



Redundancy Elimination and Enhanced Performance for Preparedness Grants Act (Public Law 111-271)



Homeland
Security

Federal Emergency Management Agency

Message from the Administrator of FEMA

August 20, 2012

The Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) is one tool among a comprehensive set of measures authorized by Congress and implemented by the Administration to help strengthen the Nation against risks associated with potential terrorist attacks. In FY 2011, the HSGP provided \$1.29 billion in funding to assist state, local, and tribal governments. Over ninety percent of the funds are dedicated to two programs—the State Homeland Security Program (SHSP) and the Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI). The SHSP and the UASI programs continue to play a vital role in increasing national preparedness to prevent, protect against, mitigate the effects of, respond to, and recover from incidents of terrorism. Precisely because of the importance of that mission, it is imperative that we are able to measure the programs' ongoing effectiveness. Performance measurement enables us to emphasize current goals and objectives, make improvements to these programs, and inform decisions about future investments. The Nation has made measurable strides toward improving preparedness for the full range of hazards at all levels of government and across all segments of society.



FEMA has made great progress in assessing preparedness, as evidenced by the publication of the first annual National Preparedness Report (NPR). The NPR draws upon existing data sources and involves the full range of whole community partners to derive findings that enable more effective use of grant funding.

Public Law 111-271, the *Redundancy Elimination and Enhanced Performance for Preparedness Grants Act (REPPG Act)*, provides for both the identification and elimination of redundant reporting requirements and the development of meaningful and quantifiable performance metrics to assess the effectiveness of grants administered by the Department of Homeland Security. This first biennial report is hereby submitted in compliance with the requirements established by the *REPPG Act*. It details FEMA's progress in eliminating redundant and unnecessary reporting requirements imposed on SHSP and UASI grant recipients, updates the status of our efforts to develop quantifiable performance measures and metrics to assess these programs' effectiveness, and provides an assessment of the performance of these grant programs.

Sincerely,

W. Craig Fugate
Administrator

Federal Emergency Management Agency

Executive Summary

This first biennial report is submitted in compliance with the requirements of Public Law 111-271, the *Redundancy Elimination and Enhanced Performance for Preparedness Grants Act* (*REEPPG Act*). As required by the *REEPPG Act*,¹ it provides—

1. the status of efforts to eliminate redundant and unnecessary reporting requirements imposed on recipients of the State Homeland Security Program (SHSP) and the Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI);
2. the status of efforts to develop quantifiable performance measures and metrics to assess the effectiveness of those grant programs; and
3. a performance assessment of the two grants programs.

Efforts to Eliminate Redundant and Unnecessary Reporting Requirements

FEMA continues to make progress in eliminating the redundant and unnecessary reporting requirements imposed on grant recipients. In the May 2011 *Redundancy Elimination and Enhanced Performance for Preparedness Grants Act Initial Report to Congress* (the *Initial Report to Congress*), FEMA provided a five-part plan for doing so, and established a schedule for implementation.² Since then, FEMA has successfully implemented some portions of the plan by waiving the first Biennial Strategy Implementation Report (BSIR) for the FY 2011 grants and reducing the narrative required in the Investment Justification (IJ). Other, more ambitious aspects of the plan—such as further streamlining the application process—can only be accomplished through significant modification in information technology (IT) systems and involve amendments to the existing Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) approvals. These challenges require FEMA to reevaluate their implementation and to modify the schedule accordingly. In addition, FEMA is working with the Department of Health and Human Services, including both the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response, and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to develop common performance measures based on the National Preparedness Goal's Core Capabilities as well as grant administration measures in the Homeland Security Grant Program, Hospital Preparedness Program and Public Health Emergency Preparedness cooperative agreements to reduce the number of reporting requirements on grantees.

FEMA continually reassesses the requirements and reporting processes associated with its grant programs. The reassessment required by the *REEPPG Act* focuses on new information requirements that have been established since the *Initial Report to Congress* was submitted. Since then, FEMA has established five new performance measures that require reporting; they focus on ensuring whole community participation, building prevention and protection capabilities, and the maturing and enhancing state and urban area fusion centers.³ FEMA has

¹ Public Law 111-271, *Redundancy Elimination and Enhanced Performance for Preparedness Grants Act*, §2.

² DHS, FEMA, *Redundancy Elimination and Enhanced Performance for Preparedness Grants Act Fiscal Year 2011 Report to Congress Initial Report to Congress*, 2011, p.15.

³ DHS, *Fiscal Year 2011 Homeland Security Grant Program Guidance and Application Kit Section I—Application and Review Information*, 2011, p.4-11.

coordinated both internally and with external agencies to ensure that these new requirements comply with the *REEPPG Act* objective of eliminating unnecessary burden on grant recipients.

Efforts to Develop Performance Measures and Metrics

Recent efforts led to the development of several quantitative performance measures and metrics that FEMA is using to assess the effectiveness of the grant programs. These efforts include the study mandated by the *REEPPG Act* in which the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) developed a set of 16 performance measures for the SHSP and UASI programs.⁴ Efforts also include development of 21 effectiveness measures that examine program outcomes as well as eight administrative measures that indicate how well the programs are managed. All of these performance measures and metrics are described and evaluated in this report.

