.

¹⁴⁹ Dye, “Local Government in Texas,” 2002.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid.

¹⁵¹ Ibid.

¹⁵² Texas Association of Regional Councils (TARC), “2009 Texas Conference on Regionalism,” Texas Association of Regional Councils, <http://www.txregionalcouncil.org/index.php> (accessed July 5, 2009).

1. Councils of Government Today

Currently the Councils of Government address issues that include developing homeland security strategies, cooperative purchasing options, services for the elderly, transportation issues, and law enforcement training.¹⁵³ Some of the regions have expanded their membership to include nongovernmental entities to augment the local units of government.¹⁵⁴ Each COG adjusts their particular focus to address the needs of their unique region. All of the regions are constructed according to state statute but have flexibility to mitigate local issues therefore, the scope of mission changes from region to region. The Ark-Tex Council of Government, Region 5, best captures the new trend with respect to mission in a simple, concise statement, “To provide services where no other vehicle exists.”¹⁵⁵

The diversity in structure of the COGs increases the difficulty in determining how to classify the level or type of collaborative effort that they represent, as described in Table 1. The degree of involvement and depth of detail varies in the twenty-four regions. Considering the variables associated with all of the regions, these organizations are best aligned in the Cooperation/Alliance and Coordination/Partnership range within Table 1.¹⁵⁶ The regions generally share resources, limit duplication of services, have defined roles, have links that are formalized, and have formalized communications.

¹⁵³ TARC, “About TARC.”

¹⁵⁴ Texas Association of Regional Councils (TARC), “Alamo Area Council of Governments,” Texas Association of Regional Councils, <http://www.txregionalcouncil.org/display.php?page=region.php&COG=AACOG> (accessed April 12, 2008).

¹⁵⁵ Texas Association of Regional Councils (TARC), “Ark-Tex Council of Governments,” Texas Association of Regional Councils, <http://www.txregionalcouncil.org/display.php?page=region.php&COG=ARK-TEX> (accessed April 12, 2008).

¹⁵⁶ Hogue, “Community Based Collaboration.”

Characterizing which level of collaborative activity according to Table 1 is not as important as it is to identify that these groups do not meet the definition of collaboration as it is defined in the table. The durability and resiliency of these groups, as they have adapted to their changing environment and remain effective collaborative efforts, is the delineating factor.

2. The Need for Statewide Coordination

A need to coordinate regions was identified early as the regional planning commissions began to gain momentum and realize accomplishments. The Texas Association of Regional Councils was created in 1973 to accomplish this task. This overarching organization functions more like a network according to Table 1 definitions than any other structure.¹⁵⁷ This model has been a clearinghouse for information, a liaison service between regions, and a conduit connecting the regions with the state government.¹⁵⁸

Mechanisms that allow TARC to share information include conferences, publications and updated Web based information.¹⁵⁹ In 2003, a Strategic Directions Committee was formed at the TARC level. The intent of this committee was to evaluate common trends in all of the regions throughout the state, identify future issues, and recommend a strategy to address the issues. The process was completed in 2005 and the Strategic Directions for Texas Regions report was completed.¹⁶⁰ The report offers a number of conclusions and recommendations addressing all regions. The details of that report are not important in this discussion, but the fact that TARC commissioned a forward-looking assessment for all regions is evidence that the collaborative effort has been successful and intends to maintain this course.

¹⁵⁷ Hogue, "Community Based Collaboration."

¹⁵⁸ TARC, "About TARC."

¹⁵⁹ Texas Association of Regional Councils, "2009 Texas Conference on Regionalism," Texas Association of Regional Councils, <http://www.txregionalcouncil.org/index.php> (accessed July 5, 2009).

¹⁶⁰ Texas Association of Regional Councils (TARC), "Strategic Directions for Texas Regions," Texas Association for Regional Councils, http://www.txregionalcouncil.org/sd_exec_summary.pdf (accessed April 12, 2008).

Further evidence of collaborative success of the COGs and TARC is found in the Texas Homeland Security Strategic Plan. Texas produced a homeland security strategic plan in 2004 and in 2005. Interestingly, neither COGs nor TARC were included in the 2004 document but play a more significant role in the 2005 version. The 2005 plan calls for each of the 24 COGs to develop local homeland security plans.¹⁶¹ The latest strategy includes the COGs in planning and communication. The plan does not, however, acknowledge the regional structure during operational situations. A detailed explanation in the plan offers that regions are divided by several state and federal agencies in different ways,¹⁶² therefore, the state defers to response agencies to determine regions dependent upon the nature and scope of the incident.

3. The Case Study

Regional councils and TARC have been in existence the longest in this case study discussion. Created in the late 1960s, these groups began with a focus on regional planning and have successfully adapted to meet the needs as they have changed over the years. Interestingly, these councils began as a result of legislation that allowed units of government to work cooperatively but did not mandate participation.

The importance of regional teamwork was realized early as the groups began gain traction as they attained objectives. The collaborative concept was so essential that the regions required a larger, statewide coordinating group to assist the regions. TARC has been filling that need since 1973.

Neither the COGs nor TARC function at the level described in Table 1. Despite that fact that these are not classified as collaborations, they have enjoyed success throughout their existence. To their credit, they have modified and adjusted their actions to meet the changing environment around them.

¹⁶¹ Rick Perry, "The Texas Homeland Security Strategic Plan 2005-2010." Huston-Galveston Area Council (2005), http://www.h-gac.com/safety/homeland-security/documents/HmLndSecurity_StratPlan.pdf (accessed October 23, 2007).

¹⁶² Perry, "Texas Homeland Security Strategic Plan," 2005, 7.

E. SELECTED CASE STUDIES COMPARED TO THE COMMUNITY BASED COLLABORATION, COMMUNITY WELLNESS MULTIPLIED—COMMUNITY LINKAGES CRITERIA

This section provides an analysis of each case study presented (BENS, ChicagoFIRST, TARC) compared to the model criteria identified in Table 1. The criteria of purpose, structure and process from Table 1 are listed in a table format. Each element is explored in subsequent paragraphs as compared to the case study data. Additionally, the qualities that support a successful organization, as defined earlier in this chapter, are presented for each case study.

A brief overview of the analysis revealed that although none of the cases presented meet the definition as compared to the CBCCWM definition, each case did evolve over time to address the issues of the time and remained successful organizations as discussed in the context of this project.

1. Business Executives for National Security (BENS) Analysis

In Table 1, each level of the community linkages was evaluated by purpose, structure, and process. The purpose, structure and process of the BENS organization is summarized in Table 7 and further explained in the paragraphs that follow.

Table 7. Analysis of BENS Case Study

CBCCWM		Criteria	
Level	Purpose	Structure	Process
Coordination or Partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share resources to address common issues • Merge resource base to create something new 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central body of people consists of decision makers • Roles defined • Links formalized • Group leverages/raises money 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Autonomous leadership but focus is on issue • Group decision making in central and subgroups • Communication is frequent and clear

a. Purpose

The purpose of BENS is best defined simply as continuity of community, which is different from continuity of operations. BENS believes that individual business continuity is not sufficient for survival but continuity of community is required.¹⁶³ The New Jersey Business Force provides a Web-based clearinghouse of locally available resources valued at over \$300 million dollars for emergency managers to call upon. This is an example of “sharing resources.” This business force further provides emergency secure communications as a backup to government systems.¹⁶⁴

In the southern region of the country, the Georgia Business Force (GBF) distinguishes itself with the creation of a Business Operations Center (BOC). The BOC functions in the same fashion as the state Emergency Operations Center (EOC) except that it is designed to communication across business sectors. The BOC is an example of merging resources to create something new. Leveraging the value of the BOC, the GBF has been invited to occupy seats in the state EOC to function as liaisons between the public and private sectors.¹⁶⁵

b. Structure

BENS began as a private business organization and became private-public organization. Congress invited the organization to better define the role of business in catastrophic events defining the role of BENS in national affairs. The Business Response Task Force was chartered and presented a report in late 2006 entitled “Getting down to Business: an Action Plan for Public-Private Disaster Response Coordination.”¹⁶⁶

¹⁶³ Business Executives for National Security, “Public Benefit Coalition, Building a Resilient America: A Proposal to Strengthen Public-Private Collaboration,” Business Executives for National Security (2009), http://www.bens.org/PBO%20Proposal_03_04_09.pdf (accessed July 5, 2009).

¹⁶⁴ BENS, “Regional Public-Private Partnerships,” 2.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁶ BENS, *Getting Down to Business*, 2007.

c. Process

As an example of group decision making, BENS created subgroups that were tasked with the analysis of specific problems and providing guidance in a written format. These structures match the criteria in Table 1 for process in leadership, decision making, and communication.

In 2008, BENS published the “Intelligence Community Analysis Project,” at the request of the Department of State Bureau of Intelligence and Research.¹⁶⁷ The project focused on assessing business practices that evaluate analytic programs. One goal of this request was to learn how business performs analysis in a similar way that governmental agencies collect data for intelligence purposes.

d. Indicators of Success

Reports have been offering guidance covering a variety of topics since 1995.¹⁶⁸ Guidance reports have increased in number and broadened in topic since 1995.¹⁶⁹ Continuing to produce guidance documents is an indicator of a successful program.

Since first organizing in 1982, the BENS model has been tested. While the comprehensive results of all BENS initiatives are not readily available, the growth of the organization is clearly visible. BENS chapters exist in New Jersey, Georgia, Massachusetts, Kansas, California, Colorado, and Iowa.¹⁷⁰ Growth from a local idea to a nationally accepted template is evidence of success.

¹⁶⁷ BENS, *Intelligence Community Analysis Project*, 2008, 3.

¹⁶⁸ Business Executives for National Security (BENS), “Public Archives,” Business Executives for National Security, <http://bens.org/library/publications/archive.html> (accessed July 5, 2009).

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁷⁰ BENS, “About Us.”

2. ChicagoFIRST Analysis

As the second case study of this project, ChicagoFIRST is summarized in Table 8 with respect to purpose, structure and process in order to determine their community linkage. Further details are offered to explain in greater detail why ChicagoFIRST best fits the Coordination or Partnership level in subsequent paragraphs.

Table 8. Analysis of ChicagoFIRST Case Study

CBCCWM		Criteria	
Level	Purpose	Structure	Process
Coordination or Partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share resources to address common issues • Merge resource base to create something new 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central body of people consists of decision makers • Roles defined • Links formalized • Group leverages/raises money 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Autonomous leadership but focus is on issue • Group decision making in central and subgroups • Communication is frequent and clear

a. Purpose

Paraphrased from its mission statement, ChicagoFIRST is dedicated to: increase resilience of the private sector, improve preparedness of employers and employees, and address interdependencies among critical infrastructure such as finance, insurance, banking, telecommunications, power, commercial facilities, and water systems.¹⁷¹

¹⁷¹ ChicagoFIRST, "Mission," ChicagoFIRST, <https://www.chicagofirst.org/about/mission.jsp> (accessed July 5, 2009).

The group began in Chicago in 2003 after many business sectors began to strengthen their disaster plans as a result of the events of September 11, 2001.¹⁷² Since that time the organization has evolved to include several governmental agencies all focused on the same mission.

