



Committee Reports

**2013 Mid-Year Emergency Management Policy &
Leadership Forum
March 17—22, 2013
Alexandria, VA**

Legal Counsel Committee
March 17, 2012

Meeting Summary

Opening Comments

Committee Chair Brenda Bergeron offered some welcoming comments and previewed the agenda for the balance of the morning.

Post-Disaster Legal Processes

After a brief discussion specific to FEMA's process for de-obligations, FEMA General Counsel Brad Kieserman outlined the two types of de-obligations:

1. When funds are available in Smartlink and the project is not done and subsequently de-obligated.
2. When an Inspector General or FEMA audit finds there was an improper payment or FEMA did not follow a policy or law.

In instances related to the latter, there are 90 days to respond to the Inspector General. FEMA will reply and may agree or disagree in whole or in part with any findings. Many times it goes through an appeal process and there is review of the projects. If at all possible, state directors were encouraged to speak with their legal counsels and FEMA to not let de-obligations get out of hand. He also recommended requesting the "capping report" which is produced by the Inspector General. Whenever that report comes out, FEMA and state legal counsels should review it together. The report points out trends that the auditors are looking for in their review. When they see these issues, it is often a cue for guidance to be improved and for states to check for those issues.

FEMA may allow for damaged programs to be funded under HMGP but there is no guidance or ability to manage expectations to the public. The goal is to change the project worksheet formulation process. Many of the disputes which result in appeals being filed are because the denial was not articulated in an easily understandable way. The first appeal generally is "why" the applicant denied.

Some states impacted by Sandy have been told that there might be a plan to put a series of project worksheets into a single project worksheet. So to combine small projects into a single large project may elevate the project over a threshold. The Sandy Recovery Implementation Act does allow for the consolidation of projects and FEMA is currently working on a pilot project. FEMA was unaware of any thresholds.

The final post-disaster issue discussed was one of stand-by contracts. Contracts were put into place with pricing utilized during emergencies. There are questions at the recovery level about whether or not the correct pricing is in place. FEMA admitted this issue is usually in regard to debris removal. States must consider "reasonable costs" and make sure contracts are permissible under existing state law. There is also a lot of flexibility during an emergency. Any contract that is pre-approved must comply with state law. If state directors have questions, they were encouraged to reach out to FEMA regional attorneys.

Issues from EMAC Committee

The issue of deploying non-state assets into other states has been raised repeatedly, and the EMAC Committee brought it to the attention of the Legal Committee again. Many states have statutes to allow such deployments. Others are looking at some broad powers to see if they can be used either as an MOU or under existing state law.

In Iowa, intrastate legislation gives the capability to share resources within the states. The legislation also allows the state to do a 28D with the local assets to make them a temporary agent of the state and deploy them under EMAC. In Connecticut, there is a definition of a civil response unit. Another committee member suggested the EMAC Assisting State swear-in the deployable assets and adapt an MOU template to deploy them. This question is also raised several times during EMAC training. Under EMAC law, the issue has been interpreted to mean they are considered an employee of the requesting political subdivision. If a state has legislation allowing them to be agents under the state it allows you to deploy, but if an MOU is signed, the individual has greater protections.

Discussion with FEMA General Counsel

Brad Kieserman, FEMA General Counsel outlined a number of current issues being addressed by his staff. The overall theme lately in FEMA is reducing the cost of disasters. Administrator Fugate is currently creating a list of goals that will become a larger strategy. He intimated that such a strategy could be a place for programs such as EMPG that help buy-down risk. Overall, FEMA is receiving increased pressure to demonstrate how investments are reducing risk. In the coming months, given efforts such as the Sandy Act, the speed at which FEMA will make policies and decisions will increase significantly.

The Counsel's office also provided an overview of how the Threat Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (THIRA) impacts the legal community. There currently are no legal issues primarily because the THIRAs are not yet tied to federal funding. FEMA does not believe the THIRA process will increase liability, but there is the potential for FOIA issues, so states were encouraged to examine existing state laws and what information goes into the THIRAs.

Private Sector Integration in State Emergency Operations Centers

The main concern of the private sector is ensuring all competitors receive the same information on an equal footing. Most businesses are concerned with seeing information utilized for the "common good" and not selfish business needs. This is one of the major issues seen by integrating the private sector into state EOCs. Legal issues regarding such integration vary by event. There are also some challenges with the private sector wanting to over-protect information to maintain a competitive advantage. In short, the committee discussion erred toward ensuring information is shared widely and openly to provide equal opportunities and broad participation.

Roundtable of Outstanding Issues

The discussion of roundtable issues was cut short due to time. The committee did discuss briefly the definition of when an appeal is "received" by FEMA. The Administration continues to work on this issue, but the General Counsel informed the committee that the receipt can be made at the regional or headquarters levels.

**Mitigation Committee
March 18, 2013**

Meeting Summary

Introduction

Bryan Koon (FL) welcomed the committee members, guest speakers, and audience members and started the meeting with an update on key issues since the Annual Forum in Seattle, Washington. In late October, 2012, the National Mitigation Alliance (administered by NEMA and funded by a cooperative grant from FEMA) held a policy forum in St. Augustine, Florida. Members of the Alliance and staff from the Florida Emergency Management Division met with local emergency managers, non-profit representatives and private sector members to discuss the proliferation of mitigation at the State and local level and determine if best practices from the State of Florida can be used to encourage mitigation across the country. The attendees also visited various recently completed or ongoing mitigation projects and learned about challenges/barriers and innovations from officials involved.

Koon also discussed his participation in the Multi-Hazard Mitigation Council Symposium in January 2013. The MMC is credited with helping to define the return on investment seen from mitigation activities and the study was originally completed 10 years ago. The Symposium brought experts in the field of mitigation together with stakeholder organizations to discuss how mitigation can continue to play a large role before and after disasters as well as how to best communicate the ROI achieved by taking action. There has been discussion around redoing the ROI study to assure the results reflect recent disaster trends. Bryan will continue to work with MMC/NIBS as they pursue this study.

Discussion with FIMA Associate Administrator

Dave Miller, Associate Administrator of the Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration at FEMA joined the Committee to discuss major mitigation priorities affecting States. One of the most critical issues Mr. Miller highlighted during his time was the changes to the Hazard Mitigation program that resulted from the passage of the Sandy Recovery Improvement Act. Prior to the mitigation committee meeting, Dave participated in a workshop with FEMA colleagues to inform the NEMA membership and conference attendees of the major changes to HMGP/Stafford Act.

Dave began his discussion by indicating that the anticipated Mitigation Framework should be released in the next few weeks (currently still under review). He highlighted the fact that the report aims to look at mitigation beyond the restrictions of the current programs and delves into the discussion of risk assignment and building resiliency on a systemic level. The key is laying out a plan for mitigation before the disaster. If we're waiting so long to start mitigation projects, we're missing data that could drive mitigation investment in the future. Intelligence drives the investment and RISK MAP is a crucial part of this. He continued by highlighting the fact that while a majority of infrastructure is privately owned, we must work closely with the private sector to assure local, regional, and national coordination for the good of the community.