Performance Assessment of the Grant Programs

FEMA used the performance measures and metrics as broad indicators to assess the extent to which the SHSP and UASI programs meet their objectives. Several of the measures indicate a high degree of grant program performance, while others reveal areas for improvement. We have selected a subset of these broad measures for refinement with initial performance targets. Data for many of these performance measures will first be reported during the coming year, enabling FEMA to make more detailed performance evaluations in the future. As required by the *REEPPG Act*, FEMA developed recommendations for modifications to the SHSP and UASI programs to improve their effectiveness in response to changing and emerging conditions. Finally, FEMA assessed the experience of grant recipients based on feedback directly solicited from them through a variety of venues, including the annual After-Action Conference (AAC). A summary of those findings is presented, as required by the *REEPPG Act*. In general, open communications and partnership between the grant recipients and FEMA are the primary concerns. Grantees seek more transparency prior to the grant application period, more engagement during the development of the grant guidance, and more specific information on the grant requirements and priorities. FEMA will continue to address grantee concerns and burden reduction as the application process is further reviewed and reformed. For example, in FY 2013 FEMA proposed consolidating several existing grants into the new National Preparedness Grant Program in order to enable grantees to develop and sustain capabilities without requiring grantees to meet the mandates from multiple individual, often disconnected, grant programs.⁵

⁴ National Academy of Public Administration, *Improving the National Preparedness System: Developing More Meaningful Grant Performance Measures*, 2011.

⁵ Department of Homeland Security, *FY 2013 National Preparedness Grant Program Vision Document*, 2012.



Redundancy Elimination and Enhanced Performance for Preparedness Grants Act (Public Law 111-271): 2012 Biennial Report to Congress

Table of Contents

I.	Background.....	1
II.	Elimination of Reporting Requirements.....	3
III.	Development of Performance Measures.....	6
IV.	Performance Assessment.....	7
V.	Conclusion.....	20

I. Background

Public Law 111-271

Public Law 111-271, the *REEPPG Act*, amends Title XX of the Homeland Security Act of 2002. It provides for improvements to homeland security preparedness grants and has two distinct but complementary objectives. The first is to understand, document, and reduce the burden and redundancy of grant reporting requirements on behalf of grant recipients. The second is to measure the effectiveness of those grants through the development of performance measures. The grants covered by the *REEPPG Act* include the SHSP and UASI programs.

The *REEPPG Act* requires the FEMA Administrator to take three actions to achieve its objectives:⁶

- (1) The Administrator is to develop an initial report containing an assessment of redundant and unnecessary reporting requirements, a plan for eliminating the redundant and unnecessary reporting requirements that are identified, and a plan for developing a set of quantifiable performance measures and metrics to assess the effectiveness of the covered grant programs.
- (2) The Administrator is to enter into a contract with NAPA under which NAPA assists FEMA in studying, developing, and implementing quantifiable performance measures and metrics for assessing grants effectiveness. The Administrator is to report the findings and recommendations of this study to Congress.
- (3) The Administrator is to report biennially on the status of efforts to eliminate redundant and unnecessary reporting requirements imposed on grant recipients, the status of efforts to develop quantifiable performance measures and metrics to assess the effectiveness of the programs, and the performance of the covered grant programs.

The first two of these requirements have been completed. This report represents the first biennial report, and is submitted in fulfillment of the third requirement.

Biennial Report

The *REEPPG Act* mandates that the FEMA Administrator submit biennial progress reports to the appropriate committees of Congress and enumerates the required content of the reports:⁷

- (1) the status of efforts to eliminate redundant and unnecessary reporting requirements imposed on grant recipients, including—
 - (A) progress made in implementing the plan required under subsection (b)(2);
 - (B) a reassessment of the reporting requirements to identify and eliminate redundant and unnecessary requirements;

⁶ Public Law 111-271, *Redundancy Elimination and Enhanced Performance for Preparedness Grants Act*, §2.

⁷ Public Law 111-271, *Redundancy Elimination and Enhanced Performance for Preparedness Grants Act*, §2.

(2) the status of efforts to develop quantifiable performance measures and metrics to assess the effectiveness of the programs under which the covered grants are awarded, including—

(A) progress made in implementing the plan required under subsection (b)(3);

(B) progress made in developing and implementing additional performance metrics and measures for grants, including as part of the comprehensive assessment system required under section 649 of the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006 (6 U.S.C. 749); and

(3) a performance assessment of each program under which the covered grants are awarded, including—

(A) a description of the objectives and goals of the program;

(B) an assessment of the extent to which the objectives and goals described in subparagraph (a) have been met, based on the quantifiable performance measures and metrics required under this section, section 2022(a)(4), and section 649 of the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006 (6 U.S.C. 749);

(C) recommendations for any program modifications to improve the effectiveness of the program, to address changed or emerging conditions; and

(D) an assessment of the experience of recipients of covered grants, including the availability of clear and accurate information, the timeliness of reviews and awards, and the provision of technical assistance, and recommendations for improving that experience.

This is the first such biennial report, hereby submitted in compliance with these requirements.

II. Elimination of Reporting Requirements

This section addresses the first of the three biennial report requirements, reporting on the status of efforts to eliminate redundant and unnecessary reporting requirements. It includes progress made on the plan to reduce burden put forth in the *Initial Report to Congress* as well as a reassessment of existing reporting requirements.

Progress on the Plan to Reduce Burden

The *Initial Report to Congress* presented a plan to eliminate redundant and unnecessary grant reporting requirements. While reducing burden to grant recipients, the plan's recommendations simultaneously enhanced the quality of data collected to improve both programmatic monitoring and national preparedness assessment.

