



FEMA

FEMA National Advisory Council

April 26, 2013

Hilton Garden Inn Capitol Hill, 1225 First Street NE, Washington, DC

MEETING NOTES

NAC MEMBER ATTENDANCE

NAME	DISCIPLINE	PRESENT	ABSENT
Jim Featherstone, Chair	Emergency Response	X	
Teresa Scott, Vice Chair	FEMA Administrator Selection	X	
Beth Armstrong	Standards Setting		X
Paul Biedrzycki	Public Health	X	
Joseph Bolkcom	State Elected Official		X
Mickey Caison	FEMA Administrator Selection	X	
Sarita Chung	In-Patient Medical Provider		X
Mark Cooper	Emergency Management	X	
Nancy Dragani	FEMA Administrator Selection	X	
Lee Feldman	Local Non-Elected Officials	X	
Edward Gabriel	Infrastructure Protection	X	
Jerome Hatfield	Standards Setting	X	
June Kailes	Functional Accessibility	X	
Chuck Kearns	Emergency Medical Providers	X	
Anne Kronenberg	Emergency Response		X
Clifton Lacy	Health Scientists	X	
Robert Lee	FEMA Administrator Selection	X	
Robert Maloney	FEMA Administrator Selection		X
Ken Miyagishima	Local Elected Official		X
Adora Obi Nweze	FEMA Administrator Selection		X
Thomas Powers	Cyber Security		X
Todd Rosenblum	U.S. Department of Defense		X
Pat Santos	Emergency Response	X	
Kurt Schwartz	State Non-Elected Officials		X
Charley Shimanski	FEMA Administrator Selection	X	
Guy Swan	FEMA Administrator Selection	x	
Mary Troupe	Disabilities	X	
David Waldrop	Communications	X	
Jeff Walker	Emergency Management		X
Phil Zarlengo	FEMA Administrator Selection	X (via telephone)	

FEMA ATTENDEES

NAME	TITLE
Karen Coates	Office of External Affairs
Jasper Cooke	Office of the Administrator
Michael Delman	Office of Chief Counsel
Kathleen Fox	National Preparedness Assessments Division
Craig Fugate	Administrator
Amanda Johnson	Office of External Affairs
Susan Koshgarian	Congressional Affairs
Jason McNamara	Chief of Staff
Charlotte Porter	Designated Federal Officer, National Advisory Council
John Rabin	National Preparedness Assessments Division
Kristin Robinson	Federal Insurance & Mitigation Administration
Richard Serino	Deputy Administrator
Alexandra Woodruff	Alternate Designated Federal Officer, National Advisory Council

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

NAME	TITLE/ORGANIZATION
Martha Braddock	International Association of Emergency Managers, USA
Alex Constantopoulos	CACI/NAVAIR
Dominic Frasca	US Public Health Service, FDA
Chris Gillot	Congressman Bill Cassidy
Darryl Hart	Department of the Navy
Reggie Jones	SoBran, Inc.
Merrie Inderfurth	Association of State Floodplain Managers
Sham Manglir	National Law Income Housing Coalition
Erin O'Brien	Government Accountability Office
Alex Parcham	Williams and Jensen
Christina Payamps-Smith	National Low Income Housing Coalition
Ilya Plothran	Public Health Foundation
Palmer Rafferty	Senator David Vitter
Jena Rosare	Operation HOPE
Shahim Saloom	Center for Naval Analysis
Charles Sharp	Black Emergency Managers Association
Laura Simmons	Williams and Jensen
Tabby Waqar	National Association of Home Builders
Afton Zaunbrecher	Senator Mary Landrieu

MEETING SUMMARY

The meeting was called to order at 8:40 am EDT by Charlotte Porter, NAC Designated Federal Officer.

Welcome and Opening Remarks

Jim Featherstone—NAC Chair

- Why do we get together – is it worth it? We often wrestle with preparedness – are we prepared as a nation? More today than yesterday? We, as part of the whole community, have been training, educating, and exercising for more than a decade. It is normal to centralize planning and increase awareness.

- All of this goes to what took place in Boston; teams showed a good deal of improvisation and innovation and everyone knew their dance moves. What you and the nation do does make a difference. ROI is not usually immediately obvious but it was clear in Boston. We have achieved a greater sense of awareness across silos and at prepositioning assets. . Boston wasn't just prepared but they were ready. Thank you for your work.
- To the members, thank you for sacrifices getting here. There was a lot of great discussion in subcommittee meetings yesterday, despite only having a minimal turnout.

Jason McNamara—Chief of Staff, FEMA

- Budget issues are difficult and will continue for the foreseeable future. As a group, we need to plan for it and understand budget realities. We can do that, and that you can accomplish your mission using a variety of means. We are adaptive. We knew this one was coming and it is not going away. Along with descending budgets, we still have sequestration– even if Congress passes a budget they'll still take a little away. This is the new normal so we must adapt and decide what we must do, would like to do, and would be nice to do. Focus on that first list. If you have budget questions, just ask.
- May 31, 2013 will be my last day at FEMA, as I'm moving to the private sector. Four of the best years of my career have been here supporting the Administrator and his initiatives and working with this group. We have made historic strides: tribal legislation, the creativity during Sandy from the suggestions here and Katrina lessons learned; Sandy reforms. Thank you for your friendship, your ideas, your collegiality; I will remain in the business so will see you soon.