Miller also focused his discussion on the continued implementation of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act from last summer. The cost increases associated with the actuarial rate transition have already started while rulemaking and studies will be longer term projects. With recent disasters like Hurricane Sandy, the question remains whether States with flood hazards (and those that may be affected by climate change) will choose to elevate above the ABFEs/Fed Standard free board levels. Even

one foot could be the difference between cleaning up and completely rebuilding. The big question in all of this remains, how do you incentivize insurance when the (federal) recovery money moves faster if you don't have it?

State Hazard Mitigation Officer Update

Miles Anderson, State Hazard Mitigation Officer from the State of Florida, spoke to the Committee on behalf of SHMOs from around the country. One of the biggest issues facing SHMOs is the lack of substantive communication. Due to scheduling conflicts and a great number of workshops and briefings, NEMA was unable to dedicate time to a discussion with all SHMOs. Due to a lack of resources, FEMA has also been forced to cancel the last few meetings of State mitigation stakeholders. Without in-person meetings, SHMOs have been struggling to share best practices and truly work across the country to understand the impacts of recent changes to mitigation policies/regulations. One possibility was better coordination through the ASFPM mitigation committee since many SHMOs are also floodplain managers. This dual communication would leverage both organizations and could prevent the lack of communication we're seeing.

Mitigation and Incentives: Discussion with Partner Organization (IBHS)

Debra Ballen, General Counsel and senior vice president of public policy for the Insurance Institute for Business and Home Safety, came to the NEMA Forum to discuss the critical relationship between emergency management and the insurance community. She indicated that there is a disconnect between the insurance community and EM community and because of anti-trust laws, insurance companies are often barred from coordinating on critical issues. Insurance companies have always been challenged to translate mitigation into the market. In reality, the decision to mitigation should not be based solely on insurance benefits, since the benefits often don't outweigh the direct cost and it may take quite a long time to fully realize the monetary benefits. What cannot be measured or priced, however, are those actions that end up paying dividends right away.

Mitigation does actually have benefits for the insurance community as a whole. If you can control the losses associated with natural disasters, markets will react better and help stabilize the industry. Mitigation can bring the reinsurance companies to the table, which also increases stability in the system overall. In some states, programs have been created that require insurers to provide discounts to houses built to code and others that create residual markets or voluntary programs with special pools. Mitigation can also lead to lower deductibles in some places. Politics at the state level and regulations already in place can negatively affect insurance company's willingness to incentivize mitigation. The reality that insurance rates are already too low has insurance companies wondering how they could justify singing up to lose more. As we move towards actuarial rates under new federal legislation, however, there may be a shift to reward those who take mitigation action.

The key for the future of mitigation is the relationship between the emergency management community and the insurance community and Ballen indicated that the best way to foster this communication is for State EMs to reach out to State Insurance Commissioners and discuss shared priorities. To achieve larger public policy changes they could pursue joint support for mitigation or building code policies. By joining together, they enhance their ability to do outreach and the material they are already using to communicate with stakeholders can benefit from this cross pollination.

**Preparedness Committee
March 18, 2013**

Meeting Summary

Committee Chair Al Berndt (NE) called the meeting to order at 9:50 am.

The discussion proceeded as follows:

REP Hostile-Action Based Exercises and compliance with NIMS/ICS

Presenters:

- Andy Mitchell, Director of the Technological Hazards Division at FEMA
- Mark Thaggard, Deputy Director for Emergency Preparedness in the division of Preparedness & Response at the NRC Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response
- Joe Anderson, Chief of Operating Reactor Licensing and Outreach Branch Division of Preparedness and Response Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

The issue focused on the fact that NIMS compliance is not a requirement for hostile-action based exercises for nuclear facilities. A state licensee would like to adopt its plan to incorporate NIMS/ICS so that it better integrates with state plans that already use that approach. The NRC representatives explained that there is nothing in the NRC regulation to prevent that integration. The only stipulation is that the plan's overall effectiveness is not reduced. Mr. Anderson agreed to follow up with the state in question and assist in the effort. Mr. Mitchell added that the industry has been extremely supportive of the exercises and saw the integration as an opportunity for better understanding of NIMS/ICS.

Grant Alignment between Emergency Management and Public Health

Presenters:

- Dr. David Marcozzi, Director, National Healthcare Preparedness Programs, Assistant Secretary of Preparedness and Response, Department of Health and Human Services
- Gary Rogers, Senior Policy Advisor, DHS/FEMA/GPD

Dr. Marcozzi – CDC and ASPR have been working over the past two years to better align the Public Health Emergency Preparedness Cooperative Agreements and the Hospital Preparedness Program Cooperative Agreements. In all, these health preparedness grants total close to \$1 billion. The HHS preparedness programs have developed aligned Public Health Emergency Preparedness Capabilities: <http://www.cdc.gov/phpr/capabilities/DSLRCapabilitiesJuly.pdf> and Healthcare Preparedness Capabilities <http://www.phe.gov/Preparedness/planning/hpp/reports/Documents/capabilities.pdf>. These health emergency preparedness capabilities support and are consistent with the National Preparedness Goal core capabilities. A crosswalk of the core capabilities and the health emergency preparedness capabilities is nearly complete and will be released with the renewal of the DHS/HHS/DOT Grant Alignment MOU in July 2013.

Gary Rogers – the second year of work under an MOU between DHS/FEMA, DHHS and DOT/NHTSA is now finishing up. The purpose of the MOU is to create a common framework that supports joint federal planning

and optimizes preparedness grant investment by all the federal partners. FEMA and HHS have agreed on a two year work plan that is in process and will be incorporated into the updated and renewed MOU. In addition, FEMA and HHS have formally reviewed and commented on the FY 2013 HSGP and Hospital Preparedness Program (HPP) and the Public Health Emergency Preparedness (PHEP) funding opportunities. FEMA also provided and HHS included standard THIRA language that was included in the FY 2013 HPP/PHEP grant announcement which also encouraged HC and PH organizations to become involved in the annual THIRA/capability estimation/strategic planning process. The HPP/PHEP grant announcement included requirement for exercises to be compliant with the Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP).

Public Information in EM – Embrace Information Sharing or Be Publicly Irrelevant

Presenter:

- Jeremy Heidt, Spokesman and Public Information Officer, Tennessee Emergency Management Agency, Lead for NEMA Public Information Subcommittee

Mr. Berndt asked Mr. Heidt to 1) discuss how two serious events from the past year – Hurricane Sandy and the school shooting at Sandy Hook Elementary – changed the public information discussion, and 2) tell EMA directors what they should be thinking about in light of these two things, particularly in the area of technology.

For #1), Mr. Heidt said the focus should be on data-sharing. It needs to improve and be more flexible in how EMAs develop it and use it. The challenges facing state EM PIOs have increased in almost unimaginable ways. The speed and the technical expertise necessary to be informative, authoritative and credible to the public are tremendous. This requires specialty training and collaborative approaches with peers, but most of all, a management team willing to support flexible and innovative solutions. #2) EM directors can assist by having greater involvement in supporting innovation in the public information effort.