The plan outlined five objectives for implementation, each of which depended on a series of prerequisites: a decision to adopt the objective, unchanged staffing, funding for any information technology (IT) modification, and the ability to ensure compliance with Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) requirements. Since the release of the *Initial Report to Congress*, FEMA has continued to assess the viability of each of these objectives, given existing resources. To that end, the following provides an overview of the status of the five objectives and the path forward.

Eliminate the Semi-Annual Progress Report (SAPR)

FEMA eliminated the SAPR in FY 2012, replacing it with Standard Form–Periodic Progress Report (SF-PPR). While the SAPR collected redundant information in the past, SF-PPR is being used to collect new, critical data such as—

- how expenditures support maintenance and sustainment of core capabilities;⁸
- bi-annual updates on Comprehensive Preparedness Guide (CPG) 101 v.2 compliance; and
- the number of people trained to support defined resource typed teams. For the SHSP and UASI grants, grantees will report—
 - the total number of a defined type of resource and capabilities built utilizing grant resources;
 - what equipment was purchased and what typed capability it supports;
 - the achievement of capabilities and compliance with measurement requirements within the Maturation and Enhancement of State and Major Urban Area Fusion Centers priority through the annual Fusion Center Assessment Program managed by the DHS Office of Intelligence and Analysis (I&A) and reported to FEMA;
 - the number of personnel involved in the Nationwide Suspicious Activity Reporting (SAR) Initiative (NSI) as well as the number of personnel who have completed the required training; and
 - whether a planning body has been established and demonstrates that the membership and activities reflect the whole community.

⁸ The core capabilities are defined in the National Preparedness Goal: DHS, FEMA, *National Preparedness Goal*, 2011.

FEMA will continue to use SF-PPR to collect these performance measures until it can modify the Non-Disaster (ND) Grants system to collect them, anticipated to be for the FY 2014 grant cycle.

Replace the Initial Strategy Implementation Plan (ISIP) with a Pass-through Certification

Originally intended for FY 2011, FEMA is reexamining this recommendation. Delays in FY 2011 appropriations and the resulting compressed grant cycle precluded sound implementation, which requires IT systems development, advance communications with grantees, and development of a longer-term strategy to comply with the certification requirements of the *Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007* (Public Law 110–53, *9/11 Act*).

Waive the First Biennial Strategy Implementation Report (BSIR) Update

FEMA adopted this recommendation and waived the first BSIR update for SHSP and UASI awards. The first required update for FY 2011 grants will be due no later than July 30, 2012, and updates will occur on the normal biannual schedule thereafter.

Reduce the Narrative in the Investment Justification (IJ)

FEMA reduced the narrative in the FY 2011 and FY 2012 IJs. FEMA limited the length states are allowed to summarize the goals and objectives from homeland security strategies and eliminated the optional cost share narrative. Additional reductions are being considered.

Eliminate the IJ

FEMA is working to implement this recommendation through the enhancement of the ND Grants system. This enhancement is currently underway in FY 2012, with completion anticipated in time for the FY 2013 grant cycle. This enhancement will eliminate narrative from investment justifications and directly tie them to specific projects.

Reassessment of the Reporting Requirements

FEMA continues to assess the impact of the recommendations cited in the *Initial Report to Congress* and is engaged in an ongoing, measured effort to identify and eliminate redundant requirements and improve the way the organization collects and uses information. The agency has taken steps to make current requirements better reflect the intent of the programs and to meet the need to assess national preparedness without increasing the reporting burden on grantees. In FY 2011, in compliance with the *REPPG Act* requirement to develop quantifiable measures of grants effectiveness, FEMA added five new grant effectiveness measures that will require reporting within the UASI and SHSP programs:⁹

- submission of an approved State Hazard Mitigation Plan that includes a Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (THIRA);

⁹ DHS, *Fiscal Year 2011 Homeland Security Grant Program Guidance and Application Kit Section I—Application and Review Information*, 2011, p.4-11.

- submission of information on the compliance of the grant recipient's Emergency Operations Plan with FEMA's Comprehensive Preparedness Guide 101 version 2;
- submission of information on the typed capabilities and resources supported by equipment and training procured under the grant;
- certification of the percentage of personnel involved with the NSI who have completed the required training; and
- submission of information demonstrating fusion centers' achievement in the Critical Operational Capabilities¹⁰.

FEMA is developing the reporting method and collection strategy for each new requirement in keeping with the intent of the *REPPG Act*, and planning efforts to incorporate these requirements into existing reporting tools are currently underway.

In addition FEMA is working to ensure that the State Preparedness Report (SPR) self-assessment is appropriately integrated with the grant guidance development process, application cycle, and reporting. Not only should this reduce the burden on grantees, but it should serve as a sustainable way for them to closely align assessed capability gaps with subsequent capability improvement and sustainment prioritization through these grant programs.

¹⁰ 2010 Baseline Capabilities Assessment of Fusion Centers and Critical Operational Capabilities Gap Mitigation Strategy; http://www.dhs.gov/files/programs/gc_1296491960442.shtm; 7/26/2012.

III. Development of Performance Measures

This section addresses the second of the three biennial report requirements, reporting on the status of efforts to develop performance measures that FEMA will use to assess the effectiveness of the grant programs.

