



FEMA

June 19, 2015

MEMORANDUM FOR: James Featherstone  
Chairman, National Advisory Council

FROM: W. Craig Fugate   
Administrator

SUBJECT: Response to National Advisory Council Recommendations from  
March 2015 NAC Meeting

Thank you for your letter dated March 31, 2015, regarding the National Advisory Council (NAC) recommendations from the March 2015 NAC meeting. Below you will find FEMA's responses to your recommendations.

**Training for the Whole Community**

**Issue:** Training and awareness gaps exist for critical components of the whole community (e.g., higher education, day-care centers, hospitals, access and functional needs, and seniors). The Emergency Management Institute (EMI) is the nexus for the training of emergency managers.

**NAC Recommendation 1:** EMI should periodically audit and revise, as necessary, all courses to ensure that access and functional needs, seniors', and children's issues are addressed and integrated into current training programs. The audits should include feedback on existing curricula from relevant stakeholder populations.

**FEMA Response 1:** FEMA agrees with this recommendation. EMI welcomes and encourages feedback on its curriculum. Stakeholder audits, feedback, and recommendations are systematically taken into consideration through regularly scheduled curriculum reviews. EMI is in the process of centralizing its curriculum management function through the establishment of a single curriculum management office. The curriculum management office will be responsible for coordinating EMI's curriculum reviews, revisions, and retiring of specific courses within its course library. The curriculum management process involves curriculum experts, subject matter experts, focus groups and other partners. The process is a collaborative approach to ensure EMI's curriculum reflects current doctrine and that curriculum is accessible to the whole community. Through this process, curriculum will continue to be examined to ensure that functional needs of special populations, to include seniors and children, are addressed and updates are made accordingly.

**Recommendation 2:** EMI should develop a specific curriculum of Independent Study (IS) courses at the 200-, 700-, and 800-level for the emergency management community and higher education institutions. Awareness of emergency management considerations at higher education institutions should be incorporated throughout the IS course curriculum.

**FEMA Response 2:** FEMA partially agrees with this recommendation. EMI agrees that the emergency management community and higher education institutions are key members of the whole community. Currently EMI has two residential courses developed as a resource for the higher education community, the *E363 Multi Hazard Emergency Planning for Higher Education* and *G367 Emergency Planning for Campus Executives* (currently under review and revision). Both courses are targeted to support the unique needs of the campus environment and have prerequisite IS courses that are a part of a blended learning approach. This includes *IS-100 HE Introduction to the Incident Command System for Higher Education* and *IS-360 Preparing for Mass Casualty Incidents: A Guide for Schools, Higher Education, and Houses of Worship*.

EMI's 200, 700, 800 IS course curriculum currently provides awareness level training to the whole community. The IS courses are intended to provide broad awareness level training for the whole community that builds and supports national capabilities and a unified command model for every event. EMI can embrace the blended learning model and bridge more of these IS courses to the unique training curricula for higher education. EMI welcomes its continued dialogue with higher education institutions regarding ways to leverage their resident curriculum development and delivery capabilities to improve the effectiveness of the entire EMI IS catalog for their institutions.

### **Addressing Children's Needs**

**Issue:** Children represent 25 to 50 percent of the population in any given community, and their needs during disasters are unique and must be addressed to ensure their safety and protection. The NAC believes that children's needs are currently included among the "access and functional needs" efforts but feel they should be elevated to having a specialized focus. Between 2009 and 2012, FEMA had a Children's Needs Coordinator and Children's Working Group to address children's issues. However, since 2012, FEMA no longer has a technical lead to emphasize and address children's needs. Over the last 10 years, significant progress has been made with regard to children's issues; however, there are still gaps that put children at risk. For example, a lack of awareness of the *Post Disaster Unification of Children - A Nationwide Approach*, and of how to operationalize it at the state, local, tribal, and territorial levels, leaves this population vulnerable.

**Recommendation 3:** FEMA should establish a permanent technical expert within the Agency to focus on the needs of children in disasters. This individual could act as the lead for FEMA regarding children's needs when working with other federal human service coordination agencies and other non-profit organizations.