Detailed PIO feedback on Sandy Hook school shooting – the PIOs in Connecticut EMA and state police shared their experience handling a national tragedy that precipitated the most intense media coverage of a single event in more than a decade. Onsite state police PIOs handled media briefings every 90 minutes for six days in a row. At one point, more than 1,000 media representatives were on-scene in Newtown, Conn. Support for on-site PIO included three additional staff in the field and two coordinators back at HQ. The EMA PIO handled multi-agency coordination and mutual aid with other state/federal agencies.

Detailed PIO feedback on Superstorm Sandy – PIOs from New Jersey, New York and Mississippi were able to share lessons learned from Superstorm Sandy's impact. NY activated its Joint Information Center (JIC) for two weeks and delivered over 90 press releases from various agencies. NJ used a virtual JIC with a staffed media center at their SEOC, but incorporated multiple non-response community information providers, Jersey Shore Hurricane News Page, and social media such as Facebook. Two full-time

emergency dispatch personnel were devoted to monitoring social media for emergency messages that needed triaged for an official 9-1-1 response.

Mr. Heidt also made suggestions on how to improve the PIO effort in each state:

1) Information-sharing protocols needs to be as wide as possible. Set a nationwide priority towards adopting "open-source" data standards to more easily share information. 2) Do not fear sharing information with the public. Whatever a state doesn't share, the media is making up. Information will change rapidly in a developing situation. Use self-correcting data streams by constantly providing up-to-date information. 3) Leverage and engage citizens to provide necessary information. They will do it without state EMA. When the private sector and government couldn't tell the public where to find fuel after Hurricane Sandy, a group of high school students built a crowd-source map, where the public provided real-time updates of where fuel could be found. <http://mappler.net/gasstation>
http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/11/01/hurricane-sandy-gas_n_2061305.html

The last item in Mr. Heidt's report was the proposed NEMA/FEMA PIO Training Workshop. The State PIOs are actively engaged with FEMA External Affairs on planning a multi-day workshop to be held later this summer. This would be the 5th time the PIO Training Workshop will be held, and the first since FEMA changed to make it a biennial event. The plan is to fund at least one PIO from each state EMA to attend. However, the workshop could be put on hold because of sequestration. One state director commented that an increasing amount of data is becoming available from every disaster. He suggested that at the workshop, each state develop one story from the data because the stories – not the data – are the critical elements.

Preparedness Strategies and EMAC

The last agenda item was how states prepare for their EMAC responsibilities and the challenges, in light of state budgetary constraints and federal budget cuts.

Comments:

- Two states indicated they have modeled their state mutual aid program after EMAC in order to build a robust EMAC program.
- One small state – definitely challenged in handling the administrative side of EMAC when it asked for resources during a recent event. Did not have the personnel to handle it.
- One small state – still working on getting all staff EMAC trained; turnover and layoffs make it more difficult
- One small state – currently facing staff shortfall, which inhibits their ability to manage EMAC responsibilities; working with the state fire chiefs association to develop EMAC capability at the volunteer firefighter level
- Not just a small/medium state issue – major municipalities still don't understand and aren't connected to the EMAC process.
- All EMAC resources are at the local level – this challenges the response if those resources have been diminished because of budgetary issues or if they weren't adequate from the beginning
- Term limited legislators mean that EMAC education is needed on an on-going basis; EMAC "story" gets forgotten from term to term

EMAC Committee Chair John Heltzel said that EMAC is currently working on the “EMAC Ready” concept, which will include a sliding scale system to help states of various sizes determine their level of EMAC capability. It might address everything from their familiarity with the EMAC operating system to the number of mission-ready packages. Mr. Heltzel and Mr. Berndt agreed that their two committees should work together on “EMAC Ready.”

With no further discussion items, the meeting was adjourned at 11 am.

**Homeland Security Committee
March 18, 2013**

Meeting Summary

Opening Comments

Committee Chair Nancy Dragani provided opening comments and welcomed guests

Information Sharing Between State Officials and the Private Sector

Tom Serio from Verizon Wireless joined the committee to present some thoughts on information sharing. In order to better share information, the divisions between public and private must become blurred as much as practical. Serio outlined several ways states share information including through emergency operation centers (EOC), through region or county organizations, and at joint field offices (JFO).

The concern for the private sector is what happens with the information once it is shared. Sharing information can also be very labor intensive. Following Twitter, checking Facebook feeds, and other social media outlets all require significant amounts of time. Private sector officials are also often restricted by the information that can be shared; and there is skepticism among the private sector as to the value of information received. Furthermore, the private sector will always be leery of how information is used and what competitors know.

He provided some thoughts on how to improve the process:

- Realize we are already doing a fairly good job of sharing information
- Better define the needs. Who needs information, when is it needed, and what is needed?
- Identify what is currently available now. Consider whether more private sector members should be plugged into EOC operations – including systems such as webEOC
- Understand the sensitivity of information and know what can be shared further. Not everyone is in a “need to know” status and recipients of information are often afraid to ask if it can be shared further.
- Training and exercise activities provide good opportunities for the private and public sectors to learn the priorities of each other. Engagement must happen well before a disaster ever occurs.
- State officials should not assume the full force of the private sector will be available for response and recovery if they have been cut-out of the process leading-up to the disaster.
- There can be too much information, and information must be funneled through the appropriate channels. Use key personnel to help filter information to the private sector. This is a way for the information to come from trusted resources and does not become overwhelming
- States could consider putting together a “Private Sector Division” to bring businesses into the system and give them access to webEOC or other EOC management software systems.

A concern that was raised related to how officials can determine if the right aspects of the private sector is engaged. Often times, there are large business groups or regional organizations that can be utilized to funnel information to and from the EOC. Committee members were also concerned with how to ensure the right people are assigned to the EOC, as opposed to sales representatives. From Serio's perspective, it depends on the company, but is able to be tailored. State officials should work with their business contacts to ensure the right specialist is representing the company to the state. Conversely, businesses should make sure their representatives are well-informed and able to speak for the company.

Addressing the Cyber Threat with Public/Private Partnerships

Dan Donohue from Caterpillar, Inc was available to discuss how the private sector manages the cybersecurity threat. He also provided an overview of Caterpillar's security and crisis management functions.

Caterpillar has a 24/7 risk management center which helps track dozens of information streams from a variety of sources. Their Enterprise Crisis Management System operates on 3 levels; facility/personnel, regional/country, and full enterprise. They see the lowest level as the most significant and "first line of defense." Resource allocation decisions are made solely based off a calculation of risk. The risks vary widely depending on the time of year, global threats, etc.

The company faces a range of cyber threats from small-time hackers to malware from the Chinese government. They do not feel the federal government does a very good job of intercepting cyber-threats, so Caterpillar does much of the work in-house. Donohue indicated the lack of government action is disappointing since the private sector does not usually have the same resources. The system is regularly tested at all 3 crisis management levels by the company's IT security team. He further emphasized that the key to combating cyber-threats are the timeliness of response and strength of the system.

He feels the answer to how states and companies can jointly assess the cyber risk comes down to communication. Such information can be shared without compromising corporate security or state-sensitive information. Information such as how an attack was carried out or the characteristics of an attack can easily be shared and helps both sides work together.