FEMA Sandy After Action Report

Kathleen Fox—Director, National Preparedness Assessments Division, FEMA

- The Sandy storm was huge, not catastrophic, but big and difficult – record water levels, high storm tide, 8.5 million customers without power, 20,000 in shelters, and hundreds of thousands evacuated. It took time for us to pull together, lean forward, cut red tape, and make things happen to support a prompt coordinated response. We laid out some pre and post landfall actions such as disaster declarations and emergency declarations. We used the DHS surge capacity force and FEMA deployed over 900 personnel.
- In order to account for outcomes, the Administrator established the Sandy Analysis Team to conduct an after action report (AAR) that identifies lessons learned and provides actionable recommendations, including innovative solutions. The AAR focuses on the strengths and areas for improvement in four themes: ensuring unity of effort, being survivor centric, fostering unity of effort across the whole community, and developing an agile professional emergency management workforce. We conducted 215 interviews and analyzed 2,641 deployment surveys. The National Security Staff convened the Sandy After-Action Review Team to coordinate the Federal review.
- The level of training among Community Relations (CR) staff varied. Most CR staff were full time FEMA headquarters staff, as a way for employees to gain field experience. CR may be the default program for surge staff, but CR is the most important mission because it is FEMA's direct interaction with survivors. External Affairs was in charge of training 1,000-1,500 DHS employees and FEMA Corps. Training is something we can do better.
- The application process can be melded with CR.
- Disaster recovery centers (DRCs) are not FEMA call centers and telling people to make a phone call to our phone banks is the old system. From top to bottom, we are rethinking the purpose of the DRC's and where to place them, including virtual DRCs. DRCs should have people there who can answer questions, address the immediate needs, and have the technology and capability to register people for FEMA's programs. We need to understand what types of questions people ask and make sure we have the equipment to deal with those questions.
- The Administrator's priority is to move from making the people fit the programs to making the programs fit the people; this survivor centric idea is not new. Sandy highlighted that this understanding for the purpose of DRCs varied at the local level, along with the DRCs level and type of staffing.

NAC Comment: It is hard for people with disabilities to truck it all the way to a DRC just to find a phone bank. There are also vertical density issues and issues with limited battery power and long hold times for calling the 1-800 number.

NAC Question: In finding facilities to serve as DRCs, were there any challenges and lessons learned?

- The AAR highlighted the importance of working with states and localities ahead of time and when determining where to place DRCs, demographics and a community's greatest need for services need to be considered. Co-locating DRCs with local services may inundate the local community services and cause crowd control and other problems.

- The purpose of a DRC is not just about immediate needs and a primary point of entry into the system, but about follow-up. When we walk away from one house, our goal is to have everything done so that citizens do not have to come back in the system. The whole idea is to streamline the process; you have experienced trauma, so how many times do you want to talk to FEMA to determine eligibility and actually get a check to get your life back on track? CR and DRCs were processes. The ideal outcome is that your interaction with FEMA is positive and you are provided with maximum service and referrals to other support programs whether that interaction is through the phone, internet, or in person.
- We tasked our mobile communications team to set up public communications sites (tent or store front). Connectivity enables us to provide resources and assist with simple recovery tasks, such as replacing drivers' licenses. A mobile webpage combined with tablet technology is faster than a regular webpage, and it is practical to carry a tablet. Information is not stored on the tablet, so liability and information security issues are avoided.

NAC Question: Has it been suggested to allow people to pre-register online for benefits?

- Yes, but is not ideal, as we never know who is going to be impacted by a disaster, maintaining data is difficult, and people will not self-identify. Instead, we evaluate available open source data such as census bureau data and tax data.
- In Katrina we initially distributed more money with a ten percent error rate. Whereas in Sandy, the overall distributions have been less but the error rate is less than one percent. Within the first 30 days, FEMA deposited over \$1 billion into individual checking accounts and 10 percent of those requests came in over mobile devices, which previously would have been submitted online.

NAC Question: A more robust AAR might be helpful for the NAC's visibility. What coordination could be better?

- FEMA Office of Chief Counsel is finalizing the AAR. One lesson learned is our perceived inability to share info as people register with FEMA. Stafford Act says we need to share but privacy issues prevent it. Are there data points that we can collect so that when you give info to us, the info we are collecting is going to help us identify who needs help?
- At FEMA, every employee is an emergency manager and understands and executes FEMA's core mission. FEMA deployed 10,000 personnel for Sandy which brought up issues of outfitting them with FEMA gear and determining rest time for those on deployments longer than 30 days.
- The AAR was intended to be a catalyst, not just a paper report, and continuous improvement working group will be monitoring and tracking the implementation of the AAR recommendations.

NAC Question: When you deploy folks to a disaster, how are you backfilling day to day operations?

- This is one thing we have hopefully fixed but it came up in response. When we realized this would be a maximum effort, everyone was directed to implement their coop plans – minimum staff to perform core functions. Generally, moving staff from training makes more sense than moving staff from grants. Being an emergency manager may mean that you are filling in other hours for deployed co-workers. Coop plans have been updated as a result.

NAC Question: What do you mean by ensuring all survivors have equal access to services and clarifying roles and responsibilities related to disability integration and equal rights?

- Before Sandy, disability integration specialists would not be part of the initial deployment and would deploy 3-4 days after the incident which created gaps and lost opportunities. Now, disability integration specialists are part of the initial deployment, and we are hiring reservists with this skill set. None of our previous IMATs have had a disability integration specialist but they now have that.

Discussion with FEMA Administrator and Deputy Administrator

Craig Fugate—Administrator, FEMA

Richard Serino—Deputy Administrator, FEMA

- We are not going to wait until next time to be prepared. Next time could be one minute from now, so we are going to be ready. There will not be paralysis by analysis.
- The Administrator has 1,365 days left at FEMA, with 36 days until hurricane season. When he first came to FEMA, not everyone was an emergency manager and a statement that you could be deployed as a FEMA employee was in the job postings but not in position descriptions; employees could not be held accountable for this. Now, as part of the hiring process, employees acknowledge that they are subject to deployment and adverse environments as part of their job, regardless of their program office. Everybody is an emergency manager is no longer a talking point – we have lived it. There were also internal issues with managers not allowing staff to deploy due to workload issues.
- In Sandy, everything that went wrong did, but many pieces added up and many things that went right were better than expected.
- We are in a constrained financial situation. Even though the Congressional Resolution (CR) was funded at higher than the FY13 request, we voluntarily cut our expenditures to meet the President's request. There

will not be new money and it is likely that Congress will make further reductions, so we have to move funds around internally to meet where are we going to be in the future versus what it takes to get to the next year.