**FEMA Response 3:** FEMA agrees with the NAC recommendation to establish a permanent technical expert within the Agency dedicated to the needs of children in disasters. As a part of FEMA's goals outlined in the 2014-2018 Strategic Plan, one of the agency's strategic priorities is to be survivor centric in mission and program delivery by maximizing speed, efficiency, accessibility and ease of use of FEMA's programs and services for individuals and communities. In reviewing our programs to ensure we are meeting this priority, FEMA is ensuring that the disaster services we provide are transparent, efficient and effective in meeting the needs of all survivors, including children.

FEMA has made tremendous progress in integrating children's disaster related needs throughout disaster planning, preparedness, response and recovery efforts across FEMA. For example, FEMA created a three-pronged youth preparedness program, to include: a responsive Technical Assistance Center for practitioners (<http://www.ready.gov/youth-preparedness>); a partner-driven National Strategy for Youth Preparedness (<http://www.ready.gov/youth-preparedness>); and a Youth Preparedness Council (<http://www.ready.gov/youth-preparedness-council>). FEMA continues to strengthen and build upon relationships with all pediatric stakeholders to include other federal agencies, state and local partners, Non-Governmental Organizations, the private sector, and pediatric experts. These relationships have proven to be invaluable, most importantly, during disaster operations – specifically the 2011 Joplin tornado and 2013 Hurricane Sandy response in New Jersey. The states of Missouri and New Jersey, the Department of Education, and Department of Health and Human Services have repeatedly expressed the value of FEMA's child-centric approach during these disaster operations, noting the consequential impact on local communities and the transformation in how children's disaster related needs are now addressed on a state level.

FEMA's efforts continue to evolve, and children's disaster related needs continue to be integrated into our program delivery and training. The coordination with our federal and external partners and identification of cross cutting programs to support children in the affected communities and states throughout their short and long term recovery is vital to our program delivery and the disaster services provided for children.

Despite the progress made to date, there is still more to do, which is why FEMA is committed to dedicating a technical expert to continue shepherding efforts across program offices to institutionalize newly established resources and tools throughout FEMA and to further integrate disaster services to meet the needs of children in disasters.

**Recommendation 4:** FEMA should include specific language in future grant guidance to authorize state, local, tribal, and territorial personnel to establish a similar role to the FEMA permanent technical advisor position to ensure current and future policy and planning is operationalized at the state, local, tribal, and territorial levels.

**FEMA Response 4:** FEMA agrees with this recommendation. FEMA will include language in the FY 2016 Emergency Management Performance Grant (EMPG) Notice of Funding Opportunity as follows:

Per the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, as amended, (42 U.S.C. §§ 5121-5207), EMPG Program funds may be used for all-hazards emergency management operations, staffing, and other day-to-day activities in support of emergency management, including hazard mitigation staffing of the State Hazard Mitigation Officer (SHMO) position; staffing CERT and Citizen Corps positions at the state and local levels in order to promote whole community engagement in all phases of emergency management; performing close-out activities on FEMA Disaster Assistance grants; staffing permanent technical advisors on children's needs at the state, local, tribal and territorial levels; and supporting fusion center analysts who are directly involved in all-hazards preparedness activities as defined by the Stafford Act. Proposed staffing activities should be linked to accomplishing the

activities outlined in the EMPG Program Work Plan. Recipients are encouraged to fund at least one dedicated Planner, Training Officer, and Exercise Officer.

**Recommendation 5:** FEMA should confirm availability of and increase awareness of FEMA's infant and toddler supply availability and capability to federal, state, local, tribal, and territorial emergency management leadership.

**FEMA Response 5:** FEMA agrees with this recommendation. In 2010, FEMA added Infant & Toddler Kits onto the Commonly Used Sheltering Items (CUSI) List <http://nationalmasscarestrategy.org/sheltering/>. This list, initially created by participants from the National Commission on Children and Disasters, the American Red Cross, FEMA, and the American Academy of Pediatrics and Save the Children, was developed to provide guidance to shelter managers and staff on essential shelter supplies necessary to sustain children. Taking a proactive approach, FEMA identified the best methods for federal responders to rapidly distribute these items in preparation of and/or in response to an event. At any given time, FEMA Logistics Management Directorate (LMD) has the capability for immediate deployment of pre-kitted Infant & Toddler Kits from CONUS and OCONUS Distribution Centers in support of sheltered disaster survivors during presidentially declared emergency responses. There are also pre-positioned contracts in place for ordering additional complete kits or individual components as required during emergency responses.