In October, 2011, NAPA delivered the results of its study, containing 16 performance measures for the SHSP and UASI grant programs.¹¹ The study report also included approximately 30 additional recommendations, many of which are related to the implementation of the performance measures. Section IV of this report provides a detailed list of the measures developed as a result of the NAPA engagement, along with values where performance can currently be measured.

In addition to the measures from the NAPA study, FEMA independently developed a set of effectiveness measures and a set of administrative measures.

Effectiveness Measures

In accordance with the *Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006*¹² and the *9/11 Act*,¹³ FEMA developed and has begun to implement additional performance measures to assess the effectiveness of grant programs. These 21 outcome-based measures report broadly on national preparedness.

Administrative Measures

In February 2011, GPD created a working group to develop administrative performance measures that demonstrate how effectively GPD manages the preparedness grants. The GPD working group met weekly to design, analyze, and validate proposed measures and, in July 2011, completed the development of eight such performance measures.

Section IV contains a detailed list of the measures, along with values performance can currently be measured.

¹¹ National Academy of Public Administration, *Improving the National Preparedness System: Developing More Meaningful Grant Performance Measures*, 2011.

¹² Public Law 109-295, *Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006*, §649, Oct 4, 2006.

¹³ Public Law 110-53, *Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007*, §103(a)(3), Aug 3, 2007.

IV. Performance Assessment

This section addresses the third of the three biennial report requirements, an assessment of the grant programs based on the performance measures that have been developed. This assessment also includes a discussion of program goals, recommendations for program improvements, and an assessment of the experience of grantees.

Grant Program Goals and Objectives

State Homeland Security Grant Program

The SHSP supports the implementation of State Homeland Security Strategies to address the identified planning, organization, equipment, training, and exercises needs in order to prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from acts of terrorism and other catastrophic events.¹⁴

Urban Areas Security Initiative

UASI funds address the unique planning, organization, equipment, training, and exercise needs of high-threat, high-density urban areas, and assists them in building an enhanced and sustainable capacity to prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from acts of terrorism.¹⁵

Extent to Which Goals and Objectives Have Been Met

Table 1 through Table 5 document in detail the performance measures that NAPA developed, along with their measured values. Table 6 presents FEMA's effectiveness measures and their measured values, and Table 7 presents FEMA's administrative measures and their values. In addition, this section provides a collective evaluation to assess the effectiveness of the SHSP and UASI grant programs.

Both programs exist to build and sustain preparedness capabilities consistent with homeland security strategies, and they have been relatively successful in doing so. The most recent self-assessments of state/territory capabilities show that on average, grant recipients rate their capability levels between 42 percent and 78 percent for the different core capabilities. States and territories gave the highest ratings for the core capabilities they assessed as most important; these include those capabilities that apply across all preparedness mission areas¹⁶ and several of the response core capabilities. Analysis of grant applications also shows that jurisdictions feel their capabilities are fairly well-developed, as grant recipients propose approximately 64 percent of

¹⁴ FEMA, *FY 2011 Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) State Homeland Security Program (SHSP)*, <http://www.fema.gov/government/grant/hsgp/#1>

¹⁵ FEMA, *FY 2011 Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI)*, <http://www.fema.gov/government/grant/hsgp/#2>

¹⁶ Presidential Policy Directive 8: National Preparedness defines the five preparedness mission areas: prevention, protection, mitigation, response, and recovery. The White House, *Presidential Policy Directive 8: National Preparedness*, 2011.

funding for sustaining existing capabilities, with only 36 percent proposed for building additional capacity.

The programs are designed to support the implementation of risk-based homeland security strategies and have been highly successful in this regard. Without exception, all grantees have developed and submitted risk assessments and strategies. The programs have also been fairly successful in encouraging jurisdictions to keep these tools current, as 25 of the 31 urban areas (81 percent) in the 2011 UASI program have updated their strategies within the last two years.

Measures supporting fusion centers to build prevention and protection capability indicate at least 75 percent of fusion centers report having plans, policies, or SOPs to address each of the Critical Operational Capabilities to receive, analyze, disseminate, and gather critical threat-related information. In addition, 100 percent of fusion centers report having a plan, policy, or SOP in place to ensure privacy, civil rights, and civil liberties, as is required to receive grant funding.

The grant programs have had mixed success in encouraging the timely implementation of corrective actions that emerge from exercises and real-world incidents. Only 28 percent of the state and local corrective actions tracked using FEMA's Corrective Action Program (CAP) system between FY 2007 and FY 2010 have been completed on time. However, it should be noted that FEMA does not require grantees to track corrective actions in the CAP system.

The small amount of grant funds returned to the Treasury indicates, grantees are performing the financial management of grant funding fairly well. For the most recent year for which awards have expired, a total of 0.53 percent of Homeland Security Grant Program funding has been de-obligated. FEMA has recently launched several initiatives to ensure that grantees continuously and consistently draw down funds; these include an expedited process to allow grantees to apply previously awarded funds to more urgent priorities, waiving some of the allocation requirements, and expanding allowable maintenance and sustainment costs.¹⁷

¹⁷ DHS, FEMA, Grant Programs Directorate, *Guidance to State Administrative Agencies to Expedite the Expenditure of Certain DHS/FEMA Grant Funding*, 2012.