Louis Rosenthal, a cofounder of ChicagoFIRST and executive vice-president of LaSalle Bank revealed that sharing resources was an unexpected benefit of the collaboration. Rosenthal explained how surprised he was when during a significant fire in 2004 in his Chicago facility; other members were calling him offering the use of their facilities and space for the LaSalle Bank to work.¹⁷³ While structure fires have not been considered a traditional homeland security threat, this example illustrates how ChicagoFIRST shares resources among its members.

b. Structure

An initial goal of ChicagoFIRST was communicating critical information during a crisis. This goal was achieved late in 2003 when the group obtained a permanent seat in the Chicago Emergency Operations Center (EOC).¹⁷⁴ Obtaining a seat in the Chicago EOC clearly defined ChicagoFIRST's role and formalized the link as a partner in emergency response and recovery.

c. Process

ChicagoFIRST assisted in planning and execution of the first evacuation drill in the entire country conducted in a major city. Nearly 3,000 workers from the Central Business District participated on a voluntary basis in the exercise in September of 2006.¹⁷⁵ The process to execute such an undertaking required autonomous leadership as this drill was not required by any governmental agency. The entire concept began, grew, and was executed from within the organization.

¹⁷² CTG, "Exploring Regional Telecommunication," 2007.

¹⁷³ Sternberg, "Taking Care of Business," 2006.

¹⁷⁴ Tishuk, "Participating in a Regional Public-Private Emergency Partnership," 2007, 395.

¹⁷⁵ ChicagoFIRST, "2006 Annual Report."

d. Indicators of Success

ChicagoFIRST drew the attention of the U.S. Treasury Department and became the model template for financial districts around the country. Once additional chapters of financial districts were established, a need for a coordinating group became apparent in order to consistently share information between financial districts throughout the country. RPCfirst was modeled after ChicagoFIRST.

The U.S. Treasury Department released a case study in December of 2004 reviewing the ChicagoFIRST model. The report lists this model as a best practice and encourages other financial centers to apply the model in their regions.¹⁷⁶ Since that time, regional partnerships have embraced this model in: Minnesota, California, Texas, Florida, Hawaii, Arizona, the National Capitol Region, Missouri, Tennessee, and Pennsylvania.¹⁷⁷

As the principals of collaboration were identified in Chicago and embraced in other population centers throughout the country, it became evident that a larger overarching structure was required to coordinate the national strategy. The Regional Partnership Council first (RPCfirst) formed in 2007 as a coalition of regional partnerships.¹⁷⁸

3. Texas Association of Regional Councils (TARC) Analysis

Completing the case study community linkage analysis, the organization of TARC is summarized in Table 9. A more in depth discussion about the purpose, structure and process of the TARC organization is provided in the paragraphs following Table 9.

¹⁷⁶ ChicagoFIRST, “ChicagoFIRST Paves the Way,” 2006.

¹⁷⁷ RPCfirst, “RPCfirst Regional Partnership Council.”

¹⁷⁸ RPCfirst “About RPCfirst.”

Table 9. Analysis of TARC Case Study

CBCCWM		Criteria	
Level	Purpose	Structure	Process
Networking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dialogue and common understanding • Clearinghouse for information • Create base of support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-hierarchical • Loose/flexible links • Roles loosely defined • Communication is primary link among members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low-key leadership • Minimal decision making • Little conflict • Informal communication

a. Purpose

Founded in 1973, the Texas Association of Regional Councils (TARC) functions as a networking oriented collaborative organization connecting the 24 regional planning groups.¹⁷⁹ TARC assists regional councils by: providing a forum for the regular exchange of information and ideas. Furthermore, TARC educates governmental entities, public and private organizations and the public about the services and functions of regional councils.¹⁸⁰

b. Structure

Key decisions that affect local governments and residents take place at the regional planning group level. TARC remains flexible in function as the mission identifies assisting regional councils in “strengthening their capabilities to serve their local government members”¹⁸¹ This position requires loose/flexible linkages but depends on open communications.

¹⁷⁹ TARC, “About TARC.”

¹⁸⁰ Ibid.

¹⁸¹ Ibid.

c. Process

Through “references,” TARC communicates to regional councils utilizing written reports.¹⁸² Given that TARC began in 1973, strikingly few guidance documents are readily available from the association Web site. The overarching group, TARC, does not provide strong leadership but rather offers the regional councils the opportunity to work together during quarterly meetings.¹⁸³

d. Indicators of Success

In terms of longevity, the Texas regional councils and TARC have been working far longer than the other case studies presented. The regional councils were formed in 1965 and TARC followed in 1973. A key factor in the durability of these groups is the ability to change and adapt to the current trends and needs of the regions.

The regional councils began as planning commissions. Initially the purposes of the planning commissions were to perform studies and create plans, to guide the development of the region, and promote efficiency and the economy in the coordinated development in the region.¹⁸⁴ TARC has evolved along with the regional councils.

F. CONCLUSION

Using a case study methodology, three organizations that work in the homeland security field, BENS, ChicagoFIRST, and TARC, were studied. This proved to be a difficult task as homeland security is an emerging field with limited literature with which to work. As the homeland security field matures, the number of collaborations will likely increase, allowing for more, expanded research in the future.

¹⁸² Texas Association of Regional Councils (TARC), “References,” Texas Association of Regional Councils, <http://www.txregionalcouncil.org/display.php?page=references.php> (accessed July 5, 2009).

¹⁸³ Texas Association of Regional Councils (TARC), “Texas Association of Regional Councils Quarterly Meetings Schedule,” Texas Association of Regional Councils, http://www.txregionalcouncil.org/2009_July_Quarterly_Meetings_Schedule.pdf (accessed July 5, 2009).

¹⁸⁴ Texas Statutes, Local Government Code, Regional Planning Commissions, 1965.

Organizations that originated as both public and private sectors were examined. Two of the cases, BENS and ChicagoFIRST, began as private sector oriented organizations and one, TARC, as public sector organization. As each group encountered new and more challenging issues, they all evolved into private-public structures. It became evident to each group that it could not reach its objectives without including all sectors.

Over time, the members of BENS realized that they could not be self-sustaining without help. At first, it was sufficient to partner with other businesses. After some real life experiences and interaction with the government, BENS members realized that they had to work with government in order to fully protect themselves. These educational experiences culminated with the idea that the ultimate level of protection depended upon community continuity. The end result can work for the whole community. It is the progression from self-survival to continuity of community that distinguishes BENS in the homeland security arena.

September 11, 2001, became the impetus for the principals of ChicagoFIRST to take action. Like BENS executives, these executives were also concerned about corporate survival. What distinguishes these group members is the direct concern that they had for their employees. One of the first objectives for this organization was to develop an evacuation plan. Nobody else from the government or the private sector had achieved this. ChicagoFIRST actually accomplished an *actual* evacuation moving some 3,000 people out of the financial district of Chicago. By the time that the evacuation took place; the organization had grown to a public-private structure. The organization moved along the private-public interdependency learning curve rapidly.

Serving as the oldest case study presented, the Texas Association of Regional Councils had radically different origins from the other two cases presented. This statewide structure began by focusing solely on community planning anticipating building and population growth. The statutory structure of the TARC groups could have served as an impediment to keeping up with current affairs but it did not. These groups,

for a period of time working independently, were able to adapt to the changing threats and opportunities. Incorporating homeland security issues is one example of the dynamic ability of these groups.

Each case study was compared to the criteria identified in Chapter II. Interestingly, each case is considered to be successful, but none of the cases qualified as an actual collaboration. These cases stand as model organizations due to their success and often proven by their replication. These results point to the question of the necessity of reaching collaboration.

Table 10 summarizes key elements of organizational structure as compared to the CBCCWM model. Additionally this table lists measures of success for each case study in an effort to simplify comparison. This table brings all of the analysis completed throughout this project together in order to compare the case studies in a head-to-head format.

Table 10. Head-to-Head Comparison

<u>Case Study:</u>	Business Executives for National Security	ChicagoFIRST	Texas Association of Regional Councils
<u>CBCWWM Criteria:</u>			
Level:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordination or Partnership 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordination or Partnership 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Network
Purpose:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuity of Community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase resilience of the private sector • Address interdependencies among critical infrastructures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinate 24 regional councils offering a clearinghouse for information exchange
Structure:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formalized links—Congress • Role defined as partner in creation of BOC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Links formalized and role defined as accepted partner in the Chicago EOC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthening capabilities of 24 regions requires loosely defined roles, as they change frequently
Process:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Task forces created to address specific problems resulted in group and subgroup decision making 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Autonomous leadership executed non-mandatory evacuating of financial district, some 3,000 employees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitates quarterly meetings so that regions can interact themselves, not taking direction from TARC
<u>Case Study Framework</u>			
Structure at conception:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public
Current structure:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public-Private 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public-Private 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public-Private

<u><i>Case Study:</i></u>	Business Executives for National Security	ChicagoFIRST	Texas Association of Regional Councils
Indicators of Success:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Written reports at the request of Congress • Chapters: NJ, GA, MA, KS, CA, CO, IA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • U.S. Treasury adoption • Congressional testimony • RPCFirst¹⁸⁵ • Chapters: AZ, FL, VA, WA¹⁸⁶ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since 1973 no legal obligation to continue • Supports regional councils as coordinating group

¹⁸⁵ RPCfirst, “RPCfirst Regional Partnership Council.”

¹⁸⁶ Ibid.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

IV. SMART PRACTICES

A. INTRODUCTION

Central to the argument of this project is that collaboration is presented as an organizational structure in homeland security guidance but it is not explained as how to create or develop collaboration. Smart practices offer guidance to initiate and support collaboration. The concepts of smart practices and best practices are defined in this chapter as presented by Eugene Bardach in a policy analysis context.¹⁸⁷ In this application, smart practices will be used in a case study analysis context.

Smart practices are split into structure-governance and operational categories that have been perceived as successful concepts by existing collaborative efforts. During the course of this chapter, smart practices are discussed in the context of the case studies presented in Chapter III and examples of organizations who utilize the smart practices are explored. It is impossible to collect all smart practices comprehensively as collaborative activity is ongoing and dynamic.

The comparison of smart practices to the case studies and additional referenced organizations has revealed some trends of importance in building collaboration. Research of the literature did not reveal a collection of smart practices to build collaboration and, therefore, an order of importance has not been established. While an absolutely perfect condition under which to build collaboration does not exist, presenting the identified trends may be helpful to groups working towards collaboration in the future.

Important in this discussion is the determination of collaborative capacity. Collaborative capacity is substantial unto itself, leaving a detailed discussion for a future project. This project is based on the premise that organizations have determined and possess collaborative capacity.

¹⁸⁷ Bardach, *A Practical Guide*, 2005. 91.

Although collaborative organization principles can be applied to any topical situation, the effort in this chapter is to focus on a homeland security context. Smart practices are presented in this chapter in two areas: structure-governance and operational issues. The structure-governance component of the chapter addresses topics that may not manifest in a deliverable product or action. These practices steer the group and offer direction for group organization. The operational smart practices are more closely related to tangible products and actions. It is in this area that deliverables, projects, and member activities are listed.

1. Collaborative Capacity

Determining an organization's capacity to collaborate is vitally important to successful organizations. For purposes of this project, organizations discussed in the context of collaboration are assumed to have sufficient capacity to collaborate. Assessing and improving collaborative capacity is a subject area that warrants study unto itself.