- We placed a premium on human capital; we are cutting positions not people – no furloughs. We are not going to ask our staff to do more with less but ask them to do fewer things better. Work Place Transformation is an initiative to move FEMA to a smaller footprint in order to cut rental costs while maintaining personnel. Congress mandates what we must do and those things will be funded. We have to cut programs and make some strategic decision – what are things we have done that made sense but that we cannot really afford now? There are some things we will no longer do.
- Look at how we achieve outcomes, not process. We spend a lot of money on process and would rather invest in delivery of services than the process – how much does it cost to manage travel? How do we improve those processes to get accountability, tracking, and transparency with fewer positions? There are tremendous opportunities for cost savings in areas such as information technology that by streamlining, funds can be moved to the priority programs. We must make some painful decisions.
- After the events in Newtown, CT and Boston, MA, FEMA has also been engaging in conversations about how people respond to mass shootings and bombings, how to save lives, and change how we respond with emergency medical services (EMS). As first responders and agencies, looking at Iraq and Afghanistan as examples, survivor rates increased when treatments improved and more first responders used tourniquets and moved quickly. Law enforcement changed after the Columbine Massacre in 1999 but fire and EMS did not. We have met with EMS, police chiefs, International Association of Fire Chiefs to get EMS in first and allow bystanders to start treating people. There are multiple success stories of bystanders helping survivors in Aurora, CO and in Boston, MA. No one who went to a hospital in Boston died – the three fatalities were on scene. How do we be safe and treat people at the same time?
- We established an almost zero tolerance for risk with staging done outside of the incident area and teaching citizens not to touch people; however, this mindset does not save lives. We need to change the culture. EMS cannot wait for hours for the “all-clear,” EMS needs to move in quickly, stop the bleeding, and get people to the hospital – not treat people on the scene.

NAC Comment: The finish line at the Chicago marathon this year was like a small hospital, whereas in the Aurora, CO shooting incident there was angst and frustration about not allowing medical units to move in.

- This is not about data or treatment protocols but is about implementing what we know from partner countries and Iraq and Afghanistan. More people die on scene when they wait for medical teams to be cleared to enter the scene and help. However, if every soldier is equipped to perform basic first aid, such as carrying a tourniquet to plug people up and get them out, more lives are saved. If you bleed out you are dead. If you want zero risk, people will die. However, if you manage risk, you can save lives. We have, as a nation, discouraged public from doing anything unless they are trained (i.e. in a crash, tell people do not move and do not touch). But first aid is simple: apply pressure. We have disengaged the public and assumed they are a liability not a resource. But, we need to reengage them, as the public is a resource. Israeli model – if you are reporting a suspicious activity, they want you to do something. But in the US, the guidance is “See something, say something.” We do not tell them to act. Action saves lives.

NAC Comment: The culture needs to change so that emergency response personnel are properly equipped and trained.

- In Arlington, VA, paramedics carry body armor and will pair up with police officers. The paramedics are trained to get out the first patients they come across, no treatment, only plug, patch, and get them out. Specialized teams take too long to assemble and do not change the outcome.

NAC Comment: With improvised explosive devices, we started using rapid extraction method. If you do not stop bleeding, the rest does not matter. Equipping police with automated external defibrillators (AED) and/or tourniquets saves lives.

- Boston teams have been using tourniquets for 15 years and body armor for 20 years. Almost everyone had body armor.
- Police do not want AEDs because of their cost, but tourniquets are cheap.

NAC Comment: Israelis also use trucks to block in active shooters. How does this come together for us to update textbooks and training?

- We are working with USFA, police chiefs, and sheriffs to incorporate these new protocols in the next series of classes and prototyping it. We cannot wait for the perfect answer – part of it is culture change. Even in the US, there is rarely an active shooter that goes on for more than 10 minutes which makes EMS staging useless. How do you mitigate risk for the injured and for response personnel that does not paralyze systems? Minimalist approach is going to save more lives. We are working with police chiefs to train law enforcement how to use tourniquets, but it will take a while.

NAC Comment: EMS is fragmented. Grants for vests and quick clot stuff should be considered. Public Safety Officers' Benefits Improvements Act of 2012 includes nonprofits but does not include for profit which leaves for profit entities with less funds to purchase live saving equipment.

- We are dealing with reality; grant money is not endless. If we depend on grant dollars to change behavior, what happens when the grant funds are depleted?

NAC Comment: The Response and Recovery Subcommittee discussed the issues of liability and indemnification for the use of international USAR teams. Can you comment on this?

- We focus on delivering outcome; outcome is what our customers say works for them. How we engineer that is relevant to the federal bureaucracy. Having worked at the local, state, and federal levels, there is not much to gain by going outside that system. All three levels do it differently. This is not occurring on the inside – it is the Sandy Recovery Improvement Act (SRIA). SRIA covers transactional operations in support and response. We have new authorities to allow states to use own personnel – the city will no longer be penalized for using public works personnel; they can charge full cost and it will be fully reimbursable. Issues like this have to be fixed within federal structure but output is where it will occur. SRIA is the biggest change since the Stafford Act was written. We are using rulemaking authorization such as tribal organizations. Our goal is to implement them. We have got to fix this from the inside.

NAC Comment: How is FEMA facing the challenges related to the Biggert Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012?

- We are moving to actuarially sound rates so insurance holders will pay more. Whose role is it to subsidize the rate—the policy holder or the taxpayer?

NAC Comment: We fully support sound rates, but there are areas of the country and population that will be decimated. Homes will be unsellable with 100 percent or more increases in rates. One of our recommendations is a whole of government effort to create a better process. Those who are put into Zone A with mapping changes and those who are now behind uncertified levees and cannot afford the new rates need to be considered.

- You are saying we should subsidize rates below a point at which behavior changes – this is a Draconian view. The current pain point is too low, so people keep building in flood zones. The big concern with Biggert-Waters is the shocking potential that rates could be 100 percent or more of the current rates, based on the phase out of grandfathered rates, subsidies and the true actuarial value, but the statute differs from what people think. If you have flood insurance and you have been reclassified, rates can be raised 20 percent annually until it reaches the actuarially sound rate – will take longer for existing policies and less time for remapping. The numbers are not clear until we have the published tables. There will not be grandfathering, new construction must be sound from the get go, and second homes are not subsidized.
 - As a nation, we did not set the pain point high enough to change behavior and unfairly subsidize the risk. There is a more gradual phase in place. We as a nation should not subsidize risk at a point when the individual Tax payer receives benefit. We cannot continue to run the program at rate of subsidy. If we are using sound data and people pay for insurance, why is the private sector not more aggressive?
 - We identified affordability as the issue, but it may not be as imminent with phased insurance. Affordability is not at a point that perpetuates risk. There are concerns that people will drop out of program.
 - Who will be impacted? If affordability becomes so egregious that it threatens the whole program, we do not want to be back to square one where we enable development in areas where we should not have development. We do not want to continue to increase risk. Initial reports about increases were very dramatic.
 - It is not replacement insurance but depreciated insurance which was a rude awakening for some people.
- NAC Comment: Agree. We are hearing about lack of public awareness and misinformation in the news; there is much fear of the unknown. There are a few parishes that are freaking out. But we are also hearing and seeing second and third effects – what is going to happen in some communities that have risk? A chemical plant in the south wants to expand the size of its plant but is holding back due to the community impact of Biggert-Waters, as workers may leave the area. How is this going to affect oil and gas? What about the factory workers who commute – are companies going to pay workers more to be able to continue to live in the area? How is that cost going to be passed on?
- We must focus on the national benefit. We accepted a risk greater than actuarially sound rates. Why are we perpetuating a risk with no end? What is the right balance between behavior change and national benefit? Some islands get flooded so often that people can only live there because insurance is subsidized by the taxpayers.