In the spring of 2010, FEMA and our Mass Care partners, as well as state and local emergency managers, facilitated the development of a Multi-Agency Feeding Plan Template (MAFPT). This document focuses on aiding states (and other jurisdictions and non-governmental partners) to develop a feeding plan, including infant formula and food that can be integrated into a jurisdictional Standard Operating Procedure (SOP). Additionally, the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) developed an Infant & Toddler (I/T) Disaster Feeding Calculator, which can be used by ESF #6, ESF #7 and ESF #11 representatives to guide state partners in ordering the desired quantity and mix of infant formula and baby foods that are on the CUSI List. Further guidance to states and jurisdictions on obtaining infant and toddler items is available in the MAFPT.

FEMA LMD will continue to regularly inform stakeholders of the availability of these items. FEMA has also incorporated the CUSI List into numerous presentations and other internal and external planning documents indicating that these supplies are available and cost-reimbursable.

### **Research Consolidation of Mitigation Best Practices**

**Issue:** Disaster research has exposed numerous negative issues and best practices from around the world involving mitigation efforts. However, many community decision makers have either not had access to or are unable to spend time exploring the data. Emergency management personnel and political decision makers should have quick and easily understood access to this social science data in order to make sound decisions when attempting to mitigate hazards.

**Recommendation 6:** FEMA should work closely with organizations like the Natural Hazards Center and the National Science Foundation to assess and gather best practices through research that has been conducted throughout the social science community relating to disaster mitigation. FEMA should consolidate this information and distribute to state, local, tribal, and territorial

emergency management personnel through avenues, such as NEMA, IAEM, FEMA's regional offices, and the FEMA.gov and/or HSDL.org websites.

**FEMA Response 6:** FEMA agrees with the recommendation to work closely with organizations like the Natural Hazards Center and the National Science Foundation to assess and gather best practices through research that has been conducted throughout the social science community relating to disaster mitigation and we are in the process of exploring online solutions.

### **Consolidation and Alignment of Risk/Vulnerability Assessment Tools, Including HIRAs and the THIRA**

**Issue:** Confusion exists in the emergency management profession around the relationship between Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (HIRA) and the Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (THIRA) tool promulgated by FEMA. This problem is compounded by a lack of training and guidance on risk assessment procedures and tools.

**Recommendation 7:** FEMA should review the risk assessment process and provide additional guidance and training to state, local, tribal, and territorial emergency managers. Specifically, FEMA should:

- Develop additional guidance to state, local, tribal, and territorial emergency managers on tools and methodologies for conducting detailed, data-driven risk assessments;
- Develop and deliver training on how to conduct a risk assessment;
- Better identify how each jurisdictional level of THIRA feeds into the next, allowing for a more transparent process at all levels, explaining how the Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI) THIRA informs the State, Tribal, and Regional THIRA and reviewing the due dates for THIRAs, as the state, local, tribal, and territorial THIRAs are often due on the same date;
- Assess the THIRA process to determine if the assessment is accomplishing the goal of determining where the capability gaps exist within the Nation; and
- If the THIRA is effective, consider renaming the THIRA to better reflect its intent to assess capabilities versus hazard identification and risk assessments.

**FEMA Response 7:** FEMA partially agrees with the recommendation. Identifying and assessing risk is the foundation of the National Preparedness System. FEMA released both risk assessment guidance, *Comprehensive Preparedness Guide (201)*, and risk assessment tools through an accompanying *CPG 201 Toolkit*. FEMA designed the THIRA process outlined in CPG 201 in a way that did not mandate a complex, detailed, data-driven risk assessment methodology, recognizing that jurisdictions have volunteer or part-time personnel. FEMA also provides technical assistance to all grantees required to complete a THIRA, and provides THIRA related technical assistance to jurisdictions across the country on an as-requested basis. The Texas A&M Engineering Extension Service (TEEX), a National Domestic Preparedness Consortium member, offers a training course on THIRA - *Jurisdictional Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment*. In addition, EMI is developing an Independent Study course on THIRA. EMI will release the IS 2001 THIRA courses no later than 30 days after the publication of the refreshed National Preparedness Goal. FEMA will continue to work with partners on refining guidance, technical assistance, and training to meet the needs of the whole community.