2. Smart Practice versus Best Practice

Commonly found in homeland security literature today is the term "best practices." Eugene Bardach discusses this term and challenges what it means implies. In his book *A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis*, Bardach keenly asserts that "best practices" have not likely been carefully researched and documented to support such a claim.¹⁸⁸ An alternate suggestion is to replace "best" with "good," but this also fails to accurately describe the practices listed. Essentially, Bardach argues that "good practices" are only relative to the author and their perspective.¹⁸⁹

The term that best captures what many authors intend to be helpful practices according to Bardach are "smart practices."¹⁹⁰ He goes on to characterize smart practices to mean more than a behavior that worked well for someone, somewhere at some time. Bardach identifies two features that comprise a smart practice.

¹⁸⁸ Bardach, *A Practical Guide*, 2005. 91.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid., 92.

¹⁹⁰ Ibid.

- Smart (Practice):¹⁹¹
 - Potential for creating value and
 - Mechanism for extracting and focusing that potential
- Practice:¹⁹²A behavior or an idea on how the actions of a practice work to solve a problem

It is the Bardach definition of smart practices that is central to the purpose of this chapter.

Chapter II explored collaboration as a model structure in the context of homeland security interagency networking. Missing from the guidance is instruction on how to accomplish collaboration, also discussed in Chapter II. The case studies presented in Chapter III offer that groups focused on homeland security issues can function successfully but not achieve the technical definition of collaboration.

The intent of this chapter is to offer smart practices identified by existing collaborative organizations. Furthermore, the intent is to provide a “menu” of smart practices to assist groups as they are creating new collaborative organizations or enhancing existing associations.

B. STRUCTURE-GOVERNANCE SMART PRACTICES

The order of importance of these smart practices with respect to structure and governance are listed based on identified trends through research. Some of these practices are dependent on sequence, as one cannot be initiated before the previous concept has been started. The order of structure-governance importance is:

- Shared vision and shared mission
- Top-level buy-in
- Ownership
- Responsibility, Authority, and Expertise (RAE)
- Structure: public, private, non-governmental organization, citizen membership

¹⁹¹ Bardach, *A Practical Guide*, 2005. 97

¹⁹² *Ibid.*, 92.

1. Shared Vision and Shared Mission

Creating a shared vision or mission may be a simple activity for some groups like ChicagoFIRST whose membership was initially comprised of financial institutions who were familiar with each other. The literature is not clear in the ChicagoFIRST case, but generally as organizations work towards common vision, questions of legitimacy and stereotypes arise between members. Hocevar, Jansen, and Thomas assert that getting past these issues are critical to work toward successful collaboration.¹⁹³ Hocevar et al. go on to explain that the diversity within the group “can lead to innovative solutions that are key to dealing with novel situations such as terrorism.”¹⁹⁴

One shared vision for BENS in 1982 was the idea of a strong, effective affordable national defense.¹⁹⁵ More importantly, the members of BENS rallied around the idea of “Continuity of Community”¹⁹⁶ as they realized that they could not remain in business without the community structure. While there are certainly some aspects of this posture that are selfish, the community well-being became a driving force to collaborate.

Beginning in 1965 with the Texas Regional Planning Act,¹⁹⁷ collaborative efforts were legislated in Texas; and the resulting organizations became to be known as Regional Planning Commissions.¹⁹⁸ These groups began working under a shared vision as a result of legislation, which is significantly different than the case studies presented. Despite the difference in origination, these groups have proven to be successful in working together.

The literature suggests that shared vision is the most basic of tenets in successful collaboration. In 2004, the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) published a summary report covering the events of a forum dedicated to managing intergovernmental relations for homeland security. The forum included participants from

¹⁹³ Hocevar, Jansen, and Thomas, *Building Collaborative Capacity*, 65.

¹⁹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁹⁵ BENS, “Business Executives for National Security History.”

¹⁹⁶ BENS, “BENS Business Force Partnership Criteria.”

¹⁹⁷ Dye, “Local Government in Texas,” 2002.

¹⁹⁸ Texas Statutes, Local Government Code, Regional Planning Commissions, 1965.

the Department of Homeland Security and 11 distinguished Academy Fellows who worked towards establishing a new set of intergovernmental relationships ranging from federal to local governments.¹⁹⁹ According to the summary, not achieving clarity will result in the failure of the group.²⁰⁰

Of the various collaborative efforts among governmental entities, the National Capital Region (NCR) faces some of the greatest challenges. The NCR faces homeland security from the local government, state government, and national capital perspectives. Uniquely located in and around the District of Columbia region, responders and planners come together representing all levels of government. At the core of the NCR Homeland Security Strategic Plan is “One Vision.” The entire strategic plan is based upon “the NCR partners and all Regional jurisdictions (will) continue working together.”²⁰¹ The plan identifies that “One Vision” creates “One Mission,” which leads to four goals and 12 objectives. If the vision in this case is not shared and universally accepted by all members, then the mission, goals, and objectives are unachievable.

One of the most comprehensive and long-running collaborative endeavors in the United States is known as the Joint Venture Silicon Valley (JVSV).²⁰² The economic picture in the early 1990s did not look positive in the Silicon Valley. In 1991, the area chamber of commerce called a meeting to address the collective economic problem. In addition to the economic concern, a host of other issues arose. Regulatory reform, education, housing, transportation, and the environment all were identified as problematic.²⁰³ These issues became the basis of the JVSV vision and subsequent

¹⁹⁹ National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA), *Advancing the Management of Homeland Security: Managing Intergovernmental Relations for Homeland Security* (Washington, DC: National Academy of Public Administration, 2004), 3, National Academy of Public Administration, <http://www.napawash.org/si/HS-WHITE.pdf> (accessed July 12, 2008).

²⁰⁰ NAPA, *Advancing the Management*, 2004, 23.

²⁰¹ National Capital Region Emergency Preparedness Council (NCREPC), *National Capital Region Homeland Security Strategic Plan 2007–2009 Overview* (Washington, DC: National Capital Region Emergency Preparedness Council, 2006), 7, Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, <http://www.mwcog.org/uploads/pub-documents/z11WXg20061116180932.pdf> (accessed July 16, 2007).

²⁰² Chrislip, *Collaborative Leadership Fieldbook*, 2002, 133.

²⁰³ *Ibid.*, 135.

mission. These issues directly parallel those that the regional councils address in Texas. JVSU identified its needs as a result of collaboration; similarly, the Texas model began as a result of legislation.

2. Top-Level Buy-In

Who is involved in collaborative efforts has proven to be a key factor in success. If the top-level members in any organization do not share with vision, mission or purpose, and support them, then sustainability is questionable. In the case study presented in Chapter III, the BENS structure has hinged upon buy-in from top -level executives since its inception.²⁰⁴ Throughout the BENS literature, discussions highlight the importance of executive involvement. Formation of the collaborative effort in the ChicagoFIRST case can be attributed to senior executives asking some basic questions about homeland security.²⁰⁵

In the BENS and ChicagoFIRST cases, the top-level actors existed before a collaborative effort was attempted. In the Texas Association of Regional Councils, there were no existing organizations; the top-level actors had not yet been established. This changes the need to gain buy-in, as the top-level actors were created as a function of the group's creation. In the Texas case, the buy-in was automatic.

The Michigan Centers for Regional Excellence (CRE) offers the example of a regional emergency dispatch center. The center is run by a board of public safety officials and includes elected officials from representative agencies in an oversight board.²⁰⁶ CRE recommends this construct as local officials often change with elections. The use of safety officials, who are typically not elected and therefore not usually subject to frequent turnover, offers continuity.²⁰⁷

²⁰⁴ BENS, "Business Executives for National Security History."

²⁰⁵ Department of the Treasury, *Improving Business Continuity*, 2004, 6.

²⁰⁶ Centers for Regional Excellence, "Building Models."

²⁰⁷ Centers for Regional Excellence, "Building Models."

In the “Guide to Successful Local Government Collaboration in America’s Regions,” the National League of Cities (NLC) cites the importance of top-level engagement simply as “Leadership reflecting business, civic groups and government is best.”²⁰⁸ In this report from the NLC, 17 approaches to achieve collaboration are explored, and each is described with advantages, disadvantages, and examples. Additionally, lessons learned, consistent with all 17 options, are categorized. It is in the lessons learned chapter that the inclusion of leadership is presented, which means that this principle is important to all forms of the collaborative efforts presented in the report.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) supports the importance of involvement by elected officials. In November 2007, the U.S. EPA released a case study on a collaborative approach to water sector resiliency conducted in the Seattle-King County area in the state of Washington. The study identifies a series of lessons learned from the joint venture in the region and lists “Secure Support from Leadership” as one of the top four issues.²⁰⁹ The EPA states that an “effective security program requires support from elected officials and emergency responders.”²¹⁰

3. Ownership

The concept that “Collaboration is an emergent process not a prescribed state”²¹¹ is important when addressing ownership in a group. Emergent encompasses the idea that collaboration can adjust to the changing needs of the group as they are discovered and identified. In the Texas Regional Council Model, the organizations initially focused on civic planning but have adapted to meet the needs of the region through the years. Currently, the Councils of Government address issues that include: developing homeland security strategies, cooperative purchasing options, services for the elderly, transportation

²⁰⁸ Parr, Riehm, and McFarland, *Guide to Successful Government Collaboration*, 2006, 48.

²⁰⁹ EPA, *Seattle-King County*, 2007.

²¹⁰ Ibid.

²¹¹ Hocesvar, Jansen, and Thomas, *Building Collaborative Capacity*, 65.

issues, and law enforcement training.²¹² The Ark-Tex Council of Government, Region 5, best captures the spirit of ownership in a simple, concise statement; “To provide services where no other vehicle exists.”²¹³

Ownership for BENS comes in a variety of examples. As the initial organization grew and spread out across the country, each local group began to address local needs along with the larger issues that affect BENS as a national group. These local initiatives provide support to the smart practice of ownership.

On the East Coast, the New Jersey Business Force demonstrates ownership by providing a Web-based clearinghouse of locally available resources for emergency managers. This business force further provides emergency secure communications as a backup to government systems.²¹⁴ In the metro Kansas City region, the Mid-America Business Force co-developed the charter for the fusion center and created educational seminars and exercises for both business and the public.²¹⁵ Recognizing the gaps in communications and analysis, the Mid-America Business Force Fusion Center demonstrates that both organizations are engaged in their communities.

In the southern region of the country, the Georgia Business Force distinguished itself with the creation of a Business Operations Center which functions in the same fashion as the state Emergency Operations Center (EOC) except that it is designed to communicate across business sectors.²¹⁶ The Georgia Business Force recognized the need to coordinate business resources in order to best support the community and took the initiative to create the BOC.

ChicagoFIRST has accomplished ownership several times over. Working from the original objective of protecting their businesses and employees, the organization has grown as their activities have become increasingly successful.²¹⁷ After reviewing and

²¹² TARC, “About TARC.”

²¹³ TARC, “Ark-Tex Council of Governments.”

²¹⁴ BENS, “Regional Public-Private Partnerships,” 2.

²¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 3.

²¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 2.