NAC Comment: All on aboard with changing behavior, but we do need to look at cases of individuals who are backed into a corner. For example, those who took mitigation efforts but are now below base flood elevation, or built a home a few years ago but now are in a flood zone, or cannot leave because they cannot sell their home,

or low income individuals who cannot afford to make changes. The banking association is trying to find out what it means for them in mortgages. What is this going to mean in these communities across the country?

- Biggert-Waters does not deal with lapses in policy but addresses a fundamental shift in flood insurance policy. The actuarial tables will provide clarity. The program requires much work, and as implementer of the program and policy, there is not much flexibility. However, we are still determining what the law means internally.

NAC Comment: Our recommendations may be based on incorrect info—FAQ sheets written for the end user. How can we have solid analysis of bill and the correct data?

- Talk with FIMA. Until we have the updated tables, FEMA cannot advise on the rates – recommend talking with an insurance adjuster.

NAC Comment: What are FEMA's lessons for life safety checks for those isolated for a long period?

- Those individuals need to be identified on the front end. However, this is the responsibility and capacity of the states and locals. FEMA assists the states and locals at their discretion.

NAC Comment: We can improve the education and awareness about vulnerabilities and mitigate challenges, but when people decide to stay, they need to take ownership of their outcome. However, the states usually take the ownership as they care for millions of residents. The education and awareness needs to happen well in advance, not days prior to an event, in order to manage the risk.

NAC Comment: How do we involve utilities to coordinate with federal, states, and locals to turn off gas and prevent fires?

- It is the state's decision as they regulate the utilities. It is a painful learning curve. At the federal level, what can we do to improve regulatory capability, etc. with utilities?

NAC Comment: We have discussed public private partnerships since 2004, mainly at the national level, but need to parallel these conversations at the local level. The lesson learned is that we need to integrate ourselves with better understanding of resources and awareness with private sector, to work with utilities and mitigate challenges in the future.

NAC Comment: In New Jersey, we knew how many needed dialysis and certain medical modalities but were surprised by the number of people on home oxygen with oxygen concentrators when they went to local hospitals for help, often overwhelming the local capacity.

- We cannot know everything beforehand. Oxygen providers and their truck drivers know where they deliver and where the needs are. We only have real-time information.

NAC Comment: There is a group of people that cannot heed an evacuation warning, no matter how far in advance it is, because they do not have a place to go. For those people, we need to rethink evacuation orders at a district level. We assume that with enough warning people can leave, but that is not always the case, specifically with people who are institutionalized, older folks in their homes, or have special medical equipment. In small scale events, we can call hospitals and take them there. How do we address these populations at a national level for large scale events?

NAC Comment: The FEMA Corps have an impressive commitment and education. How did it go? Was their involvement valuable?

- 460 FEMA Corps members were deployed to New Jersey and New York, several of whom were deployed for Hurricane Isaac. Some FEMA Corps members showed reservists new ways to do things and trained DHS surge staff. The FCO asked for more FEMA Corps teams. The deployment model had to be adjusted as FEMA Corps does not receive per diem or a stipend. AmeriCorps partnered to provide food and housing.
- FEMA Corps has the technology piece under control – did not have to train them to use iPads – and are future emergency managers. Not all of them will become emergency managers but some will.
- Total number involved in the program is 800, and will eventually be 1,600. People are positively surprised with this program that started a year ago in Joplin, MO. This approach seems revolutionary.
- How do you build diversity in emergency management unless you are reaching out to underserved communities? It is a feeder program – not all will come to FEMA but some will and some will go to voluntary orgs, etc., but it could change where they go in their career.

NAC Comment: What still needs work as far as local hires?

- The current economy meant that many local hires were not able to meet security requirements based on their personal finances – more applied than we could clear. The target for local hires is 25 percent and we are meeting that. This is not permanent work, so hiring for only one month is a challenge. In response to Sandy, hiring second and third generation individuals who were fluent in English and their native tongue, especially Russian, was the perfect mix – they knew the community and we were able to teach them programs. After 1-2 months, the number of community relations personnel decreases. Local hires are often cheaper, especially in hard to reach areas, such as Guam. How do we bring in the right mix of overhead team and local hires?

NAC Comment: How should we generate practical recommendations, especially as you deal with interagency coordination? Would it be valuable to get a white paper on best practices on shooting scenes?

- Sure. We are looking at rapid prototyping and known research, so when people ask for citations, we can give them. FEMA's primary role is that of an advocate and establishing programs through the National Fire Academy.

NAC Question/Comment: How did the military coordination work?

- Dual status commanders were beneficial. A bigger problem than a lack of resources was the tendency of state officials to not want military or National Guard involvement which delayed their eventual participation because local officials saw Guard involvement as an indicator that they could not manage the response. They did not have unity of command but did have unity of effort. Bigger challenge for DOD was lack of assignments; they wanted to do more but the Guard was helping.

NAC Question/Comment: In regards to the challenges with fuel and de-conflicting pre-identified fuel resources, how do we ensure DOD, states, and locals all rely on the same fuel resources?

- It will occur again as the industry does not lend itself to easy solutions. Only one fuel provider had vertical integration from refining to supply. On any given day there is only enough fuel in the system to fill the tanks for that day, without new demands. Consumption skyrocketed and supply plummeted because power failure pipelines quit and tankers could not make it in. Sandy was two disasters – storm surge and wind impact – and in this combination of disrupted system and increased demand, people were filling up small gallon tanks to run generators. When should the government start providing inherently privately sourced services to the public with public funds? It became its own issue – how do you provide this distribution and when do you start and when do you stop? We went far beyond providing fuel for public vehicles. However, our daily consumption rates were a drop in the bucket – mostly public perception. We did not want to ration too much because perception but it allowed time for the system to normalize and consumption to decrease. How do you deal with fuel tax for gas bought in one state and distributed in another?