Table 1. NAPA Performance Measures: Foundational Activities

Measure	Results
Number of current, FEMA-approved state and UASI risk assessments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 100% (56/56) of states have a current risk assessment • Submitting a state risk assessment is a requirement for receiving SHSP/UASI funding. • State risk assessments are coordinated with any UASIs within the state.
Number of state and UASI homeland security strategies in compliance with update requirements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 100% (56/56) of states have a current homeland security strategy ➤ 100% (31/31) UASIs have a current homeland security strategy • Submitting a homeland security strategy is a requirement for receiving SHSP/UASI funding. • There is currently no formal update requirement, although FY 2011 grant guidance strongly encourages biennial update.

Table 2. NAPA Performance Measures: Strengthening Preparedness: Strategies, Investments, and Capabilities

Measure	Results
Percentage and number of measurable homeland security strategy objectives achieved by SHSP or UASI grantees.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Data that would allow the evaluation of these new performance measures are currently unavailable.
The percentage and number of proposed grant outcomes achieved by SHSP or UASI grantees.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FEMA Grant Programs Directorate (GPD) continues to consider how best to implement these performance measures while keeping the reporting burden on grant recipients low.
Level and change in each core capability demonstrated by the states and UASIs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ See table below • These data reflect the 2011 State Preparedness Report (SPR) self-assessment of core capabilities. • These are baseline results; annual changes in capability levels will be available following the 2012 SPR.

Average state/territory self-assessed capability levels for the 31 core capabilities

Core Capability	Average Assessment¹⁸
Public Health and Medical Services	78%
Operational Coordination	73%
On-scene Security and Protection	72%
Operational Communications	72%
Public Information and Warning	71%
Environmental Response/Health and Safety	70%
Planning	69%
Threats and Hazard Identification	69%
Interdiction and Disruption	67%
Mass Search and Rescue Operations	65%
Intelligence and Information Sharing	64%
Screening, Search, and Detection	64%
Critical Transportation	64%
Situational Assessment	64%
Long-term Vulnerability Reduction	63%
Mass Care Services	63%
Risk Management for Protection Programs and Activities	62%
Risk and Disaster Resilience Assessment	62%
Infrastructure Systems	62%
Public and Private Services and Resources	62%
Forensics and Attribution	61%
Fatality Management Services	59%
Community Resilience	58%
Physical Protective Measures	56%
Health and Social Services	54%
Supply Chain Integrity and Security	52%
Access Control and Identity Verification	50%
Economic Recovery	50%
Natural and Cultural Resources	47%
Housing	44%
Cybersecurity	42%

Table 3. NAPA Performance Measures: Preventing Terrorist Incidents

Measure	Results
Percentage of achievement of each Critical Operational Capability by the fusion centers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ See table below. • These data reflect the results of the DHS-led 2011 Fusion Center Assessment.

¹⁸ These percentages represent a national summary of a set of capability assessments conducted by the states and territories. While reported here as isolated performance measures, the National Preparedness Report (DHS, FEMA, 2012 National Preparedness Report, 2012) examines the implications and context of these results in greater detail.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percent of fusion centers in the National Network that have developed plans, policies, or standard operating procedures (SOPs) in each of the Critical Operational Capabilities.
Percentage of fusion centers that have developed plans, policies, or standard operating procedures (SOPs) in each of the Critical Operational Capabilities	
Percent	Critical Operational Capability
79%	Receive
76%	Analyze
79%	Disseminate
81%	Gather
100%	Privacy, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties (P/CRCL) Protections

Table 4. NAPA Performance Measures: Demonstrating Preparedness Outcomes

Measure	Results
Scoring of state and UASI preparedness capabilities based on performance during incidents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Data that would allow the evaluation of these new performance measures are currently unavailable. • FEMA continues to consider how best to implement these performance measures while keeping the reporting burden on grant recipients low.
Scoring of state and UASI preparedness capabilities based on performance during exercises.	
Number of critical task corrective actions identified and completed following grant-funded exercises.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ See table below • These data reflect corrective actions for both exercises and incidents as found in the Corrective Action Program (CAP) system. • Because the CAP system is voluntary, its use is not consistent. FEMA continues to evaluate how to make the CAP system more effective for its users and to measure performance. • Because the deadlines for many corrective actions submitted in recent years have not yet passed, it is likely that the percentages of actions completed on time will continue to increase. The rightmost column of the table shows the sum of actions that have already been completed on time and actions that are currently open and have not yet missed their deadlines.
Number of critical task corrective actions identified and completed following incidents.	

Corrective actions for exercises and incidents tracked in the Corrective Action Program (CAP) system

FY	Total Corrected Actions	Percent of Actions Completed	Percent of Actions Already Completed on Time	Percent of Actions on Schedule
2007	632	56%	24%	24%
2008	1748	62%	27%	28%
2009	2734	60%	26%	33%
2010	2337	47%	32%	52%
2011	2175	19%	16%	77%

Number of recurring, critical task failures identified following incidents in the past three years.

- **Data that would allow the evaluation of these new performance measures are currently unavailable.**
- FEMA continues to consider how best to implement these performance measures while keeping the reporting burden on grant recipients low.

Table 5. NAPA Performance Measures: Context Measures

Measure	Results			
Number of program improvements identified during programmatic monitoring, agreed upon by FEMA and grantee, corrected within the specified timeframe.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Data that would allow the evaluation of these new performance measures are currently unavailable. ➤ The current monitoring process does not track improvements identified as part of the programmatic monitoring process. FEMA Grant Programs Directorate (GPD) is working to identify a process to do this. 			
Number of financial deficiencies identified during financial monitoring corrected within the specified timeframe.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 28% (5/18) of the findings and recommendations identified through FY 2011 financial monitoring were resolved by the end of the year. 			
Amount and percentage of SHSP and UASI grant funds reverted.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ See table below • These data include all HSGP grants. 			
Amount of HSGP grant funding reverted				
FY	Appropriation	Allocated	De obligated	Percent
2006	\$1,755,000,000	\$1,682,925,433	\$8,917,087	0.53%

Amount and percentage of SHSP and UASI funding spent by states and UASIs to build each core capability.