Currently, FEMA's THIRA Technical Assistance Program includes information on how each level of THIRA informs the next. FEMA will consider including additional information to further clarify the relationships in the 2015 THIRA Technical Assistance.

FEMA, however, disagrees with the recommendation to review the due dates for the UASI State, Tribal, and Regional THIRAs as FEMA's review of the submissions received since 2012 do not indicate a lack of coordination at the varying levels of jurisdictions. However, the states have the discretion to set the due date for the UASI THIRAs within their jurisdiction earlier than the FEMA date.

To date, the THIRA meets its intended purpose, which is to (1) understand what we as a Nation need to prepare for; (2) identify what resources are required to meet those needs; and (3) identify actions to avoid, divert, lessen, or eliminate a threat or hazard. FEMA will work with partners to clarify the purpose of the THIRA process and the integral step of identifying threats and hazards to understand the capabilities needed to address them; however, FEMA disagrees with the recommendation to rename the process.

#### **Clarifying and Leveraging 404/406 Mitigation Opportunities**

**Issue:** The lack of integration between the 404 Hazard Mitigation Funding and 406 Hazard Mitigation Funding (attached to eligible Public Assistance (PA) projects) creates challenges with effectively mitigating against future damage. The current programs appear to operate in a silo, exacerbated by stove-piped program implementation, lack of training among federal and state JFO staff, and disparate implementation timeframes. 404 monies are allocated by the state, consistent with state and local hazard mitigation plans, but the final amount available is not determined until months after the disaster. These factors sometimes cause significant delay and may not fully serve the need of the impacted jurisdiction. The NAC explored avenues to leverage, and potentially integrate, mitigation programs.

**Recommendation 8:** FEMA should develop a specified training track at EMI for Public Assistance and Hazard Mitigation Officers that is available to all levels of government. This would allow Public Assistance and Hazard Mitigation Office staff to cultivate a greater understanding of how the programs can be utilized to protect against future loss.

**FEMA Response 8:** FEMA agrees with this recommendation. EMI's courses are available to a mixed audience of state, local, tribal, territorial and federal partners and allows for the interface across multiple levels of government. In light of an increased demand for EMI's existing courses, EMI is focusing on strengthening its current training offerings. This includes the suite of federal and state resident Public Assistance courses, and the Public Assistance Independent Study courses (IS-0632.a, IS-0634 and IS-0822). All of these courses will be subject to review and revision as part of the larger curriculum management process that EMI is transitioning to (see response to Recommendation #1), which will ensure stakeholder involvement. As part of that process, EMI will more closely examine the opportunity to target a training track for Public Assistance and Hazard Mitigation Officers.

The Federal Insurance Mitigation Administration (FIMA) has an existing robust training track of nine (9) different courses at EMI that immerses all levels of government in mitigation and the full life-cycle of Hazard Mitigation Assistance (HMA) grants. These courses can be found on

EMI's webpage at <http://www.training.fema.gov/emicourses/>. Furthermore, the Public Assistance and Hazard Mitigation Grant programs have engaged in dialogue for developing further specific training for Hazard Mitigation and Public Assistance Officers that will provide a greater understanding of how the two programs can best leverage all funding available for state, local, tribal, and territorial governments to mitigate the impacts of future damages. As part of the Administrator's strategic priorities, FEMA will review current authorities, policy, and procedures and make recommendations to meet the agency's goal to reduce risk nationally. As a part of this effort, training needs will be assessed.

**Recommendation 9:** FEMA should refine the 404 and 406 processes to capitalize on efficiencies of an informed Public Assistance and Hazard Mitigation Officers workforce, applying the federal support in a manner that is expeditious, and responsible. As part of this refinement, FEMA should consider taking the following actions:

- Supporting policy and regulatory changes that will support the integration of the 404 and 406 programs and should ensure that sufficient personnel are provided post-disaster to help state, local, tribal, and territorial jurisdictions best utilize 404 and 406 opportunities;
- Deploying Hazard Mitigation specialists in tandem with Public Assistance specialists; and
- Collapsing the Public Assistance (406) and Mitigation (404) skill sets into one position type under the FEMA Qualification System.