NAC Question/Comment: What was the value of the National Business Emergency Operations Center (NBEOC) to FEMA?

- The NBEOC fills a gap. If you are in a state with a strong private sector relationship, we do not have to do that much, just facilitate multiregional issues. However, for many other issues (retail, financial, insurance) the NBEOC allows them to get an answer after all other channels are exhausted. We are going from asking private sector, "Are you open?" to addressing the issue, to asking, "What can we do to get you open?" The private sector does find value in the NBEOC - a major positive change between Isaac and Sandy.

NAC Question/Comment: With so many people dependent on mobile devices, what are your thoughts on providing power back to people when grid is down?

- Mobile devices require charging stations and connectivity, and both failed in New York City. In suburban areas, people could plug into cars, but Manhattan does not have the same car population. Think about placing local charging stations.
- As people move to wireless environment, the important things are ability to recharge (private sector is setting up charging stations as well) and set up Wi-Fi data clouds. Some cities are looking at mobile Wi-Fi terminals to piggyback on network broadband or use satellite uplinks. Not too much security to exclude people but we want let people communicate and get assistance from those who can provide it. If the public is a resource and we want to empower them, they need communications.

NAC Open Discussion

- The NAC had opportunity to bring up any new issues.
- Some members opined on the frequency, duration, and location of future NAC and subcommittee meetings with the new budget. Some would prefer two day meeting on Wednesday and Thursday to avoid traveling on the weekend. Suggested meeting in flight hubs to reduce layovers.
- The NAC and its subcommittees will meet twice per year for 2-3 days, depending on the issues; one meeting in DC, and one outside DC. The next meeting will be in the late fall. The NAC will typically not meet on Fridays; this meeting was an unusual circumstance. Meeting in DC allows FEMA colleagues to participate.
- Some members reiterated the importance of participating in subcommittee work. NAC is more than just a one-day meeting twice per year. All members volunteered for this responsibility and part of it is to participate in conference calls. It is evident who has participated and who has not. We are taking attendance and taking note – if you are not attending we will discuss with you because it is part of being on the council.
- Some members are interested in participating or observing more than one subcommittee, while understanding the logic of focusing on one subcommittee topic. Members are encouraged to observe

another subcommittee if interested; however, we do not want to go back a step and educate people. Scheduling these calls is like herding cats; we will never find times that will work for everyone.

- Participation on subcommittee calls may increase if there was more of a consensus process on date/time selection. If a subcommittee call schedule does not work for you, it is the member's responsibility to notify the subcommittee chair and FEMA staff.
- Member suggested inviting FEMA Corps to talk to the NAC about their experiences and what they learned and what they intend to do. Quality young people, almost all with Bachelor's degrees, and many with Master's. It was noted as an innovative example of how FEMA is leveraging young talent.

Briefing on the National Preparedness Grant Program and Quadrennial Homeland Security Review

Dave Kaufman—Director, Office of Policy and Program Analysis, FEMA

- DHS is committed to open engagement in the Quadrennial Homeland Security Review (QHSR) process and is waiting for the guidance document to be published before starting to engage our stakeholders. The first QHSR focused on defining homeland security. The second QHSR focuses more on the how we implement homeland security. Some things will be different than before; it has been refined but not reinvented. There will be an explicit outreach campaign to all DHS FACA committees. The timeframe for the QHSR is the end of 2013. The last QHSR started in May 2009 and was completed by the end of the year.
- The Administration proposed a modified version of National Preparedness Grant Program (NPGP) in the President's Budget, which consolidates 16 programs into one and the changes were made based on stakeholder input. In a philosophical nutshell, we have a shrinking pie and a complex set of challenges and need to integrate the decision making so the limited dollars can be put towards areas with the highest payoff. Fundamentally, we need to address this as a national issue and a national system. Practically, an investment that helps one community but not others is not as important as one that helps one community in a way that helps others. We have spent \$37 billion to build capability. We have designed the construct in two parts. Risk assessment methodology will continue with a competitive process that highlights how; THIRAs will highlight the critical capabilities. For the first time, this year, capability estimates will be conducted to identify gaps between capabilities had and needed to determine what we have that needs to be kept and what we do not have that we need?

NAC Question: Sandy and Boston highlighted capability that has been developed and implemented. How do you quantify that capability, as assessments are formulaic?

- We will still look at dollar levels, but allow the analytic process to decide what gets funded. In a competitive pool, we will look at what is being built and its efficacy and longevity.

NAC Question: The Administrator mentioned the need for a culture change with regard to EMS response to mass violence, such as instilling the "load and go" philosophy. However, culture changes take time. Can the grant program be used as a way to stimulate that cultural change? For example, tying grant money to adopting the new culture.

- Definitely; however, some cases will be easier to implement than others. One thing we are looking at in FY2013 is how we place that initial area of emphasis and how we deal with victim care at mass casualty events. In addition to incentivizing the "load and go" approach, we want to empower local communities. Israel's core approach is different, as their policy mobilizes bystanders to help. For example, their policy does not allow for the purchase of IV stands because bystanders can hold the IV.
- We have discussed things the Administration would like to see the grant program do. The grant program is often used for incentivizing/dis-incentivizing different programs or actions. However, the Administrator is trying to change the billboard for the grant program from public safety block grants to building the national capability, which will take time capability approach.
- The question is, Boston built this capability, exercised it, and implemented. How much more money do they need from us?

NAC Comment: Sustainment has been a challenge for grant stimulus. While generating the mindset and the culture shift, even the most robust mindsets still need some nurturing.

- We fund \$4 billion per year into these programs and it is not sustainable. We cannot wash our hands of it and expect it to bear fruit, but we also cannot fund it into perpetuity. How do we keep what we have and respond to other things as they come up, all with smaller pie?