²¹⁷ Department of the Treasury, *Improving Business Continuity*, 2004, 6.

then participating with the organization, the U.S. Treasury Department released a case study about the ChicagoFIRST model listing it as a best practice and encouraging other financial centers to apply the model in their regions.²¹⁸ Since that time, regional partnerships have embraced the model in; Minnesota, California, Texas, Florida, Hawaii, Arizona, the National Capitol Region, Missouri, Tennessee, and Pennsylvania.²¹⁹

Members of the collaborative effort are directly responsible for reaching agreement on issues brought to the group.²²⁰ Responsibility holds the members accountable and creates an interest in the outcome of the decision, thus creating ownership.

In his book, *How to Make Collaboration Work*, David Straus ties collaborative ownership to the group mission. Straus cites a study by Professor Daniel Denison on cultural traits which included some 1200 companies in the context of successful collaboration.²²¹ Straus further discusses the interpretation of Dr. Caroline J. Fisher with respect to “Mission,” which is one of the dimensions that Denison studied. Fisher argues that mission is “about shared understanding, alignment, and ownership of that vision throughout your company—with line of sight from job to mission.”²²² This framework accentuates the relationship between vision/mission and ownership.

4. Responsibility, Authority, and Expertise (RAE)

In the summer of 1998, an exercise was held at the home of the Chicago White Sox, Comiskey Park, which integrated law enforcement, military, and the fire service. Deputy Commissioner Gene Ryan of the Chicago Fire Department was searching for a management tool to bring these disparate disciplines to the same operational strategy. Prior to the exercise Gene and the research author developed a simple set of guides to accomplish scene coordination.

²¹⁸ ChicagoFIRST, “ChicagoFIRST Paves the Way,” 2006.

²¹⁹ RPCfirst, “RPCfirst Regional Partnership Council.

²²⁰ Hocesvar, Jansen, and Thomas, *Building Collaborative Capacity*, 65.

²²¹ Straus, *How to Make Collaboration Work*, 2002, 178–179.

²²² Ibid.

The guides provide a flexible, dynamic approach that integrates all agencies in both an incident command and a unified command structure. Having a relationship with representatives of various response agencies before an incident occurs is the best option for ensuring a working relationship but is impossible to accomplish considering volume of possible entities that could be involved.

The system identifies the Responsibility, Authority, and Expertise (RAE) of those agencies involved in an incident. Since one agency or discipline cannot manage a complex homeland security incident alone, responsibility, authority, and expertise will change hands frequently.

During events driven by one incident commander, RAE quickly identifies available resources. In a true unified command structure incident objectives are determined by a collective group of agency representatives. The principles of RAE provide guidance to determine how incident objectives will be accomplished.

A hypothetical example of the application of RAE is found in the article from *Homeland Protection Professional*, “The Missing Link in Unified Command.”²²³ In this article, a siege at a local high school is described creating a plausible scenario for homeland security officials to mitigate. The tactical and task level objectives are discussed, along with how RAE applies to each step.²²⁴

The RAE concept has proven to be successful in an operational based unified command context. Since the inception of RAE, it has been adopted as the operating principle of the Illinois State Weapons of Mass Destruction Team and was implemented in a complex investigation and subsequent arrest of a terrorism network orchestrated by Dr. Chaos in 2002.²²⁵ Dr. Chaos is an alias for Joseph Konopka, who led the “Realm of

²²³ Gene Ryan and Raymond Kay, “The Missing Link of Unified Command,” *Homeland Protection Professional* (March 2004): 24–26.

²²⁴ Ryan and Kay, “The Missing Link,” 2004, 24–26.

²²⁵ Gene Ryan, personal conversation with author, August 20, 2008.

Chaos,” a group whose members were accused and convicted of damaging critical infrastructure in Wisconsin, particularly electrical distribution systems and communication antennas.²²⁶

Dr. Chaos was arrested in Chicago related to his involvement in acquiring and storing cyanide in the city’s subway system.²²⁷ RAE was instrumental in coordinating a number of organizations involved in the response and investigation. This case crossed local and federal jurisdictional lines which blurred authority and responsibility. Several physical sites were involved presenting a variety of hazards including a possibly armed human threat, the threat of fire and the use of cyanide. The RAE guides provided a roadmap establishing responsibilities, authorities, and expertise of each agency involved at each step in the response and investigation processes.²²⁸

Given that collaboration is the essence of unified command, the RAE concept can serve the non-emergency arenas of homeland security. This practice suggests that identifying who in the organization has responsibility, authority, and/or expertise for a particular problem offers the basis for group relationship. In some ways, this method resembles a variation of the gap analysis tool. Different from gap analysis is the direct and immediate identification of RAE. Gap analysis requires an extra step to interpret the data collected and then identify RAE and more if the metrics assess these topics.

Of the case studies presented, the literature does not show that the RAE concept has been embraced by any of the organizations. However, because of its location, ChicagoFIRST has been exposed to the RAE concept through its relationship with the Chicago Fire Department.²²⁹

²²⁶ Associated Press, “[ISN] ‘Dr. Chaos’ Indicted in Wisconsin Utility Attacks,” May 7, 2002, Info Sec News, <http://lists.jammed.com/ISN/2002/05/0045.html> (accessed September 15, 2009).

²²⁷ Ibid.

²²⁸ Information this section is derived from researcher’s personal experiences.

²²⁹ As a professional peer of Deputy Fire Commissioner Gene Ryan and co-creator of the RAE concept, the author has discussed the RAE concept and its introduction to ChicagoFIRST. Summer 2008.

5. Structure—Public, Private, Non-Governmental Organization, and Citizen Membership

Who is invited to the collaboration is important. This smart practice does not address the timeline to integrate the variety of actors but focuses on the value of the breadth of involvement. The National League of Cities advocates that collaborative membership matters, “If you bring the appropriate people together in constructive ways with good information, they will create authentic visions and strategies for addressing the shared concerns of the community.”²³⁰

In 1982, the creators of BENS embarked on a path to narrowly focus on national security in a solely private sector structure.²³¹ As time evolved and the scope of the organizational mission changed, it became clear that the composition of the organization had to change. Public sector partners were introduced to the organization through BENS Business Force in order to “provide the means for the private sector and government to build an efficient, collaborative partnership—one that strengthens a region's capability to prevent, prepare for, and respond to security threats or other catastrophic events.”²³²

Important in the growth of BENS, as it is true for all of the case studies presented, is the ability to modify the organizational structure to meet the needs of the issues at hand. In this case, BENS evolved from a private sector organization to a public-private based organization.

ChicagoFIRST also began as an organization solely structured in the private sector. In a similar fashion to BENS, ChicagoFIRST adjusted its membership as the issues at hand changed. The literature is unclear about the original intent of BENS as far as having public sector partners, but it is clear that ChicagoFIRST had always intended to engage with public sector partners.²³³

²³⁰ Parr, Riehm, and McFarland, *Guide to Successful Government Collaboration*, 2006, 42.

²³¹ BENS, “Business Executives for National Security History.”

²³² Business Executives for National Security, “BENS Business Force,” Doc Stoc, <http://www.docstoc.com/docs/2289794/What-is-the-BENS-Business-Force/> (accessed July 24, 2009).

²³³ ChicagoFIRST, “2006 Annual Report.”

Unlike BENS and ChicagoFIRST, the members of the Texas Association of Regional Councils did not have a choice of structure when they were formed as they were created as a public sector organization by legislation.²³⁴ In a similar fashion to the other case study organizations, the Texas Association of Regional Councils adapted their membership addressing current problems.

As a direct result of September 11, 2001, a collaborative group formed as a national forum for public and private sector organizations to address issues regarding resilience of the nation's critical infrastructure, the Infrastructure Security Partnership (TISP). One of the reports that TISP has generated, "The Regional Disaster Resilience," addresses the structure of collaborative efforts. This report is a guide for developing an action plan and written for the critical infrastructure community.

In the action plan, the first step in a series of seven steps makes recommendations for the membership composition of a collaborative effort. Linked to the idea of senior leadership, this document also calls for top-level involvement.²³⁵ Specifically, the plan calls for inclusion of the following: "major utilities, key local, state, and regional government organizations, including defense installations, businesses, nonprofits and such academic and community institutions as schools and hospitals."²³⁶

In a similar fashion, the CRE from Michigan suggest the following membership based on their work: "area chambers of commerce, large employers, local media, non profits, the foundation community, public safety representatives, the faith community, local schools and colleges, representatives of ethnic groups, unions, community and constituency groups, etc."²³⁷

²³⁴ TARC, "About TARC."

²³⁵ TISP, *Regional Disaster Resilience*, 2006, 23.

²³⁶ Ibid.

²³⁷ Centers for Regional Excellence, "Building Models."

In the case studies presented in Chapter III, regardless of how each organization began, they all arrived at the same structure described by both CRE and TISP. The histories of the case studies presented show that each group evolved and expanded its membership as a result of a dynamic change in vision and mission.

C OPERATIONAL SMART PRACTICES

Operational smart practices differ from the structure-governance practices in that they represent more tangible activities and actions. The sequence and timing of engaging these practices is irrespective to the structure-governance practices. The structure-governance practices provide policy and direction, whereas the operational practices provide tools to work towards collaboration. Unlike the structure-governance smart practices, the literature is in many cases is not sufficiently detailed to determine if the case studies presented employed these operational practices. Where the literature provided, the operational practice is used as an analysis tool. The order of operational smart practices importance is:

- Effective communications
- Start with a winnable project
- Perform a gap analysis
- Develop metrics to gauge performance
- Create a funding system

1. Effective Communication

As the constituency of a collaborative effort becomes more complicated so do the communications associated with it. Success depends upon the efforts of all of the members of the group. The type of communications in a complex organization requires a variety of methods of to convey messages. Memos and internal reports are insufficient in today's world. The use of Web sites, e-mail, traditional media, and personal contacts are important tools in effective communications.²³⁸

²³⁸ Parr, Riehm, and McFarland, *Guide to Successful Government Collaboration*, 2006, 50.

When the ChicagoFIRST group was organizing, a critical objective involving communications was identified. The resolution to this identified problem was to obtain a seat within the Chicago Office of Emergency Management. This was achieved, and this collaborative effort now has the ability to share vital information during a crisis.²³⁹

2. Start with a Winnable Project

The early achievement of an objective can help to build confidence and teamwork among the members of the collaborative effort.²⁴⁰ These improved working relationships can become the basis to accomplishing larger, more far-reaching objectives in the future. Improving infrastructure, for example, is likely to result in a visible return in the short-term. Another example of a highly visible, immediate return on the collaborative effort is sharing services.²⁴¹

3. Perform a Gap Analysis

Earlier in this chapter, the idea of legitimacy and stereotypes were discussed with emphasis being placed on getting past them.²⁴² Hocevar et al. raise these issues, which could be impediments to successful collaboration. In their book, Barry Berman and Joel R. Evans define gap analysis as the tool that “Enables a company to compare its actual performance against its potential performance, and then determine the areas in which it must improve.”²⁴³ While this definition of gap analysis is derived from a business model, it closely compares to the desired outcome in a collaborative effort. In the collaboration context, the gap-analysis tool compares what resources and services currently exist to what are the collective desired goals are. Unlike the business model

²³⁹ Tishuk, “Participating in a Regional Public-Private Emergency Partnership,” 2007, 395.

²⁴⁰ Parr, Riehm, and McFarland, *Guide to Successful Government Collaboration*, 2006, 50.

²⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 48.

²⁴² Hocevar, Jansen, and Thomas, *Building Collaborative Capacity*, p. 65.

²⁴³ Prentice Hall, “Retail Management: A Strategic Approach 7/E, Barry Berman and Joel R Evans,” Prentice Hall, http://www.prenhall.com/rm_student/html/start.html (accessed September 6, 2008).

definition, the use of a gap analysis in the collaborative environment will produce overlaps. Given the fragmented structure of governmental agencies in a collaborative effort, services and resources can be duplicative.

A gap-analysis exercise identifies the missing services/resources, sets objectives, and highlights the overlapping issues. Reducing overlapping and competing services can be a winnable project that offers momentum to an upstart program. Utilizing this assessment tool will address the issues brought forward by Hocevar et al. in overcoming stereotypes and legitimacy issues.

In the TISP guide on improving resilience for infrastructure protection, identifying “preparedness shortfalls”²⁴⁴ is listed as an implementation challenge. The report goes on to state the “collaborative solutions (are needed) to address these gaps (shortfalls).”²⁴⁵ Utilizing a gap-analysis process will assist in addressing this challenge.

Particular to homeland security issues, a gap-analysis exercise was conducted in October 2007 at the Illinois State Emergency Operations Center. Representatives from emergency management, fire service, law enforcement, National Guard, private sector and public health participated in a two-day seminar. Each discipline evaluated the roles/responsibilities of the other disciplines through a series of events.²⁴⁶

The goals during the first phase of the exercise included identifying the perceived responsibility, actions, and resources of each discipline during an incident. During phase two, each discipline identified what actual responsibility, actions, and resources it would deploy during the same series of incidents.²⁴⁷

²⁴⁴ TISP, *Regional Disaster Resilience*, 2006, 24.

²⁴⁵ Ibid.

²⁴⁶ Illinois State Police (ISP), “Closing the GAPS, Illinois Homeland Security Reflects,” presented at GAP Analysis Workshop, Springfield, Illinois, October 29-30, 2007, 2.

²⁴⁷ ISP, *Closing the GAPS*, 2007, p 2 Illinois Homeland Security Reflects, GAP Analysis Workshop, October 29-30, 2007, 2.

As expected, gaps and overlaps were identified through the process. Importantly, perceptions, legitimacy, and stereotypes were flushed out. The collective homeland security community in Illinois has a picture of the capabilities among key actors within the community.²⁴⁸

4. Develop Metrics to Gauge Performance

Utilizing a strategic plan is one example where metrics can be used to identify the rate of success in the collaborative effort. Regardless of the method, it is important to gauge the progress of the group. The NCR group included performance measures in the construction of its strategic plan. Specifically, the NCR group looks for output measures which gauge the completion of initiatives.²⁴⁹

Periodic measurement by stakeholders is recommended by Hocevar et al.²⁵⁰ The discussion in the “Building Collaborative Capacity” document offers generic examples of questions that should be asked to evaluate the collaborative effort.²⁵¹ The important take-away here is that a schedule should be set to review progress based upon how and what type of programs and initiatives were established.

5. Create a Funding System

“Cooperation is free. Running programs is not.”²⁵² This quip from the NLC captures the most important aspect of funding a collaborative effort. Throughout history governmental agencies have discussed how often that they are budget deficient, in fact, do they ever communicate that they have too much money? Supporting collaborative efforts will require some funding. Several sources of government grant funding have

²⁴⁸ The researcher participated as a facilitator in the two-day exercise, GAP Analysis Workshop (October 29-30, 2007) in Springfield Illinois as a representative for the fire service in Illinois.

²⁴⁹ NCREPC, *National Capital Region Homeland Security Strategic Plan*, 2006, 9.

²⁵⁰ Hocevar, Jansen, and Thomas, *Building Collaborative Capacity*, 75.

²⁵¹ Ibid.

²⁵² Parr, Riehm, and McFarland, *Guide to Successful Government Collaboration*, 2006, 51.

been available to seed upstart groups like the Urban Area Security Initiatives (UASI). However, the reality of this type of support is that they will change if not stop all together.

The NCR strategic plan identifies a “variety of funding sources including Federal grants channeled through State and local authorities.”²⁵³ The plan is unclear as to what the variety of sources include. It is concerning to rely heavily upon federal grant dollars as they can change or be diverted. This concern is illustrated by further language in the NCR plan, “Due to recent actions by the Administration to curtail Urban Area Security Initiative funding for FY2006 for the NCR, when and to what extent we can implement these Initiatives is uncertain.”²⁵⁴ This statement clearly identifies that funding is primarily based on grant dollars. The NLC speaks to the overdependence on grants advocating self-sufficiency in place of federal reliance.²⁵⁵

Funding has the potential to be the most critical aspect determining success of a collaborative effort from the big picture view. Each of the cases evaluated in Chapter III approached financial issues in different ways, supporting the notion that solutions will be as unique to the collaborations themselves. For example, ChicagoFIRST assessed annual dues to cover its financial costs. Financial contributions may be covered by offering services or resources in place of dollars.

Identifying how fiduciary responsibilities will be addressed is critical.²⁵⁶ When federal grants are involved, the state or a county government may function as the fiduciary agency. Regardless of how the fiduciary is determined, all members expect to know how the funding arrangements will be handled.²⁵⁷

²⁵³ NCREPC, *National Capital Region Homeland Security Strategic Plan*, 2006, 9.

²⁵⁴ NCREPC, *National Capital Region Homeland Security Strategic Plan*, 2006, 9.

²⁵⁵ Parr, Riehm, and McFarland, *Guide to Successful Government Collaboration*, 2006, 51.

²⁵⁶ Centers for Regional Excellence, “Building Models.”

²⁵⁷ Parr, Riehm, and McFarland, *Guide to Successful Government Collaboration*, 2006, 51.

D. CONCLUSION

The homeland security culture needs to evaluate the use of best practices to describe desirable actions and move towards a framework of smart practices. Perhaps someday the actions of today may be recognized as best practices, but only when they have been vetted as best practices. Time will and retro-analysis will help to make that determination. In the interim, smart practices will become the foundational components essential in working towards collaboration.

Analysis of the case studies from Chapter III was compared to the smart practices in this chapter and resulted in several key findings:

- Agreeing on shared vision and mission
- Gaining top-level buy-in; developing ownership
- Determining responsibility authority, and expertise
- Agreeing on structure are all critical elements in creating a successful collaboration.

Existing organizations and new initiatives should address these elements on their path to collaboration.

Literature relating to the case studies presented in Chapter III did not provide sufficient detail to determine what operational smart practices were utilized. Presenting the ideas of good communications and the need for funding are obvious components of any organization. Equally obvious is the idea of starting with a winnable project. Although these smart practices may be obvious to some, it is important to emphasize the need to address these concepts.

Of the operational smart practices, the gap-analysis process is least commonly known yet provides vital information. During the Illinois gap-analysis exercise conducted in 2007, dialogue between disciplines allowed participants to replace perceptions with facts concerning all actors involved. In short order, all participants moved closer to common objectives with respect to roles and responsibilities of each discipline.

As homeland security is an evolving discipline so are the smart practices that offer guidance in achieving collaboration. These smart practices should continue to be collected and evaluated as organizations attempt to comply with homeland security policy and work towards collaboration.

V. FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND RESEARCH

A. INTRODUCTION

The first step in framing this chapter is to review the main research question from Chapter I. Looking back at the main question calibrates the focus of the project to establish relevancy to the findings, recommendations and future research information.

Primary research question:

Given that a multi-discipline, multi-agency cooperative environment will enhance present and future homeland security initiatives, what is the desired structure and how do organizations achieve that structure?

During the course of this project, collaboration, and how to achieve it, was examined in a homeland security context. Significant analysis about the research in this project is presented in six areas as findings.

1. Call for collaboration
2. What is collaboration and how can you get there?
3. Why collaboration and not other structures?
4. Case studies provided insight
5. Guidance is needed
6. Smart practices provide the foundation for collaboration guidance

Following the significance of the findings, recommendations are offered to address the main research question of organizational structure and how to arrive at collaboration. Finally, issues that were uncovered in the research as weaker areas were identified as topics for future research.

B. FINDINGS

1. Call for Collaboration

Since the attacks in the country on September 11, 2001, numerous organizations and agencies have published reports and recommendations relating to homeland security.

These publications were created by both the private sector and public sector. The public sector documents have been published primarily by the federal government. A common theme in these documents recommended that some type of collaborative effort should take place, specifically dealing with homeland security issues. These collaborative efforts are meant to engage actors that might not otherwise be engaged.

One of the first documents published by the federal government to promote the idea of collaboration is the 2002 National Strategy for Homeland Security.²⁵⁸ In 2003, President Bush released HSPD 5,²⁵⁹ “The Management of Domestic Incidents,” which also called for collaboration through the development of the National Response Plan.²⁶⁰

Collaboration has remained an important part of these federal documents even as they have been updated. In 2007 a revised version of the National Strategy for Homeland Security²⁶¹ was published containing the same call for collaboration. These documents primarily addressed the actions of the federal government.

As time progressed, the focus of collaborative effort changed to include all levels of government, especially local governments. Although modified from the original language of HSPD 5, in 2008 the National Response Framework²⁶² replaced the National Response Plan. In this case, the National Response Framework relied upon collaboration more heavily than its predecessor, the National Response Plan, specifically concerning local government collaboration. Expanding regional collaboration is the highest priority of the 2007 *National Preparedness Guidelines*.²⁶³ These guidelines again changed the target of collaboration to a regional concept.

²⁵⁸ Office of Homeland Security, *National Strategy for Homeland Security*, 2002.

²⁵⁹ White House, *HSPD5: Management of Domestic Incidents*, 2003.

²⁶⁰ DHS, *National Response Plan*, 2004, 29, 327, 339, 351.

²⁶¹ Homeland Security Council, *National Strategy for Homeland Security*, 2007.

²⁶² DHS, *National Response Framework*, 2008.

²⁶³ DHS, *National Preparedness Guidelines*, 2007, 11.

The most significant effort to promote collaboration appeared in the Urban Area Security Initiative documentation. The 2005 “State and Urban Area Homeland Security Strategy, Guidance on Aligning Strategies with the National Preparedness Goal”²⁶⁴ publication virtually forced collaboration for state governments and selected population centers throughout the country that were selected as UASI locations. These groups are in effect leveraged to become collaborations as federal homeland security funding may be tied to collaborative efforts.

Through a variety of documents, the federal government has consistently called for collaboration to address homeland security issues. The membership of these collaborations has been refined as the publications are updated.

Literature originating in the private sector revealed that active private sector organizations also had concerns about homeland security. In August of 2008, Business Executives for National Security published a report entitled “BENS’ Regional Public-Private Partnerships: Building a Resilient Nation”²⁶⁵ that specifically addressed continuity of community and the need for community collaboration.

In his book *Collaborative Leadership Fieldbook*,²⁶⁶ David D. Chrislip explored private sector and public-private sector collaborations. Chrislip called for public-private collaborations as the best model and uses an example to help prove his point. One example that Chrislip explored was the Joint Venture Silicon Valley group, which began as a private sector collaboration. The JVSV encountered some difficult economic times and found that they needed to evolve into a public-private structure.