Amount and percentage of SHSP and UASI funding spent by states and UASIs to sustain each core capability.

➤ **See table below.**

- These data reflect capability investments proposed in FY 2011 Investment Justifications for all Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) grants.

Amount of grant funding spent by states and urban areas to build and sustain each core capability

Build		Target Capability	Sustain	
Amount	Percent		Amount	Percent
\$88,490	12	Animal Disease and Emergency Support	\$627,456	88
\$9,298,238	28	CBRNE Detection	\$24,250,611	72
\$1,458,360	39	Citizen Evacuation and Shelter -in-Place	\$2,287,500	61
\$77,547,511	68	Communications	\$37,166,998	32
\$2,929,663	11	Community Preparedness and Participation	\$24,726,419	89
\$2,720,372	9	Counter -Terror Investigation and Law Enforcement	\$27,705,269	91
\$13,003,656	29	Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP)	\$31,414,994	71
\$1,781,533	100	Critical Resource Logistics and Distribution	\$0	0
\$25,000	100	Economic and Community Recovery	\$0	0
\$13,235,270	81	Emergency Operations Center Management	\$3,088,601	19
\$880,300	29	Emergency Public Information and Warning	\$2,122,942	71
\$3,773,127	74	Emergency Public Safety & Security	\$1,320,350	26
\$1,086,864	21	Emergency Triage and Pre -Hospital Treatment	\$4,067,696	79
\$0	0	Epidemiological Surveillance and Investigation	\$16,702,607	100
\$2,958,825	74	Explosive Device Response Operations	\$1,026,793	26
\$45,000	11	Fatality Management	\$372,537	89
\$226,445	16	Fire Incident Response Support	\$1,198,373	84
\$563,956	12	Food and Agriculture Safety and Defense	\$4,031,664	88
\$5,669,870	41	Info Gathering & Recognition of Indicators & Warnings	\$7,997,643	59
\$4,325,132	27	Intelligence Analysis and Production	\$11,542,679	73
\$11,962,106	44	Intelligence and Info Sharing and Dissemination	\$15,007,694	56
\$1,114,293	39	Mass Care (Sheltering, Feeding and Related Services)	\$1,716,649	61
\$1,690,158	41	Mass Prophylaxis	\$2,395,562	59
\$178,406	9	Medical Supplies Management and Distribution	\$1,877,953	91
\$1,647,991	21	Medical Surge	\$6,057,857	79
\$4,504,539	28	On-Site Incident Management	\$11,865,764	72
\$24,802,784	30	Planning	\$56,911,044	70
\$938,403	18	Responder Safety and Health	\$4,205,252	82
\$966,380	93	Risk Management	\$75,000	7
\$3,040,379	49	Search and Rescue (Land Based)	\$3,221,252	51
\$92,000	69	Volunteer Management and Donations	\$41,088	31
\$3,453,736	8	WMD and HazMat Response and Decontamination	\$40,648,997	92
\$196M	36	Total	\$346M	64

Table 6. FEMA Effectiveness Performance Measures

Measure	Results
Percent of grant funding proposed for developing new capabilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 36% of grant funding is proposed for building new capabilities • These data reflect capability investments proposed in FY 2011 Investment Justifications for all Homeland Security Grant Program grants.
Percent of grant funding proposed for sustaining existing capabilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 64% of grant funding is proposed for sustaining existing capabilities • These data reflect capability investments proposed in FY 2011 Investment Justifications for all Homeland Security Grant Program grants.
Percent of states with current, FEMA-approved Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessments that have been coordinated with UASI(s) located in the State	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 100% (56/56) of states have FEMA approved risk assessments
Number and percent of high-risk urban areas that have updated their urban area homeland security strategy, within a 2 year timeframe, based on current FEMA guidance, with measurable, prioritized objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 81% (25/31) urban areas have updated their homeland security strategies within the last two years
Percent of states with an approved State Hazard Mitigation Plan that includes a THIRA that has been coordinated with UASI(s) located in the State	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 100% (56/56) of states have FEMA approved risk assessments that are coordinated with the UASI(s) in the state.
Percent of grantees [†] with a completed CPG 101 v.2 Compliance Matrix	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Data that would allow the evaluation of these new performance measures are currently unavailable. • In the FY 12 HSGP grant guidance, FEMA lists these performance measures as methods of measuring the achievement of the grant programs' objectives.¹⁹ On July 18, 2012, FEMA released Information Bulletin (IB) #388. This IB issued guidance regarding the reporting of these measures, described the scope of these measures, and established a timeline for submission.. Results will be available in future REEPPG Act reports.
Percent of grant funded equipment expenditures that support a resource-typed capability.	
Percent of grant-funded training expenditures that supports a resource-typed capability	
Percent of equipment and training that supports a NIMS-types resource where such typing exists	
Percent of SHSP/UASI-funded personnel who are engaged in the Nationwide Suspicious Activity Reporting Initiative (NSI) and have completed the training	
Percentage of fusion centers with documented plans, policies, or SOPs describing fusion center business processes for receiving, handling, and storing classified and unclassified information in accordance with the metrics established by the DHS Office of Intelligence and Analysis (I&A)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 79%

¹⁹ DHS, FEMA, *FY 2012 Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) Funding Opportunity Announcement (FOA)*, 2012, http://www.fema.gov/pdf/government/grant/2012/fy12_hsgp_foa.pdf.