**FEMA Response 9:** FEMA partially agrees with this recommendation. FEMA is exploring ways to better align the programs as they currently exist to maximize risk reduction, but would support Stafford Act changes or initiating regulatory or policy changes that support the integration of the 404 and 406 programs as an eventuality. Currently, the Risk Reduction Division (RRD) and Public Assistance have begun coordinating to identify, cross-train, and deploy staff that can support mitigation efforts in both programs. Further, such staff will be able to advise state, local, tribal, and territorial governments about how to leverage across the two programs to maximize available mitigation funding and opportunities. FEMA's Hazard Mitigation Assistance Guidance (<https://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/103279>) document discusses ways in which the two programs can be used concurrently to achieve more effective mitigation and promote greater resilience during post-disaster recovery. This integration will provide a flexible structure which can focus on how best to restore, redevelop and revitalize the health, social, economic, natural and environmental fabric of a community to build a more resilient Nation in accordance with the National Disaster Recovery Framework (NDRF). FEMA JFO operations may employ both Hazard Mitigation 406 Specialists and Public Assistance 406 Specialists, depending on availability. Common practice dictates that communication between the 404 and 406 programs is facilitated on multiple fronts. FEMA will undertake a review of FEMA Qualification System (FQS) Position Task Books (PTB) to determine whether there are opportunities to combine or collapse positions into a single skill set.

**Recommendation 10:** FEMA should revise the Hazard Mitigation Plan process to include requirements for pre-identified 406 projects as part of the HIRA for state, local, tribal, and

territorial jurisdictions and for a disaster specific Administration Plan for mitigation, similar to Public Assistance, that identifies process, timelines, and priorities.

**FEMA Response 10:** FEMA partially agrees with the recommendation to revise procedures for Hazard Mitigation Plans and Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) State Administrative Plans to include requirements for Stafford Act Section 406 mitigation projects and has made the following changes to its guidance to reflect this agreement. First, a FEMA-approved state mitigation plan is a condition of receiving certain non-emergency Stafford Act assistance and FEMA mitigation grants, including Public Assistance Categories C-G (PA C-G) and the HMGP. However, the rule does not include a specific requirement for states to identify PA 406 projects in state mitigation plans. As stated in Title 44 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 201, the “purpose of mitigation planning is for State, local, and Indian tribal governments to identify the natural hazards that impact them, to identify actions and activities to reduce any losses from those hazards, and to establish a coordinated process to implement the plan, taking advantage of a wide range of resources.”

Second, FEMA recently updated its guidance on state mitigation plan requirements through the release of the “State Mitigation Plan Review Guide” (“Guide”) (<https://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/101659>). The Guide clarifies the requirements and sets a national standard for FEMA approval of state mitigation plans. For example, states are required to evaluate laws, regulations, policies and programs related to hazard mitigation and the Guide clarifies the discussion of funding capabilities for hazard mitigation projects, including how the state has used PA C-G as well as hazard mitigation assistance (44 CFR §201.4(c)(3)(ii and iv)). In addition, the Guide clarifies how state mitigation plans must address the vulnerability of infrastructure, critical facilities and state owned or operated facilities in both the risk assessment and the mitigation strategy (44 CFR §201.4(d), §201.4(c)(2)(ii-iii), and §201.4(c)(3)(i)). As of March 6, 2016, the Guide will be FEMA’s official policy and interpretation of the natural hazard mitigation planning requirements at 44 CFR Part 201 for state mitigation plans, inclusive of the District of Columbia and five U.S. territories. For more information on mitigation planning guidance, resources, and training, visit the FEMA Mitigation Planning website at: <https://www.fema.gov/multi-hazard-mitigation-planning>.

The State Administrative Plan is a procedural guide that details how the recipient will administer the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program. At a minimum, the Administrative Plan must identify the state agency that will act as the grant recipient, the State Hazard Mitigation Officer, and a plan for managing and implementing the HMGP such as staffing plans, the distribution of management costs, and be in compliance with 44 CFR §206.437.

**Recommendation 11:** FEMA should revise the Public Assistance Worksheet to place a stronger emphasis on hazard mitigation funding (both 404 and 406).