NAC Comment: Two things we have to look at: sustain capabilities and meet new challenges. At the state level, looking at THIRAs, risks, capabilities and needs. As you said, the Administrator is really interested in what capability we can build within a state that you can use nationally. In Louisiana, we had three type 3 USAR teams. We used that capability when the Tuscaloosa tornadoes happened. Got them there in 3 hours when it would have taken national teams much longer. At a state level, what do we need to sustain critical threats that we have and what are the gaps we have on a competitive basis. Is what we are looking for something we can use nationally?

- That's exactly what we are saying. It will be hard to get there though. Everyone who is involved in the Grant Program has to articulate what you just said. There will be parochial concerns too.

NAC Comment: How do you spread the money across the nation, when there is the impression that New York has received a lot of funding?

NAC Comment: Sandy is a game changer, especially after Irene. You would be surprised how much information is out there that has been learned the hard way. How many things have been proved to work?

NAC Comment: With a smaller pool of federal money for states, the states are reevaluating their capabilities to determine what to sustain with state funds when the federal funds run out. Let's stop looking to the feds to pay for everything, while maintaining a sustainability mentality and creating new capabilities. Special groups will want certain things called out (like body armor) which nibbles away at the intent of the grants. FEMA should set the course to help us stay on track.

NAC Comment: Advocate for a specific strategy (i.e. load and go) instead of a specific equipment (i.e. body armor). Entities need to commit to using the equipment if they apply for them.

NAC Comment: To clarify, not everyone is eligible for the same grants (i.e. firefighters versus private ambulance companies). However, private ambulances will come from across the country to provide resources when called. These ambulance companies should be allowed to apply for equipment. They provide much needed aid when firefighter resources are quickly overwhelmed.

- Very good points; the Administrator has discussed leveraging whole community assets. The groundbreaking ideas and ideas that cut through tape – things where there is a demonstrated need – those are the things where you can provide momentum for us.

NAC Comment: Some ambulance companies do not have stair chairs as part of their equipment because of insurance issues while others will do it anyway. Some companies will not buy them unless it is required by the state. Another thing, mutual aid occurs every day in every city – one city providing ambulances to another city to help keep up with the volume. If a city signs a contract with a company that cannot provide that service, why do we need to use federal dollars to support that?

- This goes back to local jurisdictions understanding the local challenges and preparing for what they need. For example, a small city does not need to equip for the trauma of a big city. Multistory buildings should be required to have stair chairs.
- Everyone wants the ability to provide the service. Is it a good use of federal dollars to augment private companies and allow them to use those dollars to make money? Local government could be writing bad contracts.
- We have just internally released the Administrator's intent for FEMA which is designed to drive the yearly budgeting process and is the foundation of the Agency going forward. There are three parts: first is statement recognizing that strategic environment has changed. Second, articulation of two strategic imperatives for the agency – whole community and innovation and learning. How do we improve our ability to learn adapt and be agile? The third part identifies the Administrator's five priorities.
- Between now and the end of the year, we are going to develop the next FEMA strategic plan. As we build out strategy, what comments do you have in your deliberations as a body?
- Five Agency priorities are: 1) be survivor-centric in rethinking how we structure our programs and fit our programs to people; 2) increase speed and mobility as we orient ourselves toward field response and recovery; 3) retain emphasis on catastrophic and look at maximum of maximums and ensure those are the outcomes we are ready to handle; 4) mitigate and reduce disaster risk nationally; 5) achieve business and managerial excellence.
- There are a number of areas for opportunity, such as how we want to execute, not just rebrand, the Disaster Survivor Assistance Teams (DSAT); rethinking how we capture data and how we share it; who we are interacting with in the VOAD community; taking extra steps to connect service providers; changing survivor experience wraps up whole community and innovation and learning.
- This administration has decided that we fail without whole community and if we rely on stagnant processes we will fail. Things pop up that you could not or did not plan for and the system needs to acknowledge that.
- The main problem in Sandy was that too many people were without power. If Sandy occurred in a rural community, the outcome would not have been anywhere close to catastrophic. Sandy was catastrophic because of the population density and power outages.

NAC Subcommittee Report Outs

Jerome Hatfield—Member, Response & Recovery Subcommittee

Subcommittee Mission: To advise and provide recommendations to the FEMA National Advisory Council on strategic issues relating to FEMA's disaster response and recovery efforts, and to help develop FEMA's initiatives in these areas (ex. NDHS, NDRF, NIMS, NRF); and ensuring through deliberation and promulgation of

recommendations that representation, awareness, engagement, and integration of the whole community and FEMA's strategic goals are addressed.

- The Response & Recovery Subcommittee has met six times since October 2012 and met in person April 26, 2013 for two hours.

PREVIOUS CHARGES

Charge 1: Review how FEMA allocates planning, training, and funding resources to ensure whole community response and recovery efforts are sustainable beyond 72 hours.

- In the aftermath of Sandy, the challenge about sustainability might not be as strong as we thought. As the Administrator mentioned earlier, *catastrophic event* has yet to be defined. New Jersey faced challenges but they were not bad. Nevertheless, we were supported with federal resources that stayed around for several months. In taking a look at Hurricane Sandy impacting a few states, we are pondering our capability to respond to those events. IMAT teams that have been established have the ability to deploy for around 90 days. The initial team that came in October left in February.
- FEMA Corps helped to maintain operations and support our capabilities. It is encouraging seeing young bright people committed to public safety and public service. We as a state were encouraged that contrary to popular belief, we do have young vibrant, intelligent people, ready to support.
- Whole community is a concept that has been defined but not on granular level. We looked at that, though we did not discuss Citizen Corps capabilities. Not all stakeholders of interest are engaged. Some of the shortfalls and gaps highlighted by Sandy can be mitigated by a better understanding of the whole community and nontraditional support that we have yet to tap into.

Charge 2: Receive a briefing, and provide input on the National Mass Care Strategy, including the implementation plan.