Assisting THIRA: How Does the Private Sector Conduct Threat Assessments?

Rob Guinn from UPS Airlines outlined the perspective of the private sector that "threat assessment" is really the same as "risk assessment." The latter has just been done for a much longer time. UPS utilizes its web of employees to help gather information on the ground.

As assessments are completed, the allocation of resources is a direct result of the threat and risk assessment including personnel decisions. The major difference between the public and private sectors is the need for businesses to always consider the profitability of the company. The UPS security concern goes far beyond asset protection in locally held assets. As the airline flies internationally, threats and risks must also be assessed around the world.

The airline utilizes four tiers of risk assessment:

- Assessment of risk including regional assessments and escort requirements.

- Determination on how the enterprise will be impacted
- Intelligence gathering; and
- Distribution of intelligence to key stakeholders.

They have attempted to gain information from the federal government, but have had difficulties. Paid resources have also been utilized, but they find relationships with state and local governments (as well as social media) provide the best information.

Information is shared widely even among competitors, and UPS sits on many industry groups with other companies. There are also agreements with competitors to look past business priorities when dealing with the security of the companies. Securing the enterprise stands above all else.

General Discussion

A thread that ran through all the presentations was fast but also accurate information. The presenters provided some ideas on how information can be shared more quickly while also ensuring the quality.

- All information is subject to change, and such flexibility must be considered when evaluating risk. Sometimes it can be helpful even if information is appropriately labeled (such as “unvalidated”). Information can also be tiered based off the reliability.
- The hardest part about information sharing in this day and age is the speed at which it travels. Patience is necessary because in the absence of speedy information, people tend to get “frantic” and desperate for updates.

The committee was interested in how all the industry representatives seemed to be utilizing a similarly process in risk assessment. While there is no industry standard, most companies follow a process which includes the identification of assets to protect; consideration of those events which could damage that asset; analyze the probability of the threat; and understand the implications of an attack. Each is assigned a value so they can be compared across the enterprise. Updates to assessments are being done on a daily basis. Twice a year the emergency response plan is updated.

Future Consideration of a THIRA Position Paper

Vice Chairman Jon Monken provided an overview of the Illinois paper on the THIRA process. The initial idea was to examine the THIRA from the local level “up” and integrate the private sector. The paper posits that overall; states should emulate and integrate the private sector process.

The Chair solicited volunteers to go over the paper and deliver broad concepts by the June Board meeting. A full product will then be delivered by the fall conference. The overall idea is to improve THIRA and help develop the framework for “THIRA 2.0.” The paper will be sent “as-is” to the full NEMA membership and volunteers for a working group will be solicited.

**EMAC Committee
March 19, 2013**

Meeting Summary

John Heltzel (KY), EMAC Committee Chair, opened the meeting. Angela Copple called roll. There was a quorum.

Allen Phillips (MA) delivered the EMAC Executive Task Force report which summarized the EMAC Executive Task Force meeting held the day before.

John Heltzel thanked Allen Phillips for his service as the ETF Chair in the past year. Carol Walton (AR) was confirmed as the ETF Chair Elect by the EMAC Committee. The motion was moved by Kurt Schwartz (MA) and seconded by Brian Satula (WI).

The EMAC Committee reviewed the recommendations in the North American Mutual Aid Agreement position paper. David Maxwell asked about the southern states interaction with Mexico. Matt Parks said so far no agreement with Mexican states has been signed. Kurt Schwartz (MA) said he strongly supported the effort. He pointed out that no governor's recommendation is required on the Canadian side, and expressed concern that there are already issues about everyday cross-border movements of resources and their reimbursement. He feels it will affect state-to-state mutual aid for everyday resource movement without a state declaration. Bruce Fitzgerald (ME) said thus far his state has not had an issue with this, but can understand how this could potentially be an issue. Brian Satula (WI) moved to adopt the position paper. Kurt Schwartz (MA) seconded the nomination. The motion passed.

Joel Thomas (G&H International Services, Inc.) talked about the "beyond the border" initiative between Maine and New Brunswick to test interaction of technologies using MASS (the Mutual Aid Support System). The exercise was very successful and they were able to use the new MASS system to view MRP's across the border. Bruce Fitzgerald (MA) said they achieved the goal of bringing in data outside of Maine, sharing it both at the county level and with FEMA.

John Heltzel discussed the MASS and the EMAC Action Planning Session that were held prior to the NEMA meeting. Anyone with ideas about the MASS system should talk to John Heltzel. There are many different avenues that can be taken to move the project forward but need to collect ideas from the NEMA membership to determine the best course of action. As follow-up from the EMAC Action Planning Session, the EMAC Committee, Executive Task Force, and NEMA staff will be working on document, "EMAC Readiness Criteria" that will be reviewed at the September NEMA Forum. It will outline the responsibilities of the states to EMAC and help states identify their gaps in EMAC preparedness. The discussion reviewed edits to the EMAC system over the years and the need to keep in mind that the EMAC system is a commitment to EMAC by the state and state Directors.

David Maxwell (AR) talked about COOP planning efforts in relation to EMAC. He explained that an exercise raised a question from his governor asked, "Who would take over if you weren't there?" By who, he meant his entire agency. This resulted in an MOU with the Arkansas National Guard (ARNG). If Arkansas Emergency Management was unavailable to respond, The Adjutant General would take over the role. The MOU will be filed with the EMAC Program Director who will be able to populate the system with the ARNG contact information so there will be EMAC Authorized Representatives (ARs) in the system. Nancy Dragani' (OH) asked if the co-location of ADEM's facility with NG was considered. David Maxwell explained the JOC was a couple of miles away.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 am.

**NATIONAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION
EMAC COMMITTEE**

POSITION PAPER

DATE: March 20, 2013

SUBJECT: Establishment of a North American Mutual Aid Agreement

BACKGROUND:

At the March 2008 Mid-Year Conference the National Emergency Management Association (NEMA) adopted a resolution on Cross Border International Mutual Aid Memorandums of Understanding which formally endorsed state efforts to establish international mutual aid agreements with their international partner countries. The position paper also called on Congress and the Administration to encourage and support international mutual aid activities.

The primary emergency management related cross border agreements in existence today include:

- Pacific Northwest Emergency Management Agreement
- International Emergency Management Assistance Memorandum of Understanding
- State-Province Emergency Management Assistance Memorandum of Understanding (newly established in 2012)

In addition, the southwest Border States are working closely with their Mexican counterparts to enter into a memorandum of understanding for intergovernmental cooperation during emergency circumstances.

While significant progress for emergency management assistance is being made between entities situated along the northern and southern U.S. borders and those agreements should continue to be supported and promoted, there is a growing desire on the part of non-border states to have the ability to receive or send cross border assistance with Canada and Mexico.

