

NATIONAL HOMELAND SECURITY CONSORTIUM SUMMARY

May 2-3, 2012 ♦ Washington, D.C.

May 2, 2012

Welcome & Introductions

Tri-Chairs Joe Wainscott (NEMA) and John Madden (GHSAC) welcomed participants and conducted self-introductions. Major General Timothy Lowenberg will join the meeting the following day.

PPD-8 Implementation Update: THIRA and National Frameworks

*The Honorable Tim Manning, Deputy Administrator for Protection and National Preparedness
Federal Emergency Management Association*

According to Manning, the PPD-8 process was meant to reflect back and build upon the past ten years of experience in preparedness efforts. Significant work has been accomplished already, but it was time to develop the next steps. The first deliverable was the National Preparedness Goal which was meant to establish a “finish line” for preparedness. But the Goal took more time than originally thought because answering “preparing for what?” is complicated. The Goal outlines the range of events and how they compare to core capabilities trying to be achieved by the nation. The next objective was making revisions to the National Exercise Program, training initiatives, and the grant programs. All revisions to existing programs were meant to support an overall National Preparedness System, prevent duplications, and leverage existing capabilities. The process is meant to be a two-year cycle of planning, exercises, training, and evaluation. FEMA wants to partner with existing exercise opportunities across the country with state and locals to be able to leverage them into a more national effort.

The National Preparedness Report was released May 3. The Report is meant to borrow from the Goal to look across the range of preparedness activities, integrate State Preparedness Reports, and determine a measureable progress report. The final aspect of the process is the National Frameworks. FEMA intentionally did not do a preparedness framework because the belief is the other frameworks are meant to support the overarching preparedness requirements. The frameworks are due to the President in June.

The next step was to address grants. FEMA was approached by the Secretary and White House to consider changes to the grant programs given existing recommendations made by associations, the Preparedness Task Force, and other stakeholders. The proposed National Preparedness Grant Program (NPGP) was meant to focus efforts on developing a collaborative preparedness system, sustaining existing capabilities, and filling existing gaps as identified. More details on the NPGP and how it will operate are due to be released by the end of May.

The THIRA is not intended to be a replacement of the risk formula in grant distribution. The overall goal was to create more consistency among the HIRA process and overall threat analysis. The THIRA guidance is meant to be a planning tool for broad use. The TCL list proved ineffective, so by expanding

the HIRA process, adding a way to understand threat, and introducing existing capabilities, the THIRA process could prove to be comprehensive and cross-cutting. Utilizing this information to establish gaps is difficult because it takes high level of trust among a broad range of responders and professionals. The truth is that some areas may have an excess of “capabilities,” and in a time of diminishing resources, we must establish where to best allocate funds. The THIRA process between states and locals should be resolved between those relationships. The federal government does not anticipate dictating how the THIRA will work within each state. States must have their THIRA completed by the end of the calendar year in order to be eligible to receive grant funds.

Facilitated Discussion: Updates to the NHSC White Paper: Consensus Building and Strategy Development

*Glen Woodbury, Executive Director
Center for Homeland Defense and Security*

Woodbury provided an overview of the recent update to the white paper, and participants overall agreed with the process and need for progression. Some members suggested discussing cross-cutting issues that go beyond traditional boundaries outlined in the paper such as impacts or the challenges stemming from fiscal constraints at all levels of government. Many smaller edits were considered and an updated version will be distributed.

Other long-range issues were brought-up for consideration. For example, explaining how the economic crisis compounds and amplifies homeland security challenges. The Consortium will not be able to solve the economic problems, but can outline how preparedness is affected as a result of the crisis. The constantly changing landscape of communications between responders, governments, and citizens was raised.

Three “asks” will be included at the conclusion; other associations outside the Consortium engage with members to discuss issues; elected leaders engage stakeholders during policy-making processes; and the NHSC will commit to exploring policy ramifications. Members were asked to submit remaining comments to Trina Sheets of NEMA with a new draft to be produced approximately June for consideration of approval by member associations.

The Federal Budget Outlook for FY2013 and Beyond

*Jennifer Lake, Will Painter, and Fran McCarthy
Congressional Research Service*

For 2013, DHS has approximately \$54 billion in budget authority with an additional \$6.4 billion for the Disaster Relief Fund (DRF) within FEMA. The bulk of DHS’ funds come from appropriations, and the balance from trust funds, fees, etc. OMB estimates the government will actually spend about \$68 billion in homeland security activities. The primary cause for the difference is the definition of HLS responsibilities. DHS, DOD, HHS, DOG, and DOS account for 92 percent of overall homeland security funding.