Percentage of fusion centers with documented plans, policies, or SOPs describing fusion center business processes for assessing local implications of threat-related information in accordance with the metrics established by the DHS I&A	➤ 76%
Percentage of fusion centers with documented plans, policies, or SOPs describing fusion center business processes for disseminating information to SLTT and private sector partners in accordance with the metrics established by the DHS I&A	➤ 79%
Percentage of fusion centers with documented plans, policies, or SOPs describing fusion center business processes for gathering locally generated information and participating in the NSI in accordance with the metrics established by the DHS I&A	➤ 81%
Percentage of fusion centers with an approved P/CRCL policy	➤ 100%
Percentage of fusion centers that have conducted a audit of their P/CRCL policy in accordance with the <i>Privacy Civil Rights and Civil Liberties Compliance Verification for the Intelligence Enterprise</i>	➤ 47%
Percentage of fusion center analytic personnel funded out of SHSP and UASI that have received/participated in training deemed to be compliant with the <i>Common Competencies for State, Local, and Tribal Intelligence Analysts</i>	➤ 88%
Percentage of fusion center personnel that require SECRET clearances have them (or have submitted requests for them)	➤ 93%
Percentage of fusion center analysts with access to sensitive but unclassified (SBU) systems	➤ 100%
Percentage of fusion center analysts trained on 28 CFR Part §23	➤ 100%
Percentage of fusion center analyst with access to tools identified in the <i>Analyst Toolbox</i>	➤ 100%

† Applies to any SHSP or UASI grantees that maintain an Emergency Operations Plan (EOP).

Table 7. FEMA Administrative Performance Measures

Measure	Results
Percent of preparedness grant awards processed within 150 days	<p data-bbox="760 527 1406 615">➤ Beginning in FY 2012, FEMA will track new performance measures such as these to establish a baseline and to aid in setting targets for future years.</p> <p data-bbox="760 653 1414 741">• FEMA’s administrative performance measures will track the agency’s own effectiveness in managing and administering the preparedness grants.</p>
Percent of preparedness grant awards monitored programmatically	
Percent of preparedness grant awards monitored financially	
Percent of preparedness grant funds monitored programmatically	
Percent of preparedness grant funds monitored financially	
Percent of corrective actions completed within the fiscal year issued	
Percent of preparedness grant funds released to grantees within 270 days	
Percent of preparedness grant close-outs within 120 days	

Recommendations for Program Modifications

The *REEPPG Act* acknowledges that these grant programs must be managed with a degree of agility, with periodic program modifications that reflect changes in strategy and emerging conditions. This section discusses three areas of possible programmatic reform.

Alignment with Presidential Policy Directive-8

On March 30, 2011, President Obama signed *Presidential Policy Directive 8: National Preparedness* (PPD-8). PPD-8 directed the development of a National Preparedness Goal to identify the core capabilities necessary to prepare for the threats that pose the greatest risk to the security of the Nation.²⁰ The directive also called for a national preparedness system to guide activities that will enable the Nation to achieve the Goal, which has been defined as a secure and resilient Nation with the capabilities required across the whole community to prevent, protect against, mitigate, respond to, and recover from the threats and hazards that pose the greatest risk.²¹ In the FY 2013 Budget, FEMA proposed consolidation of several existing grants into the new National Preparedness Grant Program in order to enable grantees to develop and sustain capabilities without requiring grantees to meet the mandates from multiple individual, often disconnected, grant programs.²² Further, FEMA will bring the grant programs into closer alignment with the new *National Preparedness Goal*, including aligning investment projects to

²¹ DHS, *National Preparedness Goal*, 2011.

²² Department of Homeland Security, *FY 2013 National Preparedness Grant Program Vision Document*, 2012.

the Goal's core capabilities and emphasizing the use of funds to address gaps identified in the THIRA and other assessments.²³

Interagency Coordination

In addition to its work implementing PPD-8, FEMA has been working with other Federal agencies that provide preparedness grant funding to better coordinate the administration of those grants, improve consistency among grant program guidance documents, and align the grant programs to better support national strategies. To that end, in July 2011, FEMA signed a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and Health Resources and Services Administration as well as the National Highway Transportation Safety Administration. A primary objective of the MOU is to align grant cycles and timelines to—

- improve pre-award administration;
- coordinate programmatic fiscal years (e.g., periods of performance);
- potentially implement a joint application; and
- conduct joint application reviews.

FEMA, HHS and the Department of Transportation continue to meet and identify more specific areas for collaboration to reduce the application and reporting burden on common grantees.

FEMA Initiatives

Beyond the external factors, FEMA is actively examining, planning and implementing efforts to enhance how the agency measures the effectiveness of its programs. A robust effort began in FY 2011 and continues into FY 2012 to more closely align the financial and programmatic monitoring practices in order to—

- (1) capture complementary data that better articulates grant management issues and informs improved corrective action plans for grants management deficiencies;
- (2) incorporate risk factors to assist in guiding FEMA's determination of grantees to be monitored each fiscal year;
- (3) reduce the burden on grantees for requests for similar or related information required for monitoring activities; and
- (4) better inform performance measures.