DISCUSSION:

Over the past decade there have been significant disasters and emergencies that have stretched the resources of the nation to their limit. Catastrophic disaster planning initiatives such as those within the New Madrid seismic zone clearly illustrate the challenges the U.S. will face in responding to and recovering from a multi-state/regional disaster of that magnitude. Events across the world such the tragedy that occurred in Japan remind us of the interdependencies of critical infrastructure and systems and potential cascading consequences. Globalization has increased the movement of people, goods, and services across borders. Climate change requires emergency managers to plan for such effects as sea level changes and dramatic seasonal climate abnormalities. All of these issues transcend political and geographic boundaries.

It is the sense of NEMA that a single North American mutual aid agreement applying to all member states, Canadian provinces, and Mexican states would serve the nation well in that it would be voluntary, open to non-border states and provinces and based on standardized doctrine and operational procedures in the same manner as the Emergency Management Assistance Compact (EMAC).

Provisions to be addressed in a voluntary North American mutual aid agreement include:

- Codify North American mutual aid in the context of state and provincial assistance as opposed to federal;
- Include provisions similar to those in EMAC with respect to liability, indemnification, licensure and reimbursement;
- Not predicate assistance upon the declaration of a state or federal disaster;
- Not impact or cause unintended consequences for existing cross border agreements;
- Provide the authority to cross international borders with reciprocity and without restriction;
- Allow for cross border training and exercises.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. NEMA should conduct outreach and build support for establishment of a North American mutual aid agreement with the National Governors Association and all appropriate stakeholders, federal agencies, Congress and the Administration;
2. NEMA should establish relationships and build support with the appropriate Canadian and Mexican entities for cross border mutual aid;
3. Congress should support states' efforts to engage in North American mutual aid by swiftly ratifying such agreement ;
4. NEMA should work with the federal government, Canadian and Mexican partners to identify the potential mechanism or structure to support the agreement similar to that of EMAC;
5. NEMA should work with the federal government to address border security and credentialing issues in order to ensure the ability of emergency personnel to quickly respond to mutual aid requests during disasters and emergencies.

Moved: IL
Second: CO

DISPOSITION: PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

NEMA 2013 Mid-Year Emergency Management Policy & Leadership Forum, March 18-22, 2013, Hilton Alexandria Mark Center Hotel, Alexandria, VA

**Pacific & Territorial Caucus
March 19, 2013**

Meeting Summary

Introduction

Doug Mayne (HI) and John Madden (AK) welcomed the members of the Caucus who had travelled from great distances to be at the NEMA Forum. They recognized that this attendance was the largest in recent years and would facilitate face to face communication that is so rare. The main goals for the meeting included understanding how current issues being discussed on the broader NEMA level affect P&T Caucus members specifically, and how these challenges can be communicated to the larger group.

EMAC

Doug indicated that in keeping with one of the major themes of the NEMA Mid-Year Forum, the Caucus would discuss the participation in and utilization of EMAC. How is it working or is it working? Are there barriers (policy/legislation/regulation) on the State or territory level that prevent EMAC from being fully implemented?

The Virgin Islands is a signatory of the agreement, but Elton Lewis indicated that beyond their signatory status, they continue to be unsure of their role during a disaster. They will be participating in a webinar soon that should help shed light on how they can become involved in the process and how they can build capabilities that could assist in an EMAC request. Due to the lack of capacity, however, they do not believe they could send many people and this concern was echoed by a few other members of the Caucus. Beyond a specialized staff member or technological component, the resources they have are required to support their own agencies. Hawaii indicated that they were challenged during Hurricane Sandy and internal confusion brought up questions of how to handle EMAC requests internally. They believe it actually helped highlight internal policy/procedures that needed to be addressed to make this process run smoothly-a great value added! This may be an area the Caucus can be more active by sharing and publishing best practices or lessons learned for internal procedures.

Mike O'Hare (AK) shifted gears and highlighted the challenges that requesting states often do not consider before a disaster. One of the main issues for requesting states is the lack of protocol or agreed upon policy for receiving people and equipment. Logistically, this can often be a nightmare and exercising this scenario is key to identifying where tie-ups may occur. Knowing how this process works and involving your closest neighbor in the preparation can lessen the chance for confusion.

Lewis reminded the group that money is the common denominator for many of these issues and building capacity for sending or receiving is the monetary responsibility of the State/Territory. The Virgin Islands has discussed a contingency fund for this purpose. Many members spoke up to echo Lewis' concerns about the monetary barriers to capacity building. Some members find that EMAC is a great deal more cost-effective than working with the Army in disaster situations so by helping to build these relationships with other EMAC signatories, disaster costs could be lessened. Some of the smaller islands remain concerned that while accepting help from off the island is key, they do not have a great deal of real estate for staging supplies and runway space for large military aircraft is scarce.

American Samoa discussed their experience with assistance during the tsunami incident. In their situation, the fastest and most effective way to get help is through the military (DOD). They also believe

the first call for them would be to unaffected villages to mobilize available volunteers through community leadership. Guam echoed this belief as they focus on how they could share resources between the islands (if a typhoon hits one island, other islands could easily be spared) and stated that training is key to assure all those potentially involved will know their roles and responsibilities. Sharing best practices was raised again as a critical need.

While EMAC may not always be the most effective tool for the islands, there are large benefits, including the during recoupment process. EMAC makes this process run smoothly and can assure coordination. Looking internationally is a critical necessity for P&T Caucus members and Washington shared their experience with the PNEMA agreement between the Pacific Northwest and Canada.

NOAA Update

Chris Maier from the National Weather Service (NOAA) joined the Caucus to discuss updates related to the National Tsunami Hazard Mitigation Program. The program arose out of a 1995 mandate and since has been a model partnership involving all 29 coastal states and the territories. The goal of the program was the support local and state organizations to add capacity to tsunami preparedness efforts.

The FY13 Planning Budget Guidance (from the Office of Management and Budget) ‘zeroed out’ all partner grants including the NTHMP. Fortunately, the FY13 budget looks promising and specifically “restores reductions proposed in the budget to the tsunami program” at \$23.5M. The approximate tsunami program budget includes quite a few critical components:

- US DART Buoys – \$11M
- Tsunami Warning Centers - \$3.5M
- Tide gages and Seismic Networks - \$11M
- PMEL/NGOC Inundation Mapping and Modeling - \$2.5M
- NTHMP – \$5.5M

While the outlook for FY2013 looks promising, the expiration of the 2006 Tsunami Warning and Education Act last year puts NOAA in a tough position of having no legal basis to ensure NTHMP grant funding. Reauthorization of this Act is critical to the success of the tsunami program that, over the years, has been a model of how the states and territories work effectively with the federal agencies to address the risks of the tsunami hazard. The Caucus continues to be very interested in how these funding and authorization issues play out as many of the members rely on the program to help support their preparedness programs.

The Role of the Caucus

One of the biggest questions for the Caucus remains how to elevate issues affecting the P&T members and influence the policy discussion happening among the larger NEMA membership. Issues like the NEMA grant proposal may have unforeseen effects on P&T members so it is imperative that members of the Caucus speak up during policy discussions. Extra considerations may be needed for isolated areas and smaller populations with unique risks.