**FEMA Response 11:** FEMA agrees with this recommendation. Public Assistance is currently revising the process by which Project Worksheets and PA Grants are formulated, processed, obligated and monitored. As part of this re-engineering, Project Worksheets are being revised and will place a stronger emphasis on both 404 and 406 hazard mitigation funding options.

## **Coordination between Emergency Management, Emergency Medical Services and Public Health**

**Issue:** Duplication of services and confusion often result due to lack of coordination between public health, emergency medical services, and emergency management. There is a need for clarification of roles and responsibilities including at the local level, in particular. Valuable time and resources can be lost when critical personnel duplicate responsibilities and unnecessarily take on activities that can be handled by the appropriate personnel. Resolution and action is difficult given the differences among the 50 states in terms of reporting relationships and structures. There is no truly centralized repository of best practices and resources for the coordination between these disciplines. Resources are spread between several federal agencies, including FEMA, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), the U.S. Department of Homeland Security Office of Health Affairs (DHS OHA), the Center for Disease Control (CDC), the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD), the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority (BARDA), the Department of Transportation (DOT), including the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), and others.

**Recommendation 12:** FEMA should consider the development of a public health and acute medical care (emergency medical services and hospitals) liaison(s) at FEMA to have strong connections to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, U.S. Department of Homeland Security Office of Health Affairs, and U.S. Department of Transportation and other agencies listed above.

**FEMA Response 12:** FEMA agrees with the intent of this recommendation and believes that the Agency already achieves these objectives through existing connections supporting all-hazard preparedness and response with HHS, OHA, DOT, and others. For example, there are already well-established mechanisms to help connect the interagency community during response operations, especially at the national and regional levels. This includes the staffing of the National Response Coordination Center (NRCC) or appropriate Regional Response Coordination Centers (RRCC) with representatives from HHS, DOT, and other agencies. In addition, FEMA already embraces the concept of medical liaisons through the present assignment of two representatives from OHA at FEMA Headquarters on a permanent day-to-day basis. The two representatives from OHA are available to staff positions in the NRCC as part of the National Response Coordination Staff (NRCS) and also support FEMA with other public health preparedness and response activities.

Examples of interagency collaboration involving significant public health concerns were seen this past year during two Non-Stafford Act incidents (Unaccompanied Children and the Ebola domestic response). Many of the processes instituted during these incidents will be the basis of new response plans and such constructs will be summarized in the soon to be released Biological Incident Annex (BIA) to the Federal Interagency Operations Plan (FIOP).

Finally, during preparedness activities, one of the OHA representatives assigned to FEMA serves as a Senior Medical Advisor to the FEMA Administrator. Additionally, both OHA members support the majority of the public health related deliberative planning efforts being conducted by FEMA. Deliberative plans involving the interagency are reviewed by the Emergency Support Function Leadership Group (ESFLG) which has permanently seated, senior level representatives from the appropriate Emergency Support Functions (ESFs) including HHS and DOT.

Overall, the joint preparedness and response measures employed by the interagency to support emergency medical services and public health are well established and continue to improve. Additionally, FEMA continues to strengthen its relationship with organizations such as the Association of State and Territorial Health Officials (ASTHO) to share information with public health directors and promote collaboration.

**Recommendation 13:** FEMA should develop a best practices library in the subject area of public health integration with emergency management and emergency medical services and hospitals available through the federal disaster.data.gov website to offer jurisdictions information to address gaps related to working relationships through jurisdictions, i.e. federal, state, local, tribal, and territorial. This recommendation builds on the NAC's recommendation #3 submitted in the fall of 2014.

**FEMA Response 13:** FEMA concurs with the intent of this recommendation but believes the Homeland Security Digital Library (HSDL.org) is a more appropriate location for public health-related best practices than the federal disaster.data.gov website. FEMA has already taken steps to improve the healthcare-related resources available on HSDL.org, the Nation's premier collection of documents related to homeland security, which includes information on public health integration with emergency management and emergency medical services. Earlier this year, FEMA made the decision to consolidate all healthcare-related content formerly posted on the Homeland Security Lessons Learned Information System (LLIS.gov) to HSDL.org. One advantage of this change is that it allows the homeland security and emergency management communities to find relevant information in a centralized location.