- Discussed short and long term issues and the three-step process, looking at the state of the nation as we see it today, identifying strategies that can harden and strengthen existing infrastructure, and private sector influences that can supplement the mass care strategy.
- In terms of engaging the whole community, we do a good job with traditional stakeholders but we need to do more to engage the nontraditional stakeholders – how do we not only identify all critical stakeholders, communities, networks, and institutions but bring them to the table?
- National Mass Care Strategy will continue to be a discussion item for the subcommittee.
- ESF 6 is overwhelming and multiple players (private sector, NGOs, VOADs, etc.) are needed to make an impact. In catastrophic disasters, VOADs feeding capacity is 1.25 million meals, so anything beyond that must be provided by the private sector. The National Mass Care Council has developed a strategic philosophy and is implementing it locally.
- It is hard to assess national capacity without looking at local capabilities; it is local boots on the ground who deal with the problem first. For example in New Jersey, there are 21 counties, 8 jurisdictions, and 8 million people. Overlaying regional and national strategy on the local capability is challenging. The private sector influence could prove critical when addressing some of the challenges (i.e. feeding people).
- What role can the NBEOC play with mass care? Can it be more proactive? As needs arise in mass care, what better place to go than the NBEOC? With feeding, we used that model in Gustav and were able to feed people much cheaper and more quickly.
- If you suddenly have a capability on the front that provides 40,000 meals a day, think about multiplying that times 10 for an urban environment with conflicts of bridges and tolls. Local emergency managers often point out that cost of MREs quickly becomes prohibitive and supply cannot keep up with demand.
- Will the national shelter strategy be included? In a New Madrid earthquake situation with 100k displaced people, who is tying all that together and who will orchestrate managing that level of need? We plan for what we have capability for but that will not be enough when we have a catastrophe incident. The Red Cross and FEMA have that role for mass care. No one has addressed that and they need to.
- There is also the supply chain aspect. We worry about the last deliverable mile. Debris in the street, downed trees and bridges out are some of the larger challenges that locals have to deal with – how can we make it easier for them?
- The Administrator talks about changing the culture, especially at the federal level. But there are still silos in the whole community. Response needs to be owned by the whole community, not just the government – similar to the concept of it takes a village to raise a child. It is our responsibility to connect those dots.

Charge 3: This charge is related to the FEMA Qualification System (FQS).

- Timing is everything. As we look at the challenge and the diminishing workforce, how do we maximize what we have? Built within the FQS system, there are gainful discussions about staffing and mitigating vulnerabilities with appropriate staff. If you have a higher level of aptitude with your staff you can still play larger than you are. We saw it in NJ and NY where an incredible surplus of members represent diverse fronts (races, creeds, genders) as well as people bringing in unique capabilities. The further build out of

FQS represents this at best. We are a microcosm of society and if we have society built representing institutions, then that mitigates some of these challenges around information sharing and gathering. The integration piece is the final piece. Looking at networks and good faith efforts to support public service and public safety. This capability allows us to represent the role that we play nationally to ensure the protection of others. We can do so with an integration of capabilities to allow for unity of effort.

- We do not have any new charges at this time. We would like to embellish the existing charges and continue to build them out. Our recommendations are to drill down on current ones with a knowledge of what is happening at the federal level. We also want to discuss ROI in this subcommittee. Arguably, we are going to be meeting less but arguably communicating more often to supplement our inability to meet in person. If we cannot make the calls, than we must make clear that we are still committed. As a chair/vice-chair it is critical that we all understand we are part of the moving parts and we have to maintain that interest to protect people. We must look at the future of the NAC to ensure we are committed to this effort, regardless of how often we meet.

Nancy Dragani, Chair, Federal Insurance & Mitigation Subcommittee

- **Mission:** To advise and provide recommendations to the FEMA National Advisory Council on strategies to lessen the loss of life and property from the impact of disasters; and ensuring through deliberation and promulgation of recommendations that representation, awareness, engagement, and integration of the whole community and FEMA's strategic goals are addressed.

PREVIOUS CHARGES

Charge 1: Provide input on FEMA's implementation of NFIP reform bill signed by president

- We have 5 recommendations on this (see below).
- The subcommittee cleared this charge.

Charge 2: Investigate and advise FEMA's initiative on total cost of flooding and who bears that cost

- We are looking beyond traditional sources of recovery dollars.

Charge 3: Advise on public education and outreach on flood insurance program, including its effectiveness

- We had several conference calls and great support from FIMA on the Group Flood Insurance Program (GFIP). If there is a federal disaster declaration and individual assets are activated, there is Other Needs Assistance for those who have no other recourse, and they are automatically provided with 3 year flood insurance. However, do GFIP policy holders understand the policy and its requirements?
- The subcommittee had five issue areas with GFIP:
 - Is the requirement to maintain flood insurance after the first three-year period problematic? Do many survivors let GFIP lapse and is this a problem? Our recommendation is to conduct an analysis on the percentage of policies that do lapse, the number of people with lapsed policies who were denied benefits, and the reasoning behind the lapse in policies.
 - In terms of enforcing deed restrictions, the requirement to maintain flood insurance is specific to property, not owner. Is there a way to deed restrict these properties so that it is clear that they have to have flood insurance?
 - Should GFIP be offered to all disaster assistance applicants? Philosophically, should everyone have flood insurance?
 - Explore the feasibility of extending the purchase of GFIP beyond Zone A.
 - GFIP would be best used if it encouraged holders to purchase flood insurance in the long-term. How can this be incentivized?
- The subcommittee cleared this charge.

Charge 4: Explore options to streamline FEMA mitigation grant programs to allow smaller communities to take advantage of mitigation opportunities

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NAC CONSIDERATION

Draft Recommendation 1: This recommendation focuses on Biggert-Waters. We recommend FEMA complete two reports, the first on the affordability of NFIP premiums, the effects of higher premiums on low-income homeowners, and on ways to increase affordability. Second, FEMA should conduct a study and issue a report on ways to encourage participation in NFIP.

Discussion:

- Biggert-Waters is a highly technical bill and some sections conflict with each other. Committee staff members also have a hard time understanding the bill. FEMA is doing 14 different studies and there could be 11 separate rulemakings. Some studies will be combined. The implementation of the law is not waiting

for the studies to be complete. The results of these studies will not impact the implementation of the law, as we do not have authorization to implement an affordability program at this time. The National Academies is directed to complete a study this summer, which is a priority of the Administrator.

- In regards to new policies and lapsed policies, Sec. 205 eliminates current subsidies, so if you are not a business, do not suffer severe repetitive loss, let your policy lapse or sell your home, you will not be impacted by this section.

The NAC concurred to forward recommendation 1 to the Administrator.

Draft Recommendation 2: FEMA should place more emphasis on a community rating system to include analysis of why more communities are not participating and why those who do participate do not attempt to get higher ratings. They should also create/conduct an outreach or public engagement strategy targeting realtors, building associations, chambers of commerce and other impacted industries and organizations.