The Infrastructure Security Partnership published a report, “Regional Disaster Resilience: A Guide for Developing an Action Plan,”²⁶⁷ in which the focus is critical

²⁶⁴ DHS, *State and Urban Area Homeland Security Strategy*, 2005, 4.

²⁶⁵ BENS, “Regional Public-Private Partnerships,” 3.

²⁶⁶ Chrislip, *Collaborative Leadership Fieldbook*, 2002, 135.

²⁶⁷ TISP, *Regional Disaster Resilience*, 2006, 6.

infrastructure planning. This group is made up of both public agencies and private sector businesses just as critical infrastructure is operated and owned by both the public and private sectors.

While not specifically called a collaboration, the regional action plan describes a collaborative effort. Both the private sector and the public sector describe a collaborative framework consisting of a variety of agencies and organizations that is needed to resolve homeland security issues.

2. What is Collaboration and How Can You Get There?

Recommending collaborative actions has been found in a variety of publications. What is noticeably missing from these publications is a definition of collaboration or at least some expected outcomes. If groups do not understand what collaboration is, then how can they possibly accomplish it? Without a consistent understanding of what collaboration is, each consumer of these homeland security documents can interpret the meaning differently. This can negate the intent of the publication to bring people together.

The *National Preparedness Guidelines* provides a definition of collaboration in a regional sense, “Standardized structures and processes for regional collaboration enable entities collectively to manage and coordinate activities for operations and preparedness consistently and effectively.”²⁶⁸ While the definition is helpful, the document does not address how to achieve collaboration.

Since the documents that call for collaboration did not provide a consistent definition, the researcher expanded his search, looking for a measurable definition for collaboration. The Chandler Center for Community Leadership²⁶⁹ studied a variety of organizational relationships. The results of its research identified five levels of organizational interactions which are concisely packaged in the Table 1 in Chapter II.²⁷⁰

²⁶⁸ DHS, *National Preparedness Guidelines*, 2007, 12.

²⁶⁹ Hogue, “Community Based Collaboration.”

²⁷⁰ Ibid.

Each level has metrics associated with purpose, structure, and process of the group. The key elements of this model can serve as benchmarks for existing groups to evaluate their current structure. Additionally, the concepts contained in Table 1 should be used as a model for both existing collaborative efforts and new initiatives to build their collaborative efforts.

Utilizing the criteria in Table 1 as the gauge for achieving collaboration, several of the organizations found in the literature, which consider themselves collaborations, do not measure up to the collaboration standard. The Business Executives for National Security and the ChicagoFIRST groups both fit the metrics of partnerships more than those of collaborations. The Texas Association of Regional Councils is best described as a network when compared to the Community Linkages standards. None of the case studies discussed in Chapter III satisfied the definition of a collaboration.

The literature did not reveal a consistent definition for collaboration. The work of the Chandler Center for Community Leadership provided a skeletal frame for moving toward defining collaboration, evaluating existing groups, and as a template to reach collaboration, but it did not define collaboration.

3. Why Collaboration and Not Other Structures?

While conducting research for this project, the choice of collaboration as the model organizational structure came under question. Why was collaboration identified as the desirable structure by these publications?

The key questions addressing this idea are:

- Are the various publications that call for collaboration citing the best organizational structure to resolve homeland security issues?
- Can other governance structures address homeland security issues resulting with positive outcomes?

The purpose of asking this question drives at structure of collaboration and how to achieve it. Several possibilities were considered that could explain why collaboration

was selected. One possibility considered that collaboration was a popular “buzzword” at the time that these documents were produced. Using buzzwords can be an easy, attractive, and less thorough choice by the authors.

Another possibility that would explain the frequent use of collaboration could be circular information sharing. That is, once the term appeared in one piece of homeland security literature, subsequent authors may have borrowed the term without explaining the intent of collaboration. Insufficient evidence exists to prove or disprove either theory concerning the word choice. The authors of these documents did not declare their intentions with respect to collaboration.

While the homeland security specific literature does not cite the structure offered by the Community Linkages material,²⁷¹ it is this structure that offers an argument for collaboration over other structures. Table 1 presented in Chapter II analyzed five levels of organizational structure, identifying key elements of purpose, structure, and process.

Table 1 may not list all possible organizational structures but for purposes of determining the target structure of collaboration, it offers a comparison matrix to work with. Moving down the table from networking towards collaboration, at each increasing level the collective group becomes more involved, efficient, and productive. Although not specifically stated, the various homeland security publications have similar expectations of group activity.

As indicated in Chapter III, none of the three case studies presented are collaborations as defined in Table 1.²⁷² Yet Business Executives for National Security, ChicagoFIRST, and Texas Association of Regional Councils are organizations successful as defined in Chapter III. The cases were studied as their current organizational structure. If these groups were evaluated at the time of their inception against the definitions in Table 1, they would all be at a lower functioning level than they are now.

Collaboration was selected as the desirable structure because it represents the greatest involvement by all parties, most productive organization working at the most

²⁷¹ Hogue, “Community Based Collaboration.”

²⁷² Ibid.

efficient level. In the interim, groups successfully function at lesser levels addressing and resolving homeland security issues. The Community Linkages²⁷³ definition of collaboration serves as a target for new and existing groups to work towards as they mature.

4. Case Studies Provided Insight

Locating collaborative efforts in homeland security with sufficient information to analyze their operations was a difficult task. Part of the difficulty in locating these organizations is that homeland security is an emerging discipline.²⁷⁴

All three case studies deal with homeland security issues, although only ChicagoFIRST was created by a common objective to address homeland security. The analysis of the case studies revealed that there is no best fit for organizations to address homeland security. Existing organizations that may not be homeland security oriented can evolve to work on homeland security issues such as BENS²⁷⁵ and TARC²⁷⁶ did. This is important when homeland security publications at times imply that new structures need to be initiated. At the other end of the spectrum, groups can be created with the express intent of resolving homeland security problems like ChicagoFIRST.²⁷⁷

Business Executives for National Security and ChicagoFIRST began as a collection of private sector businesses and the Texas Association of Regional Councils began as a result of Texas state legislation. As all three groups progressed in dealing with their respective issues, they all realized the need to change the composition of membership. In all three cases, the resulting structure became a public-private structure. These groups discovered that homeland security is not solely a private sector nor a public sector issue but a joint concern. Important here is the model structure is comprised of public and private entities.

²⁷³ Hogue, "Community Based Collaboration."

²⁷⁴ Bellavita, "Changing Homeland Security," 2008.

²⁷⁵ BENS, "Business Executives for National Security History."

²⁷⁶ Perry, "Texas Homeland Security Strategic Plan," 2005, 5.

²⁷⁷ CTG, "Exploring Regional Telecommunication," 2007.

Chapter II explored the concept that homeland security is a local issue and therefore needs to be addressed at the level. The case studies all began at a local level focus. The history of each group indicated that once they were established and modified their structure to public-private, they realized a need for a larger overarching organization.

Business Executives for National Security maintained its name but expanded chapters in various parts of the country.²⁷⁸ The Regional Partnership Council first formed in 2007 as a coalition of regional partnerships serving as the larger, overarching organization that was generated by ChicagoFIRST.²⁷⁹ The Texas Association of Regional Councils is the overarching group, and the lower level organizations are the Councils of Government. In this case the overarching organization, the Texas Association of Regional Councils, brought homeland security in a unified fashion to the Councils of Government.²⁸⁰

5. Guidance is Needed

After Hurricane Katrina devastated parts of the country in 2005, President Bush instructed the Department of Homeland Security to conduct a readiness review of state and Urban Area Security Initiatives known as the *Nationwide Plan Review*.²⁸¹ The project evaluated catastrophic readiness. Identified in the final report was the need for a planning guidance for catastrophic readiness and that more collaboration was needed.²⁸² The *Nationwide Plan Review* final report did not describe how to accomplish

²⁷⁸ BENS, “Regional Public-Private Partnerships,” 3.

²⁷⁹ RPCfirst “About RPCfirst.”

²⁸⁰ TARC, “Strategic Directions for Texas Regions.”

²⁸¹ U.S. Department of Homeland Security, “National Plan Review (NPR): Frequently Asked Questions (Version 2.0—Final),” Emergency Management Accreditation Program (2005), <http://www.emaponline.org/?230> (accessed August 1, 2009).

²⁸² DHS and DOT, *Nationwide Plan Review*, 2006, vii.

collaboration.²⁸³ While homeland security and catastrophic readiness are not identical, this assessment of readiness demonstrates that states and Urban Area Security Initiatives are hungry for direction and guidance.

In response to the *Nationwide Plan Review*, the Department of Homeland Security developed and published the Comprehensive Planning Guide 101²⁸⁴ in June of 2009. The Comprehensive Planning Guide 101 offers direction for state and local governments to better plan for disasters and catastrophic events. This new planning guide could serve as a good template to provide collaboration guidance with respect to homeland security.

Disastrous events take place somewhere not ambiguously “in the nation” or “in a state or city.” These events always begin in a locality.²⁸⁵ The International Association of Chiefs of Police found that homeland security incidents are inherently local issues and require immediate response.²⁸⁶ State and federal governments have their respective roles in such an event, but it always begins and ends as a local event.²⁸⁷

Responsibility for homeland security is clearly stated in the 2007 National Strategy for Homeland Security, “Federal, State, local, and Tribal governments, the private and non-profit sectors, communities, and individual citizens all share common goals and responsibilities—as well as accountability—for protecting and defending the Homeland.”²⁸⁸ The National Strategy for Homeland Security also calls for collaboration but does not provide the tools to achieve it.

A network of regional leaders, the Alliance for Regional Stewardship, has been studying the idea of collaboration for many years. They also have concluded that collaborating at a more refined level than the county level or state level is imperative to

²⁸³ DHS and DOT, *Nationwide Plan Review*, 2006, vii.

²⁸⁴ Federal Emergency Management Agency, “Comprehensive Preparedness Guide 101: A Guide for Emergency Operations All-Hazards Planning,” Federal Emergency Management Agency (2009), <http://www.fema.gov/about/divisions/cpg.shtm> (accessed August 1, 2009).

²⁸⁵ Senate, *F. Duane Ackerman*, 2007, 2.

²⁸⁶ IACP, *From Hometown Security to Homeland Security*, n.d.

²⁸⁷ DHS, *National Response Framework*, 2008, 10.

²⁸⁸ Homeland Security Council, *National Strategy for Homeland Security*, 2007, 4.

safeguard the citizens, businesses and institutions of the country.²⁸⁹ Like the National Strategy for Homeland Security, the Alliance for Regional Stewardship does provide a path to collaboration.

The most telling finding that supports the need for homeland security collaboration guidance is the lack of readiness for all hazard disasters. The concept of states and local governments being prepared for all-hazard type events is not new and has been expected for many years. Yet, according to the results of the *Nationwide Plan Review* assessment, these governmental agencies are not prepared and asking for guidance. It is unreasonable to expect that these levels of government will be successful in creating collaboration relating to homeland security, a field that they have little experience with.