Looking historically, tracking homeland security funding is difficult as it was classified as “counterterrorism” and was very unorganized throughout the federal government. Total funding started at about \$44 billion in 2002, peaked in 2009, and has started to level out since just below that 2009 level. The trend in homeland security funding growth trends closely with discretionary funding for the entire government. CRS estimates a total of \$643 billion in homeland security activities between FY02 and

FY12; \$712 billion including 2013 request. The majority of the funding increase between FY 08 and FY 10 is primarily a result of the natural growth of the department as well as the response to major events such as Hurricane Katrina.

Specifically to 2013, the House and Senate have chosen very different numbers to the overall budget varying by about \$19 billion. The Budget Control Act (BCA) passed by Congress in 2011 is complicating the budgetary debate this year. Since the deadlines were missed last year, automatic sequestration is due to take effect in January, and overall cuts are due to be 2.5 times the current DHS budget. No DHS programs have been found to be exempt from the current sequestration plan. Sequestration was designed to be a topic to avoid, but has become inevitable without changes to the law. If it takes effect, approximately \$109 billion will be pulled back from the agencies (half from “defense” and half from the remaining agencies). OMB determines the mechanism for implementing the sequester.

The early years of the DHS budget went through the Appropriations process relatively smoothly. In recent years, however, the bill has become complicated with outside pressures in the form of challenges such as riders. The outlook for FY2013 is murky. FEMA is currently operating on approximately a \$650 million deficiency from the previous year. The DRF is complicated because it covers the cost of all open disasters, some FEMA operational costs, and transfers to other departments for disaster operations. The main concern moving forward is providing an adequate calculation for the DRF while working within the confines of the BCA. Even though the BCA established what appears to be a relatively high number for disaster costs that amount is spread throughout many agencies, so even though FEMA received approximately \$6 billion in 2012, but other agencies received another \$4 billion, so there is little wiggle room for expansion this year. Unfortunately, it appears funding will run dry in the middle of hurricane season with potentially little options for recharging the account. The belief of CRS is that the Appropriations for FY11, FY12, and projected for 13 are making significant strides toward accurately estimating disaster costs.

Update on the Current Terrorist Threat

*Mike Walker, Senior Consultant
Center for Homeland Defense and Security*

Walker began by postulating “why are we still here?” essentially questioning the need for continued vigilance in the realm of HLS. Some experts contend al Qaida is essentially gone and ineffective. In truth, the current threat is very real and continues to target the homeland even though al Qaida proper is less organized than ten years ago. In some countries, al Qaida is still viewed favorably which gives terrorists a target audience. In an effort to remain relevant, al Qaida has begun to franchise, work on homegrown terrorists, and work on those people already citizens of the United States which can move more freely.

Al Qaida is currently fractured and lacks leadership of bin Laden, but up and comers such as al-Suri have the potential to take over the organization. Overall, al Qaida has been going through some reorganizations and mergers to provide better cohesion. With the reorganizations has come more recruitment of Americans. With the decentralization of al Qaida comes an expansion into Africa, the Arabian Peninsula, and unknown potential in countries such as Iraq (with the U.S. drawdown) and Syria. Pakistan is quickly becoming “terrorism ground zero.” A very low percentage of Pakistani’s have a favorable view of the U.S., and the Foreign Policy Failed States Index has moved Pakistan up in their rankings significantly in the past couple years.

The reality of terrorists obtaining nuclear material is becoming more real. The instability in Pakistan specifically lends experts to believe the ability for terrorists to develop nuclear weapons is ever-present. This creates inconsistencies with American culture because complacency is becoming more of an issue. Such complacency can be dangerous because even though American law enforcement is tying-up terrorists trying to plan attacks or nuclear events, the other major threat of cybersecurity remains unresolved. Unfortunately, Walker believes the United States is simply not prepared to weather a cyber-attack. In addition to cybersecurity, professionals cite domestic protestors, manmade climate change, and even the budget deficit as critical threats.

Walker provided an overview of the Occupy! movement and how it relates to law enforcement tactics. Such a movement could easily morph into utilizing Black Bloc tactics which could negatively affect the outlook for Occupy! and threaten the stability of the balance between protestors and anarchists. On the opposite side of the political spectrum, militant and patriot organizations are also significantly on the rise and breed hundreds of thousands of “sovereign citizens,” or those who recognize no government structure. There does not, however, seem to be a connection between the domestic protestors and international terrorist organizations. But the possibility does exist. Today, the diversity of the threats is greater than ever. There is still a mission for the American people and local law enforcement by remaining vigilant and considering the full range of potential threats.