Assessment of Grantee Experience

Throughout the life cycle of the SHSP and UASI grant programs, FEMA employs strategies designed to solicit feedback from grantees on a variety of topics. Some of these include the clarity and accuracy of disseminated information, the application review process and status of awards, and technical assistance to support grant implementation at the state and local levels of government. Structured opportunities for providing feedback include but are not limited to—

- the annual stakeholder After-Action Conference;

²³ Department of Homeland Security, *FY 2013 National Preparedness Grant Program Vision Document*, 2012.

- hot-wash sessions on grant program guidance development;
- technical assistance feedback surveys; and
- annual programmatic and financial monitoring.

In addition to structured feedback opportunities, FEMA program managers and staff are in daily communication with grantees. Furthermore, FEMA leaders seek stakeholder input at state and local conferences and meetings. In this setting, grantees are typically forthcoming in communicating both challenges and areas for improvement (e.g., reporting requirements, IT systems functionality, guidance interpretation), and the impact of programmatic policies on state and local administrations.

Following the release of grant guidance and after the conclusion of the application period, FEMA holds an annual After-Action Conference (AAC). The AAC is designed to solicit feedback from grantees and stakeholders on a range of issues. In June 2011, the AAC was held in San Francisco, CA, in conjunction with the national UASI Conference. Over 250 federal, state, local, tribal, private, and nongovernmental stakeholders participated in the conference, providing recommendations and best practices. Some specific findings from this engagement are presented here:

- (1) Grantees want more specific information on grant guidelines, grant reporting requirements, new and evolving priorities, and a range of program specific issues (e.g., how UASI jurisdictions are selected).
- (2) Grantees seek more transparent communication from FEMA prior to the guidance and application period. The overall consensus among participants was that better communications would lead to fewer redundancies and inefficiencies.
- (3) Grantees suggested that they become more actively engaged in the development of grant guidance, including the potential establishment of a state and local steering committee to advise FEMA on guidance development.
- (4) Grantees understand the challenges posed by operating under successive Continuing Resolutions, but would like to work with FEMA to find ways to mitigate the impact of these delays.
- (5) Concerns were raised about the IJ model. Most notably, it does not allow grantees to document progress and move from planning to implementation in a seamless manner.
- (6) Grantees recommend that IJs include an explicit category for projects that sustain existing capabilities.
- (7) Grantees proposed the use of a percentage-of-completion methodology for projects within larger initiatives.
- (8) Overlapping reporting requirements were seen as a driver of redundant processes. Grantees asked why there are different reporting requirements for different grants.

After each AAC, FEMA undertakes an assessment of stakeholder views and suggestions for changes to the grant programs. FY 2013 will see increased emphasis on program performance evaluation and a shift toward building and sustaining national core capabilities as outlined in the National Preparedness Goal.²⁴ FEMA attempts at every opportunity to engage with the stakeholder community to make them aware of potential changes to the grants program. This is

²⁴ Department of Homeland Security, *FY 2013 National Preparedness Grant Program Vision Document*, 2012.

accomplished through discussions with entities such as the National Advisory Council; the Local, State, Tribal, and Federal Preparedness Task Force; the National Emergency Management Association; the International Association of Emergency Managers; and the entire stakeholder community.

FEMA intends to address concerns about the investment justification process as it makes the transition from the current IJ to the more “BSIR like” investment justification planned for implementation in FY 2013. As increased accountability for program effectiveness becomes a prerequisite for continued funding, FEMA will likely need to implement additional performance measures to assess progress. This will place a continued emphasis on intra-FEMA data sharing to eliminate redundancy.

V. Conclusion

This first biennial report meets all of the requirements delineated by the *REEPPG Act*. It discusses the status of efforts to eliminate redundant and unnecessary reporting requirements, provides the status of efforts to develop quantifiable performance measures, and presents a performance assessment of the programs.

FEMA has made progress on its plan for streamlining reporting requirements to reduce burden; the agency has already implemented several recommendations from that plan. FEMA is implementing methods to measure grant effectiveness using new performance metrics without placing excessive burden on grant recipients or collecting redundant information.

FEMA has successfully developed performance measures, both in accordance with the NAPA grant program measurement study required by the *REEPPG Act* and as a result of independent assessment efforts throughout FEMA. FEMA has used the performance measures to evaluate the performance of the SHSP and UASI programs, and has demonstrated progress toward meeting the programs' objectives. In the FY 2013 Budget, FEMA proposed consolidation of several existing grants into the new National Preparedness Grant Program in order to enable grantees to develop and sustain capabilities without requiring grantees to meet the mandates from multiple individual, often disconnected, grant programs.²⁵ Further, FEMA will bring the grant programs into closer alignment with the new *National Preparedness Goal*, including aligning investment projects to the Goal's core capabilities and emphasizing the use of funds to address gaps identified in the THIRA and other assessments.²⁶ Finally, FEMA has summarized some of the most significant feedback obtained from its engagement with grantees. Grantees' major concerns include clearer communication, increased partnership, and streamlined requirements; FEMA is currently working to improve these areas.

²⁵ Department of Homeland Security, *FY 2013 National Preparedness Grant Program Vision Document*, 2012.

²⁶ Department of Homeland Security, *FY 2013 National Preparedness Grant Program Vision Document*, 2012.