6. Smart Practices Provide the Foundation for Collaboration Guidance

During the course of the research component of this project, some possible guidance to reach collaboration became apparent. The homeland security culture has adopted the idea of best practices, probably in an arbitrary fashion according to Eugene Bardach. He explained that “best practices” have not likely been carefully researched and documented to support such a claim.²⁹⁰

Bardach constructs his framework by more carefully defining both “smart” and “practice.” Having a potential for creating value and having a mechanism to focus that potential define “smart,”²⁹¹ according to Bardach, and “practice”²⁹² is an idea on how the actions of a practice work to solve a problem. Bardach’s framework for smart practices is more measurable than that of best practices.

²⁸⁹ Dodge, “Regional Emergency Preparedness Compacts,” 2002, 3–4.

²⁹⁰ Bardach, *A Practical Guide*, 2005, 91.

²⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 97.

²⁹² Bardach, *A Practical Guide*, 2005, 92.

Several smart practices emerged throughout the literature as trends across multiple agencies and disciplines. Identifying common practices throughout the literature from independent sources provides a strong argument for a smart practice. A total of ten smart practices were selected and ranked in order of importance from the literature, and five were used as analytical tools to evaluate the case studies presented in Chapter III. Interestingly, the case studies presented addressed all but one of the smart practices identified as governance- structure guides.

The order of importance of smart practices with respect to structure and governance are listed based on identified trends through research. Some of these practices are dependent on sequence, as one cannot be initiated before the previous concept has been started. The order of structure-governance importance is:

1. Shared vision and shared mission
2. Top-level buy-in
3. Ownership
4. Responsibility, Authority, and Expertise (RAE)
5. Structure: public, private, non-governmental organization, citizen membership

The literature was not as detailed to adequately determine if the case study organizations utilized the operational smart practices. These concepts are more case by case dependent.

The order of operational smart practices importance is:

1. Effective communications
2. Start with a winnable project
3. Perform a gap analysis
4. Create a funding system

Not all organizations have the capacity to collaborate. Early in the research, it became evident that collaborative capacity is a vast topic, yet this arena was addressed minimally in order to focus on other aspects of collaboration more fully. Determining capacity of an organization to collaborate remains imperative and is an important aspect of smart practices. Collaborative capacity for homeland security does not exist in the

same form as other smart practices presented in this project. Research has been conducted at the United States Naval Postgraduate School specifically on this topic.²⁹³

C. RECOMMENDATIONS

This project began by trying to determine the best organizational structure to address homeland security issues and how to achieve that structure. The popular structure offered through a variety of homeland security publications offered by both public and private sectors authors is a collaboration. After research and analysis, achieving collaboration is the right path. The level of collaboration offers the highest level of productivity and efficiency in the Community Linkages²⁹⁴ model.

Future homeland security efforts should focus on building collaboration among public-private actors by continuing to call for collaboration. However, important additions need to be added to the call for collaboration.

A common description for collaboration must be established. Participation, goals, and objectives will help to frame the definition. Until a common definition can be determined, the skeletal foundation provided by the Community Linkages²⁹⁵ resource provides a metric for organizations to work with. This definition should be included in future homeland security publications calling for collaboration.

Working towards the collaboration criteria identified in the Community Linkages²⁹⁶ product can serve as a model structure for newly forming organizations and existing groups alike. Some groups may never reach the level of productivity or efficiency identified in the table. The case studies revealed programs that are successful who have not reached collaboration. This recommendation is not diminishing the work that these groups have accomplished. These structures have proven their value and should continue to achieve their goals and objectives.

²⁹³ Hocevar, Jansen, and Thomas, *Building Collaborative Capacity*.

²⁹⁴ Hogue, "Community Based Collaboration."

²⁹⁵ Ibid.

²⁹⁶ Ibid.

Homeland security events take place somewhere, someplace. That someplace is at the local level, and it is at that level that homeland security collaboration should take place. The actors at this level are in need of guidance on how to accomplish collaboration. Future homeland security publications calling for collaboration need to focus their message at the local level audience.

The second half of the primary research question asks for a method to achieve collaboration. Building collaboration in the homeland security arena is an emerging activity. A limited number of smart practices were presented offering a starting point for homeland security collaboration. Smart practices should be included in future homeland security publications offering guidance to accomplish collaboration.

D. FUTURE RESEARCH

Homeland security collaboration has many miles to travel before it is widely accepted and practiced. Some areas of the research for this project were stronger and more robust than others. Other concepts require further work either to disprove their applicability to homeland security collaboration or to shore up their position.

Gap analysis and Responsibility, Authority, and Expertise (RAE) are both listed as smart practices although the breadth of existing data is not extensive when compared to some of the other smart practices. The study of collaboration and associated smart practices has only recently seen a surge of activity. That is, since September 11, 2001, the call for collaboration has increased greatly, and, therefore, the number of smart practices is minimal. Smart practices specifically focused on homeland security have not been studied extensively as of yet. To take advantage of positive practices will require more research. Attention given to the gap analysis and Responsibility, Authority, and Expertise (RAE) concepts may provide valuable insight in fostering future collaboration especially with regard to upstart efforts.

Additionally, homeland security smart practices, as a larger topic, requires more research. As organizations embark on creating new groups and as present groups evolve, they will create, evaluate, and modify smart practices. These lessons learned must be collected analyzed and published so that future organizations can continue to learn from what has worked and what to avoid.

While the literature supports the idea that homeland security is a local issue, it is not clear that the leaders in the public and private sectors at the local level are in agreement about homeland security responsibility. Introducing homeland security to the local level so that those leaders can learn to take ownership within their means is a weak area in the literature. More work is required here to understand how to support these local leaders work towards collaboration.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Associated Press. “[ISN] 'Dr. Chaos' Indicted in Wisconsin Utility Attacks.” May 7, 2002. Info Sec News. <http://lists.jammed.com/ISN/2002/05/0045.html> (accessed September 15, 2009).
- Bardach, Eugene. *A Practical Guide for Policy Analysis*. Washington, DC: CQ Press, 2005.
- Bellavita, Christopher. Changing Homeland Security: What is Homeland Security? *Homeland Security Affairs Journal* 4, no. 2 (2008).
- Blumberg, Stephen J. and Julian V. Luke. “Wireless Substitution: Preliminary Data from the January–June 2006 National Health Interview Survey.” Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics. 2007. <http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/products/pubs/pubd/hestats/wireless2006/wireless2006.htm> (accessed July 17, 2008).
- Breul, Jonathan. “Managing Homeland Security.” Presented at American Society for Public Administration National Conference, Portland, OR, March 18, 2003. National Academy of Public Administration. http://www.napawash.org/si/si_homeland_papers.html (accessed July 12, 2008).
- Business Executives for National Security, “BENS Business Force,” Doc Stoc, <http://www.docstoc.com/docs/2289794/What-is-the-BENS-Business-Force/> (accessed July 24, 2009).
- Business Executives for National Security. “BENS Business Force Partnership Criteria.” Business Executives for National Security. <http://www.bensbusinessforce.org/BENS%20BF%20Partnership%20Criteria.pdf> (accessed February 10, 2008).
- Business Executives for National Security. “Business Executives for National Security History.” Business Executives for National Security. <http://www.bens.org/about-us/histroy.html> (accessed August 23, 2008).
- Business Executives for National Security. *Getting Down to Business: An Action Plan for Public-Private Disaster Response Coordination*. Washington, DC: Business Executives for National Security, 2007.
- Business Executives for National Security. *Intelligence Community Analysis Project*. Alexandria, VA: Business Executives for National Security, 2008. http://bens.org/mis_support/ICAP-Rprt.pdf (accessed August 23, 2008).

Business Executives for National Security. "Public Archives." Business Executives for National Security. <http://bens.org/library/publications/archive.html> (accessed July 5, 2009).

Business Executives for National Security. "Public Benefit Coalition, Building a Resilient America: A Proposal to Strengthen Public-Private Collaboration." Business Executives for National Security. 2009. http://www.bens.org/PBO%20Proposal_03_04_09.pdf (accessed July 5, 2009).

Business Executives for National Security. "Regional Public-Private Partnerships: Building a Resilient Nation." Business Executives for National Security. http://www.bens.org/mis_support/BENS%20Regional%20Partnership%20White%20Paper%2008_08_08.pdf (accessed August 23, 2008).

Business Executives for National Security. "What is the BENS Business Force?" North Carolina Institute for Public Health Grand Rounds. 2006. http://www.publichealthgrandrounds.unc.edu/pandemic/handout_bens.pdf (accessed September 22, 2008).

Business Executives for National Security. "What They Say about BENS." Business Executives for National Security. <http://www.bens.org/about-us/what-they-say-about-bens.html> (accessed August 23, 2008).

Centers for Regional Excellence. "Building Models for Regional Collaboration-Best Practices." State of Michigan. <http://www.michigan.gov/cre/0,1607,7-115--125792--,00.html> (accessed July 13, 2008).

Center for Technology in Government. "Exploring Regional Telecommunication Incident Response Coordination." State University of New York at Albany. 2007. www.ctg.albany.edu/publications/reports/exploring_regional?chapter=9 (accessed June 7, 2008).

ChicagoFIRST. "ChicagoFIRST: Fostering Industry Resilience and Security through Teamwork." ChicagoFIRST. <https://www.chicagofirst.org/> (accessed July 5, 2009).

ChicagoFIRST. "ChicagoFIRST Paves the Way for Financial Community Partnerships by Providing a Business Continuity Model for U.S. Cities." ChicagoFIRST. 2006. https://www.chicagofirst.org/press/2006/press_20060530.jsp (accessed June 12, 2008).

- ChicagoFIRST. "Chicago Financial Industry Resilience and Security through Teamwork, 2006 Annual Report." ChicagoFIRST.
https://www.chicagofirst.org/resources/2006_Accomplishments.pdf (accessed August 23, 2008).
- ChicagoFIRST. "Frequently Asked Questions." ChicagoFIRST.
<https://www.chicagofirst.org/resources/faq.jsp> (accessed June 12, 2008).
- ChicagoFIRST. "Legislative Activity." ChicagoFIRST,
http://www.chicagofirst.org/legislative_activity.jsp (accessed June 12, 2008).
- ChicagoFIRST. "Mission." ChicagoFIRST.
<https://www.chicagofirst.org/about/mission.jsp> (accessed July 5, 2009).
- Chrislip, David D. *Collaborative Leadership Fieldbook*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2002.
- Dodge, William R. "Regional Emergency Preparedness Compacts: Safeguarding the Nation's Communities." Alliance for Regional Stewardship. 2002.
<http://www.regionalstewardship.org/Documents/REPCSReport.pdf> (accessed February 10, 2008).
- Dye, Thomas R. "Local Government in Texas Cities, Towns, Counties, and Special Districts" in *Politics in America*. 5th ed. (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2002), Prentice Hall Companion Web site.
http://wps.prenhall.com/hss_dye_politics_5/7/1867/478180.cw/index.html (accessed August 29, 2008).
- Environmental Protection Agency Office of Water. *Seattle-King County, Washington Community Case Study Report, Security and Preparedness Practices: A collaborative Approach to Water Sector Resiliency*. Washington, DC, Environmental Protection Agency Office of Water, 2007. Environmental Protection Agency.
<http://cfpub.epa.gov/safewater/watersecurity/publications.cfm?view=all> (accessed July 26, 2008).
- Federal Emergency Management Agency. "Comprehensive Preparedness Guide 101: A Guide for Emergency Operations All-Hazards Planning." Federal Emergency Management Agency. 2009. <http://www.fema.gov/about/divisions/cpg.shtm> (accessed August 1, 2009).