While Congressional representation is limited for many of the members, States like CA, WA, AK, and HI must help educate their delegation as to the challenges of the P&T members by highlighting the shared priorities. In order to assure key issues are being discussed and communicated well, the Caucus discussed how to consolidate key information that can be used to highlight P&T similarities, differences, gaps, and best practices. Doug Mayne introduced a document that he had drafted with questions that would provide data on the Caucus members and allow us to do statistical analysis. The data collected

utilizing this survey would help identify unique challenges P&T members face and may provide insight as to the needs/considerations related to homeland security/emergency management grants. The survey will be reviewed by the membership and distributed in April.

**Response and Recovery Committee
March 19, 2013**

Meeting Summary

Committee Chair Dave Maxwell (AR) called the meeting to order at 9:45 am.

The discussion proceeded as follows:

NEMA Hurricane Subcommittee Report

Presenter:

- Bryan Koon, Hurricane Subcommittee Chair and Director of Florida Division of Emergency Management

Mr. Koon first recognized David Griffith, FEMA National Hurricane Program manager, who was attending the meeting and was available to answer questions afterwards. Director Koon then updated the full committee on the recent meeting between the Interagency Coordinating Committee on Hurricanes (ICCOH) and the NEMA Hurricane Subcommittee, which was held in Atlanta. Representatives from 13 of the hurricane-prone states were present at this meeting, as well as participants from American Red Cross, FEMA's National Hurricane Program, National Hurricane Center, US Geological Survey and the US Army Corps of Engineers. At last year's ICCOH meeting, the NHP provided a draft version of their five-year strategic plan. NEMA provided recommendations to that plan. NHP provided an update on those recommendations and an updated strategic plan this year. NEMA's recommendations are currently in draft, but they include the following: 1) Storm Surge – the NHC is working on providing storm surge watches and warnings independent of hurricane/tropical storm watches/warnings. These are currently scheduled to be live in 2015, but Mr. Koon asked that this be expedited. The information is critical to hurricane states. Also, there is no consistent nomenclature at the state and local level for identifying surge zones and evacuation zones, which causes confusion and inhibits federal participation in the outreach and education effort. 2) Funding - NHP funding remains extremely low. FEMA and USACE funding for FY 2013 is \$2.5M. This equates to 0.004% of the \$60B allocated to Hurricane Sandy recovery alone. Because of insufficient funding Post-Storm Assessments are being delayed. As an example, the Hurricane Irene (2012) PSA is still being conducted and Sandy PSA's has not started. 3) Technology – primary tool used by EM during hurricanes is HURREVAC, which is getting ready to celebrate its 20th birthday. There is currently only enough money allocated to the program to allow for incremental improvements and hosting over the next five years; no overhauls or porting to allow for mobile users is currently planned, although a survey of users is currently underway which could lead to such efforts. Also, the Real-Time Evacuation RTEPM was not funded by DHS S&T last year, and the program has been picked up by several states, including Virginia and Florida. The future of this important evacuation program is in jeopardy, and funding to allow for real-time operational use is not forthcoming.

Mr. Koon outlined the subcommittee's action items: 1) Provide recommendations to NHP based upon their draft 2013-2017 Strategic Plan; 2) Work with members to develop a single source of storm surge zone information for use by external stakeholders including the NHC; 3) Lead effort to develop standardized nomenclature for storm surge and evacuation zones in order to facilitate better cooperation and communication; 4) Lead an event to offer a standardized format for involving the NHC in state conference calls during a storm to help ensure that all states have access to the NHC director and lead forecaster immediately following forecast updates, and reduce the administrative burden on NHC staff; 5) Provide support for the two proposals developed by the NWS at the 2012 post-season NOAA Hurricane Meeting, which would give the NHC the option to continue to issue formal advisories on post-tropical storms and hurricane watches and warnings, while issuing explicit storm surge watches and warnings by the 2015 hurricane season.

NEMA PA/IA Subcommittee Report

Presenter:

- Dave Andrews, subcommittee lead and Disaster Assistance Program Manager for the Alaska Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management.

Mr. Andrews outlined the major projects of the subcommittee:

- Quarterly Individual Assistance Conference Call – scheduled as a result of a request by the NEMA subcommittee; being held in lieu of the FEMA IA Conference, which has not scheduled for the last two years.
- IA Mentoring Work-Group – resource guide is in a final revision. Regarding the actual mentors that are an integral part of this project, mentors have been identified in five of the 10 Regions. The subcommittee will continue to coordinate with all directors in the remaining five regions to identify the remaining mentors. In assigning mentors, states that allow FEMA to manage the IA process will be matched with the same.
- Yahoo User Groups – users groups for both Individual Assistance and Public Assistance programs continue to thrive. Thanks to Larry Braja, Human Services Officer Virginia Department of Emergency Management, who hosts the IA Yahoo Group, and Curtis Caldwell, Manager of the Mitigation and Infrastructure Section for the Illinois Emergency Management Agency, who hosts the PA site. In the last 12 months there have been 13 new members for the PA group and eight for IA. For the past year, state staff posted 1,323 messages for PA with IA posting 480. Overall, there are 97 members signed up for the PA site and 63 for IA.
- FEMA PA Steering Committee – due to numerous disasters, this committee has not met on a regular basis as planned. However, there was a four-hour conference call in early March 2013, which allowed state and FEMA regional staff to coordinate on several critical issues. These included the public assistance and the tribal declaration provisions in the recently passed Sandy Recovery Improvement Act; updates on appeals and FEMA's efforts to improve the processing and adjudication of appeals within the regulated timeframes; information from FEMA regarding CORE positions that are to be filled at the Task Force leader level in both JFO and Regional settings, with the objective of better managing field operations and reducing the number of permanent FEMA regional staff who are deployed and leave the region understaffed; and an update on the JFO Transition SOP under development and currently being reviewed by the committee.

- Public Assistance Workshop – so far, sequestration has not impacted the workshop, which is currently planned in May. The subcommittee will develop a work group to help coordinate with FEMA on the agenda. The goal is to have the agenda and invitations sent to the states with a minimum 30-days’ notice to allow for proper in-state processing and approvals.
- Quarterly PA Conference Call – last held in December 2012; regular updates provided; in the process of scheduling the next call.
- State Managed Disasters Template and EMAC Reimbursement under the PA program – subcommittee continues to support both of these projects. Follow up reports expected at the NEMA annual forum in September.

EMAC Reimbursement - How States Can Improve the Process and Speed Recovery

Presenters:

- Jerome Hatfield, Deputy Superintendent of New Jersey Homeland Security
- Howie Butt, EMAC Coordinator, New Jersey Office of Emergency Management
- Victoria Carpenter, EMAC Coordinator, Louisiana Governor's Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Preparedness
- John Heltzel, Chair of EMAC Committee and Director of Kentucky Division of Emergency Management

After Hurricane/Superstorm Sandy, the state of New Jersey was extremely successful in expediting the EMAC reimbursement process. The state took some lessons from Hurricane Katrina regarding EMAC and applied those after Hurricanes Irene and Sandy. Up to that point, New Jersey had been a sending state, not receiving. This included working with the state leadership – all the way up to the governor’s office – to explain the obligations the state was incurring when it requested EMAC assistance, obligations that it would incur regardless of FEMA reimbursement. The state was meticulous in its record-keeping. It also deployed Victoria Carpenter from Louisiana as an A-Team member and reimbursement specialist. It also sent to every sending state a reimbursement packet with clear instructions on all necessary information that New Jersey required.