Discussion:

- Is there a way for FEMA to jumpstart these things?
- This is one thing we can do to increase affordability.

The NAC concurred to forward recommendation 2 to the Administrator.

Draft Recommendation 3: We recommend that FEMA engage in aggressive public engagement for two audiences: those who already in flood zone A or Z and those who are placed into a special flood hazard area as a result of new mapping.

Discussion:

- People should find out about the increased rate when selling their home. Some people are finding out about new rates in public meetings.
- The new rate structure will be available this June, so they will know how section 205 implementation affects them. Section 207, the newly mapped, will be implemented in FY14. The law says that it is retroactive but we will not be able to collect that retroactively.
- What about the people being remapped that have not been required to have insurance before. Are you implementing that? We discussed people behind non-certified levees; will those people be more immediate or implemented in FY14?
- The requirement to hold insurance was before Biggert-Waters. If they are now required to have insurance with the new maps, they will have to have insurance before section 207 is implemented. Section 207 would just raise their rate to the actuarially sound rate, not impact their requirement to carry insurance.
- The recommendation will need to change from flood zone Z to V.

The NAC concurred to forward recommendation 3 to the Administrator.

Draft Recommendation 4: We recommend that FEMA consider in FIRM all mitigation projects in communities. FEMA should use best engineering practices to certify non-fed levees as it could impact the FIRM

Discussion:

- A flood control structure that provides some level of protection should help keep an area affordable. How long does will a community have to study the new maps, such as St. Charles Parish? What if they disagree? What are their steps to contest that? What if a community chooses not to adopt the new maps?
- Regarding certifying non-fed levees, is that to the same standard as to the federal levee? Or would standard be lower? Non-federal just means that the feds do not own or maintain it. There is just one standard for levees.

The NAC concurred to forward recommendation 4 to the Administrator.

Draft Recommendation 5: We tried to look for ways to minimize the impact of steep rate increases on homeowners and small businesses. We strongly encourage FEMA to look at a whole of government approach.

The NAC concurred to forward recommendation 5 to the Administrator.

Discussion

- Pat Santos will be vice-chair of subcommittee.

Lee Feldman—Chair, Preparedness & Protection Subcommittee

- **Mission:** To advise and provide recommendations to the FEMA National Advisory Council regarding the missions of FEMA National Preparedness & Protection, including those specifically addressed in the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act (PKEMRA); and ensuring through deliberation and promulgation of recommendations that representation, awareness, engagement, and integration of the whole community and FEMA's strategic goals are addressed.
- Our previous charges were to provide input on the NIMS revision and to examine the National Exercise Program (NEP). On NEP, there is no specific issue that the Emergency Management Institute (EMI) is looking for input from us on, so will park this charge until there is a more actionable charge. The subcommittee would like to propose some recommendations on NIMS for the consideration of the NAC.

Draft Recommendation 1: The points below are included in NIMS.

- Resource typing to various missions.
- Requesting visual representation.

Discussion:

- We make the recommendation that social media is supplemental, but should not be the tool for conducting business. We were asked by staff whether information security should be included in NIMS and we recommend that it should not.
- What is the tool for communication channels?
 - The question asked was should social media be included? The answer to every question was yes except for on information security. We do not want overlying reliance on social media at expense of other means of communication. We cannot just permanently move to implement social media.

Draft Recommendation 2: NIMS should promulgate a national grid system.

Draft Recommendation 3: We need a clear and concise definition on what NIMS compliant/compliance means.

Discussion:

- Should just be the way we do business after a while.
- The original concept in 2004 was that NIMS would be a series of standards. As long as it is in documentation requiring that someone be NIMS compliant, we need a definition for it.

Draft Recommendation 4: NIMS and ICS are somewhat synonymous, so there should be a clear distinction between them.

Draft Recommendation 5: The timeframe for review and revision of the NIMS should be realistic enough to be relevant while preserving stakeholder input.

The NAC did not have a quorum so these 5 recommendations were not moved forward for voting. They will be reviewed and voted upon at a later date.

New Areas for Consideration

- Integration of emerging threats into preparedness plans.
- Interagency collaboration and communication for preparedness activities.
- Promulgation of lessons learned from NEP.
- Impact of sequester on preparedness activities.
- Incorporate community resilience fundamentals into preparedness plans.
- OPPA's capability estimation/assessment project.

Public Comment Period

- Public comment began at 3:30pm. Each commenter will have 3 minutes.
- Tim Mathews, Executive Director, Enterprise Resiliency for Educational Testing Service (ETS) in Princeton NJ. In January of this year (2013), our company became certified to the PS-Prep program. Relationship to key suppliers is important in any organization. PS-Prep program is a key enabler of supply chain resilience. Our understanding is that the PS-Prep program requires special consideration for small businesses. Self-declaration of conformity is critical for small business. For example, if you are a small business and you have been asked by ETS to declare conformity and have a business continuity plan. PS-Prep provides a mechanism for that. ETS would like to know, what is the status of the self-declaration of conformity (SDOC) scheme? What is the method to ensure that the reviewers are competent? Will there be an independent clearing house for SDOC? PS-Prep can and should be critical component in culture of preparedness.

- Jena Rosare, Senior Vice President of Government Affairs for Operation Hope. We are an official partner with the American Red Cross and DHS. I just wanted to comment, this is financial literacy month. We are pleased that efforts through John Hope Bryant on financial capability worked with the financial literacy community around helping people rebuild economically. We wanted to go on public record to thank FEMA and DHS in helping our communities rebuild economically.

Chair and Vice Chair Closing Remarks

Jim Featherstone—NAC Chair

Teresa Scott—NAC Vice-Chair

- Thank you. We have incorporated public engagement which is the most important part of all of our subcommittees. You can see that the subcommittees which have high levels of participation generate good products and good ideas.
- A few members' terms end this June; if you are interested in being considered for reappointment, please let Charlotte know as soon as possible.

Adjournment

Charlotte Porter, NAC DFO, FEMA

- If your term expires this June and you want to be considered for reappointment, please let us know as soon as possible.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm EDT.

I hereby certify that to the best of my knowledge, the foregoing executive summary of the National Advisory Council Meeting on April 26, 2013 is accurate and complete.



James Featherstone
Chair
FEMA National Advisory Council