- Hocevar, Susan, Erik Jansen, Gail F. Thomas, *Building Collaborative Capacity for Homeland Security*. Monterey, CA: Naval Postgraduate School, 2004. Homeland Security Digital Library.
https://www.hsdl.org/homesecc/docs/theses/04Nov_Hocevar.pdf&code=ae173351560410be5e2276a3347f2c04 (accessed July 14 2007).
- Hogue, Theresa. "Community Based Collaboration, Community Wellness Multiplied." Center for Rural Studies (University of Vermont).
<http://crs.uvm.edu/ncco/collab/wellness.html#why> (accessed July 4, 2007).
- Homeland Security Council. *National Strategy for Homeland Security*. Washington, DC: White House, 2007. White House.
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/infocus/homeland/nshs/NSHS.pdf> (accessed September 22, 2008).
- Illinois Terrorism Task Force. "Organization." Illinois Terrorism Task Force.
<http://www.ready.illinois.gov/ittf/Organization/> (accessed May 25, 2009).
- Illinois State Police. "Closing the GAPS, Illinois Homeland Security Reflects." Presented at GAP Analysis Workshop, Springfield, Illinois, October 29–30, 2007.
- The Infrastructure Security Partnership. *Regional Disaster Resilience: A Guide for Developing an Action Plan*. The Infrastructure Security Partnership. 2006.
<http://tisp.org/index.cfm?cdid=10962&pid=10261> (accessed June 6, 2008).
- International Association of Chiefs of Police. *From Hometown Security to Homeland Security: IACP Principles for a Locally Designed and Nationally Coordinated National Homeland Security*. Alexandria, VA: International Association of Chiefs of Police, n.d. International Association of Chiefs of Police. 2005.
<http://www.theiacp.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=78X8uKjLa0U%3D&tabid=392> (accessed April 10, 2008).
- Lewis, Ted G. *Critical Infrastructure in Homeland Security: Defending a Networked Nation*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Interscience, 2006.
- Moyer, Harriet. "What We Mean by Working Together." Center for Community and Economic Development, University of Wisconsin Extension. June 1997.
www.uwex.edu/CES/CCED/leaders/lgc197.cfm (accessed May 25 2009).
- National Academy of Public Administration. *Advancing the Management of Homeland Security: Managing Intergovernmental Relations for Homeland Security*. Washington, DC: National Academy of Public Administration, 2004. National Academy of Public Administration. <http://www.napawash.org/si/HS-WHITE.pdf> (accessed July 12, 2008).

- National Capital Region Emergency Preparedness Council. *National Capital Region Homeland Security Strategic Plan 2007–2009 Overview*. Washington, DC: National Capital Region Emergency Preparedness Council, 2006. Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments. <http://www.mwcog.org/uploads/pub-documents/z1lWXg20061116180932.pdf> (accessed July 16, 2007).
- Office of Homeland Security. *National Strategy for Homeland Security*. Washington, DC: White House, 2002. White House. http://www.whitehouse.gov/homeland/book/nat_strat_hls.pdf (accessed April 17, 2007).
- Office of the Director of National Intelligence. *Intelligence Community Information Sharing Strategy*. Washington, DC, Office of the Director of National Intelligence, 2008.
- Parr, John, Joan Riehm, and Christiana McFarland, *Guide to Successful Government Collaboration in America's Regions*. Washington, DC: National League of Cities, 2006.
- Partnership for Public Service. "Collaboration in Times of Crisis" Partnership for Public Service. 2008. www.ourpublicservice.org/OPS/publications/viewcontentdetails.php?id=127 (accessed June 7, 2008).
- Pelfrey, William V. "Cycle of Preparedness: Establishing a Framework to Prepare for Terrorist Threats." *Journal of Homeland Security and Emergency Management* 2, no. 1 (2005): 1.
- Perry, Rick. "The Texas Homeland Security Strategic Plan 2005-2010." Houston-Galveston Area Council. 2005. http://www.h-gac.com/safety/homeland-security/documents/HmLndSecurity_StratPlan.pdf (accessed October 23, 2007).
- Prentice Hall. "Retail Management: A Strategic Approach 7/E, Barry Berman and Joel R Evans." Prentice Hall. http://www.prenhall.com/rm_student/html/start.html (accessed September 6, 2008).
- RPCfirst. "About RPCfirst." RPCfirst. <http://www.rpcfirst.org/default.asp> (accessed August 24, 2008).
- RPCfirst. "Mission." RPCfirst. <http://www.rpcfirst.org/mission/default.asp> (accessed August 24, 2008).
- RPCfirst. "RPCfirst Regional Partnership Council, Partnership Information." Regional Partnership Council. <http://www.rpcfirst.org/partnerships/default.asp> (accessed August 24, 2008).

- Ryan, Gene and Raymond Kay. "The Missing Link of Unified Command." *Homeland Protection Professional*. (March 2004): 24–26.
- State of Michigan. "Michigan Communities Answer Governor's Call for Collaboration at Sold-Out 'Creating Cool' Conference." State of Michigan. 2003.
http://www.michigan.gov/dleg/0,1607,7-154-10573_11472-82827--,00.html
(accessed September 10, 2008).
- Sternberg, Ken. "Taking Care of Business." *Homeland Protection Professional*. October 2006: 27. ChicagoFIRST.
https://www.chicagofirst.org/press/2006/Taking_Care_of_Business.pdf (accessed August 26, 2008).
- Straus, David. *How to Make Collaboration Work, Powerful Ways to Build Consensus, Solve Problems, and Make Decisions*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, 2002.
- Texas Association of Regional Councils. "2009 Texas Conference on Regionalism." Texas Association of Regional Councils.
<http://www.txregionalcouncil.org/index.php> (accessed July 5, 2009).
- Texas Association of Regional Councils. "About TARC." Texas Association of Regional Councils. http://www.txregionalcouncil.org/display.php?page=about_tarc.php
(accessed April 12, 2008).
- Texas Association of Regional Councils. "Alamo Area Council of Governments." Texas Association of Regional Councils.
<http://www.txregionalcouncil.org/display.php?page=region.php&COG=AACOG>
(accessed April 12, 2008).
- Texas Association of Regional Councils. "Ark-Tex Council of Governments." Texas Association of Regional Councils.
<http://www.txregionalcouncil.org/display.php?page=region.php&COG=ARK-TEX>
(accessed April 12, 2008).
- Texas Association of Regional Councils. "References." Texas Association of Regional Councils. <http://www.txregionalcouncil.org/display.php?page=references.php>
(accessed July 5, 2009).
- Texas Association of Regional Councils. "Regions." Texas Association of Regional Councils. http://www.txregionalcouncil.org/display.php?page=regions_map.php
(accessed April 12, 2008).

- Texas Association of Regional Councils. "Strategic Directions for Texas Regions." Texas Association for Regional Councils. http://www.txregionalcouncil.org/sd_exec_summary.pdf (accessed April 12, 2008).
- Texas Association of Regional Councils. "Texas Association of Regional Councils Quarterly Meetings Schedule." Texas Association of Regional Councils. http://www.txregionalcouncil.org/2009_July_Quarterly_Meetings_Schedule.pdf (accessed July 5, 2009).
- Texas Statutes. Local Government Code. Regional Planning Commissions. 1965. Title 12, Subtitle C, Chapter 391, § 391.001 (a). <http://www.statutes.legis.state.tx.us/?link=LG> (accessed August 29, 2008).
- Tishuk, Brian. "The ChicagoFIRST Experience." Presented at 2005, Infragard Conference, Washington, DC, November 30, 2005. Infragard, http://www.infragard.net/library/congress_05/financial_sec/chicago_first_exp.ppt (accessed August 24, 2008).
- Tishuk, Brian S. "Participating in a Regional Public-Private Emergency Partnership: Why do it and How do you Make it Work?" *Journal of Business Continuity & Emergency Planning* 1, no. 4 (2007): 395.
- U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs. *Statement of F. Duane Ackerman to the Subcommittee on State, Local, and Private Sector Preparedness and Integration*. 110th Cong, 1 sess., June 21, 2007.
- U.S. Department of Homeland Security. "National Plan Review (NPR): Frequently Asked Questions (Version 2.0—Final)." Emergency Management Accreditation Program. 2005. <http://www.emaponline.org/?230> (accessed August 1, 2009).
- U.S. Department of Homeland Security. *National Preparedness Guidelines*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of homeland Security, 2007. Department of Homeland Security. http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/National_Preparedness_Guidelines.pdf (accessed March 24, 2008).
- U.S. Department of Homeland Security. *National Response Framework*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2008. Federal Emergency Management Agency. <http://www.fema.gov/pdf/emergency/nrf/nrf-core.pdf> (accessed January 25, 2008).
- U.S. Department of Homeland Security. *National Response Plan*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2004. State of Hawaii Civil Defense. <http://www.scd.state.hi.us/documents/nrp.pdf> (accessed March 1, 2008).

- U.S. Department of Homeland Security. *State and Urban Area Homeland Security Strategy: Guidance on Aligning Strategies with the National Preparedness Goal*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2005. Department of Justice, http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/odp/docs/StrategyGuidance_22JUL2005.pdf (accessed May 28, 2007).
- U.S. Department of Homeland Security and Department of Transportation. *Nationwide Plan Review: Phase 2 Report*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2006. Department of Homeland Security. http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/Prep_NationwidePlanReview.pdf (accessed May 22, 2007).
- U.S. Department of the Treasury. *Improving Business Continuity in the Financial Services Sector: A Model for Starting Regional Coalitions*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Treasury, 2004. U.S. Department of the Treasury. http://www.ustreas.gov/press/releases/reports/chicagofirst_handbook.pdf (accessed June 7, 2008).
- Wheeler, Wendy. *Encircling Institutions: Surrounding Youth in Crisis with Mutual Engagement, Commitment and Trust*. Takoma, Park, MD: Innovation Center for Community and Youth Development, 2007. Roca. <http://www.rocainc.org/pdf/pubs/EncirclingInstitutions.pdf> (June 15, 2009).
- W. *Homeland Security Presidential Directive 3: Homeland Security Advisory System*. U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2002. http://www.dhs.gov/xabout/laws/gc_1214508631313.shtm#1 (accessed May 25, 2009).
- White House. *Homeland Security Presidential Directive 5: Management of Domestic Incidents*. Washington, DC: White House, 2003. White House. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/02/20030228-9.html> (accessed April 17, 2008).
- White House. *The National Strategy for Physical Protection of Critical Infrastructures and Key Assets*. Washington, DC: White House, 2003. Department of Homeland Security. http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/Physical_Strategy.pdf (accessed December 15, 2007).

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

1. Defense Technical Information Center
Ft. Belvoir, Virginia
2. Dudley Knox Library
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California
3. Mike Chamness
Illinois Terrorism Task Force
Springfield, Illinois
4. Daniel J. McLaughlin
Village of Orland Park
Orland Park, Illinois
5. Richard Jaehne
Illinois Fire Service Institute
Champaign, Illinois
6. Gene Ryan
Chicago Fire Department
Chicago, Illinois
7. Jay Reardon
Mutual Aid Box Alarm System
Warrenville, Illinois