Victoria Carpenter – the state of Louisiana was faced with \$80 million in claims after Hurricane Katrina. As a result, it set up clear procedures and continued to refine them since 2005. The state also became very knowledgeable in how to submit acceptable paperwork to FEMA for disaster assistance reimbursement. EMAC has added reimbursement tracking to its operations system, which should assist states in the process. Upon her arrival in NJ, Ms. Carpenter met with state financial/budgetary staff as well as PA staff so that everyone would be clear on FEMA PA eligibility.

Howie Butt – Ms. Carpenter’s assistance helped greatly in project worksheet submission and processing. Within 30 day, NJ had received full FEMA funding for all EMAC missions. Mr. Butt suggested that every director meet with their PA staff and re-examine their processes. He also outlined the core deadlines that NJ established for EMAC reimbursement:

- Receive reimbursement request and review – 5-10 days
- Send to state fiscal control – 3-5 days
- Send to legal and departmental review – 2-5 days
- Send to state treasury for disbursement from FEMA acct – 2-5 days
- Return document to Mr. Butt for draft cover letter and send the check – 14-28 days

New Jersey has received 10 reimbursement packets so far and has fully reimbursed 9 so far. The average turnaround time is 16 days. Mr. Heltzel commented that New Jersey represents a model/best practice for EMAC reimbursement. Mr. Butt and Ms. Carpenter agreed to craft a template for guidance to share with all the states.

Conversation with FEMA on Sandy Recovery Improvement Act of 2013 – Follow-Up Questions from Tribal Declarations and Individual Assistance Sessions; other Discussion Items

Presenters:

- Beth Zimmerman, Beth FEMA Acting Associate Administrator for Response and Recovery
- Deb Ingram, FEMA Assistant Administrator for Recovery
- Bob Fenton, FEMA Assistant Administrator for Response
- Jeff Dorko, Acting Deputy Associate Administrator; permanent position is the Director of the Office of Federal Disaster Coordination.

Ms. Zimmerman made some opening comments about the recently passed Sandy legislation and how it's re-evaluating FEMA core's mission and requiring the agency to do more with less. She also discussed the extremely tight timeframes under which FEMA is operating in order to implement the legislation. NEMA President John Madden commented that he hopes FEMA is mindful of the relationships between the various elements of the legislation – changes to PA, IA and Tribal declarations as well as the strategy to reduce the costs of future disasters – and the need to look at everything from a holistic prism. Ms. Zimmerman agreed. Another director asked how NEMA could best engage in the process, given the lack of time. Ms. Zimmerman reviewed the deadlines that were available. The most onerous challenge appears to be related to the IA program, which involves envisioning an entirely revised program. Committee Chair Dave Maxwell announced that he will hold a conference call to discuss the IA changes as soon as possible after the conclusion of the forum. In the meantime, a notice will go out to all states, asking for comments on revising the IA program. It was also announced that the NEMA Tribal Declaration Work Group will reconvene to address the issues/questions from the law which now allows direct tribal declarations. Colorado Director Dave Hard chairs this group and will also hold a conference call in the next few days. Finally, several questions related to the Public Assistance program have also been circulated to the states and all states are asked to submit those responses directly to FEMA and copy NEMA.

After this discussion, the FEMA representatives reviewed some other FEMA programs/initiatives:

- Transfer of Community Relations to FEMA Disaster Recovery – making the transition in April and May; tried a concept in Hurricane Sandy of allowing CR representatives to move from community to community so that they could assist those who did not want to leave their homes. One state shared

its concern of FEMA personnel going into the field without state representatives because sometimes this can result in disaster survivors receiving mistaken or conflicting information. FEMA added that the CR cadre will be trained extensively for applicant services. The group will also be renamed.

- Disaster Recovery Center changes – this will work hand in hand with CR (above) changes; centers will be staffed by FEMA reservists, not contractors; FEMA will work closely with states for DRC identification and site selection; will standardize signage, materials, staff training and access and functional needs considerations.
- IMAT Teams – based on lessons learned from Hurricane Sandy, FEMA is bringing on new teams in April that integrate all federal agencies in support of the National Response Framework’s Emergency Support Functions. A pilot will also be held in summer 2013 in Region IX.
- National Planning System – FEMA has recently held workshops on this. The goal is that the system will support nationwide standards in the planning profession by developing highly skilled planners.
- FEMA Workforce – Several efforts in this area – hiring of Public Assistance (PA) Cadre of On-Call Response/Recovery Employees (COREs); development of the FEMA Qualification System, which defines training, experience and demonstrated performance required to become credentialed in various FEMA position; overhaul of former Disaster Assistance Employee (DAE) Program to a new Reservist Program; further building of FEMA Corps that recruits competent young people into the emergency management field through a 10-month service assignment with FEMA.

At the conclusion of this discussion, the meeting adjourned at 11 am.

**Private Sector Committee
March 29, 2013**

Meeting Summary

Chair Bryan Strawser called the meeting to order, welcomed the members, speakers and special guests then introduced Ian Hay with SouthEast Emergency Response Network (SEERN) to facilitate a discussion on private sector perspectives on recent disasters.

Tom Serio with Verizon began by discussing his experiences on Long Island following Superstorm Sandy. Verizon's primary objectives were to assist the public by setting up charging stations, replacement devices, bringing the network back up and bringing store back on line. Working together with others on the ground though can lead to better outcomes and service for all. Two concerns that were expressed were the volume of red tape that remains and also the questions of when to leave.

Mark Cooper with Wal-Mart stressed the importance of creating relationships prior to the disaster, identifying potential road blocks in advance and being more strategic about philanthropy. Cooper also commended FEMA on how smoothly the National Business EOC worked.

Nicole McKoin from Target talked about how streamlined communications helped reopen 192 of 197 stores within the first 72 hours following the storm. The other 5 stores were delayed due to the requirement of electrical inspections which held up the connection of generators.

Amy Mintz with the American Red Cross discussed the 6000 volunteers sent by ARC and how they worked with NORTHCOM to house them on ships. Feeding task forces produced thousands of meals per day for weeks.

John Madden stressed the need for states to more quickly respond to change, embrace complexity, pre-identify resources, and create unity in planning, action and execution. No one organization has everything so we must all work together to identify and fill gaps.

Charley English said public and private work best when they stay in touch. "We need to keep the private sector on simmer rather than only bringing them in when a disaster occurs."

The chair thanked the discussion participants, Mr. Hay and introduced Stephanie Tennyson with FEMA to give an update on the FEMA Private Sector office and BEOC.

Tennyson discussed:

- New areas of the private sector portal have been created for the academic community and small business with the goal of creating more areas for specific audiences in the coming months.
- The business continuity tool kit and planning information on their website.

- There have been 8 private sector representatives in the BEOC to date. Walgreens currently hold the chair until June. At that time the new representative will begin, this time from the academic community. FEMA is currently reviewing the program and working to improve the process to allow them to maximize the experience for the representatives and increase effectiveness.
- FEMA will again host the National Business Emergency Operations Center Summit on April 23 at FEMA HQ. More information will be available in the next few weeks.
- Region II and VI have new private sector coordinators.
- The NBEOC deployed teams to New York, New Jersey and Connecticut during Sandy. Having staff on the ground helped inform FEMA leadership decisions.
- FEMA partnered with the American Hotel & Lodging Association to help find lodging for FEMA personnel and victims of Sandy.
- An after action call took place on January 31 and a report is currently in process. This will be shared widely when available.
- FEMA has re-posted the open position of Private Sector Division Director and hopes to have someone on board soon.
- FEMA is searching for ways to de-conflict information and not compete for information and resources with states and local agencies.

The chair thanked all the committee members and participants for their input into the discussion. Strawser stressed the need for better communication and creating relationships well in advance of disasters so that the process works seamlessly when needed.

The chair requested a motion to adjourn which was made by Tom Serio, seconded by Chris Furlow and the chair adjourned the committee.

**Past Presidents Committee Meeting
March 19, 2013**

Meeting Summary

Attendees: Dave Maxwell, Chair, Nancy Dragani, Jim Mullen, Bruce Baughman, Stan McKinney, Glen Woodbury, Jim Greene and Dave McMillion.

Status of NEMA Strategic Plan and Support by Past Presidents

Over the past year the Past Presidents have made significant contributions to several of the key actions identified in the plan including, but not limited to:

- Grants Reform Proposal – Dale Shipley served on the writing team and the Committee as a whole was provided the opportunity to review the draft proposal and provide input.
- Recognize and Create our own Targets of Opportunity - Albert Ashwood spearheaded a proposal to reform the Disaster Relief Fund and Nancy Dragani participated on the work group. Albert and Nancy briefed the proposal to OMB, FEMA, Congressional Research Service and Congressional staff. Albert is also leading an effort to develop a template for state managed disasters and just hosted a work group meeting a few weeks ago. We hope that FEMA will approve the template and then it can be made available to any interested states.

New Director and Leadership Development

NEMA is continuing to with EMI on the New Director Training Course and the 2013 session is scheduled for June 11-13 at EMI. It's unusual for all the new directors to be able to make the training and right now that's the only training opportunity provided.

In 2014 there are 36 states and 2 territories with gubernatorial elections. The Committee discussed whether the EMI course should be the first and single training opportunity supported by NEMA. The Past Presidents held a lengthy discussion regarding ways in which NEMA can provide additional training opportunities for new directors and/or identify existing training and professional development and a pathway forward for both new and experienced directors. This may have budget implications for NEMA.

The Past Presidents Committee agreed to develop a recommended new director and leadership development strategy to present to the NEMA Board of Directors for consideration.

NEMA Staff Succession Plan

- NEMA Executive Director Trina Sheets asked the Past Presidents Committee to provide technical assistance in the development of a staff succession plan that could be presented to the Board of Directors at their June 2013 meeting. Not only is it a smart idea for an organization to have such a plan, but CSG would like to have one from all the

affiliate organizations so they clearly understand how each the organizations will function during transition periods and any role that CSG is expected to play.

Future Officer Candidates

- The Past Presidents Committee has responsibility for assisting the organization with identifying and recruiting future officer candidates. The committee discussed potential future officer candidates and Chair Dave Maxwell will conduct outreach to determine interest by those individuals discussed. This conversation in no way prohibits others interested in serving as a NEMA officer from becoming a candidate given they meet the requirements set forth in By-Laws.

Legislative Committee
March 20, 2013

Meeting Summary

Introduction

Charley English (GA) welcomed everyone to the meeting and began reviewing NEMA legislative priorities. He indicated NEMA will continue to look at the grant reform proposal again especially since sources tell us the President's budget will likely propose the same reform they had in 2013. NEMA will not be looking for an increase in EMPG, but will look to replace any money lost in the sequester. NEMA will be asking for \$350m again. Charley also thanked all the directors who submitted data for the EMPG report that was completed this week in a partnership with IAEM. It has gone to Congress and we're hearing great feedback. Given the success last year, we'll also be continuing our support of HLS and EM training and education programs. This priority gives us the ability to continue support of EMI and CHDS out in Monterey.

Discussion with Congressional Staff/Invited Guests

- Eric Heighberger, House Homeland Security Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications (Majority): Eric recently joined the staff of the House HLS Committee after serving on the staff of the Senate HSGAC during the 112th Congress. He discussed the new chairwoman and ranking member of the Committee and indicated both Susan Brooks and Donald Payne were excited to pursue critical issues pertaining to homeland security and emergency management. One particular area of interest is the homeland security grants including a path forward on grant reform and continued discussions involving metrics. The Subcommittee will also be looking into the Sandy bill, including other provisions that could have been included and a path forward for critical disaster issues. Chairwoman Brooks is also very interested in social media use during disasters and is looking forward to engaging on that issue.
- Moira Bergin, House Homeland Security (Minority): Moira echoed some of the same interests as Eric and indicated the budget situation will prompt many discussions on how to do more with less and achieve optimum efficiency in the homeland security and emergency preparedness programs. She indicated Representative Thompson continues to be interested in emergency communications including Next Generation 911. She also highlighted a concern that National Level Exercises may need to be examined, especially the area of after action reports that may not be making it down to the level needed to truly improve operations post-exercise.
- Will Painter and Jared Brown, Congressional Research Service (CRS): Will and Jared came to the Legislative Committee to provide insight on the budget control act and sequester that took effect in 2013. While details for how the sequester would affect specific DHS/FEMA programs are not available, CRS has done extensive research into the overall outlook for federal funding for homeland security issues. The slide presentation they presented was not for attribution. One area that benefits greatly from the BCA is the DRF which has a new funding structure that will make it more financially stable.

- Pat Hart, FEMA: Standing in for Legislative Affairs Director Aaron Davis, Pat discussed critical priorities for FEMA over the coming year. One major issue for FEMA will obviously be implementation of the Sandy Recovery Improvement Act as well as the continued implementation of the Biggert-Waters NFIP reform act from 2012. Both bills are critical to the future of FEMA regulations and policies. The tribal piece of the Sandy bill is one that requires continued outreach as the communication routes are opened between tribes that may not have experience with disaster issues in the past.
- Randy, International Association of Emergency Managers: As the IAEM Government Affairs Chair, Randy came to NEMA to discuss areas of shared interest between the two organizations. He thanked NEMA for our continued partnership on the EMPG paper that was sent to Congress earlier this week and applauded the work of our two organizations to justify the money spend on critical emergency management capabilities. IAEM remains concerned that EMPG funding under the sequester may not fare well and that more discussions are needed to determine how funds can continue to support both local and State priorities. IAEM is also working to assure NWS has the funding they need to adequately support a robust emergency management community.

Issues from Other NEMA Committees

The Response and Recovery Committee did voice concern that the response time for comments on the Sandy Recovery Improvement Act was not adequate for substantive discussion and review. NEMA staff will engage with FEMA and Congress to assure review will be a critical piece going forward.