NHSC Business Session

Facilitated by Tri-Chairs Joe Wainscott and John Madden

- Gil Orrantia provided an update on the Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative. The initiative is meant to form and develop efficient sharing of data among justice entities and provide advice to the Attorney General. They meet twice a year and they also develop white papers and policy positions on information sharing systems. Recent projects include work on the D-Block, and sharing of criminal justice information among agencies.
- Annual tri-chair elections are coming-up and there will be a call for nominations approximately 90 days prior to the next meeting
- Funding is in place until the end of October for the Consortium, and more funding is forthcoming which will secure the group for the next 18 months.
- Thomas MacLellan from the NGA Center for Best Practices gave an update on the NGA efforts to support Governors in prepping for D-Block implementation. A strategy paper is in the works and a national meeting will be hosted June 28-29, to discuss upcoming issues.
- With cybersecurity becoming a growing issue, Dave Maxwell noted a concern with a lack of information technology associations represented at the Consortium.

◇◇◇◇

May 3, 2012

Information Sharing on Key Issues from NEMA-ASTHO Joint Policy Work Group Meeting

Dr. Karen Remley and Gerrit Bakker, ASTHO

Dave Maxwell, NEMA

Medical Countermeasures; Dr. Remley provided an overview of the discussion with the White House earlier in the week and the roles and responsibilities in distribution strategies. The National Guard

Bureau must also have a role, but caution must be used to avoid issues with the optics of armed soldiers. A strong risk communication strategy must be in place to explain to the public why they are not being vaccinated at perhaps the same time or place as the medical and first responder community and others.

Health and Human Services Grant Alignment; Bakker provided an overview of HHS/ASPR and CDC grants and how the alignment of those grants mirrors efforts currently underway in DHS with state and local grants. The primary challenges involved technical alignment, different reporting structures, and an incongruence between federal and state administration of the grants. States had been aligning the grants for several years while the federal government maintained separate administrative functions.

Functional Needs Support Services (FNSS); Maxwell discussed the current state of the FNSS issue. A package of letters from FEMA General Counsel and DoJ was distributed to Consortium members. The bottom line from legal counsel is that planning is key, so if jurisdictions ensure appropriate planning is done a lawsuit could be avoided. State and local planners should ensure planning is completed to address the full range of the population that may have special needs.

Crisis Response and Disaster Resilience 2030: Forging Strategic Action in an Age of Uncertainty

Dave Kaufman, Director

Office of Policy and Program Analysis, FEMA

Kaufman provided an overview and update on FEMA's Strategic Foresight Initiative (SFI). The objective is meant to better understand the factors driving change that will impact emergency and disaster management over the next 20 years. It will provide a shared sense of direction and help all sectors of response better prepare for future events and environments. The process has involved a broad range of stakeholders and will examine issues including changing role of the individual; climate change; critical infrastructure; the evolving terrorist threat; global interdependencies; government budgets; technological innovation and dependency; universal access to and use of information; and the shift in US demographics.

Traditional and predictive planning models rely on a "most likely" future. The SFI is utilizing a scenario-based planning method to look at "multiple futures" and many strategic needs and actions. Each of those "multiple futures" will have an impact on other drivers. The process resulted in 15 strategic needs which are laid-out in the presentation handout. The three overarching themes, however, include capabilities, models/tools, and relationships/partnerships. Kaufman presented the following five overarching strategic needs: Omni-directional knowledge sharing; full public/private involvement in all phases of emergency and disaster management; alternative surge models; enabling frameworks for cross-sector activity; and new risk management tools and processes.

Recognition for Major General Timothy Lowenberg

The AGAUS, DHS-IGA, GHSAC, and Consortium on the whole offered recognition to Lowenberg for his contributions to public safety and the Consortium.

Identification of NHSC Priorities and Action Items

Facilitated by Tri-Chairs Joe Wainscott and John Madden

- Manning presented copies of the National Preparedness Report and announced the release of the document later today.
- The suggestion was presented that the Consortium needs to develop a greater position on cyber-issues including the involvement of appropriate associations. A motion was made, seconded, and passed to offer an invitation for membership to NASCIO.
- Fusion centers serve a very important role and are currently relying on “soft” funding for sustainment. Even among the public health community, fusion centers are critical to maintaining a strong information sharing environment. Fusion centers also tie into the role of combating cybersecurity. The 72 centers across the country do not operate in isolation, but rather serve as one piece of the overall system where each aspect is necessary to enhance preparedness. The Fusion Center Association was also mentioned for either potential membership to the Consortium, or at a minimum offered an opportunity to present on current priorities and challenges.
- Long-term and widespread power outages as well as increased vulnerabilities and interdependencies across the country and preparedness spectrum. A possible enhancement to the discussion could be a facilitated dialogue with Kaufman specifically related to interdependencies and the global supply chain.
- The Consortium could be utilized to look beyond just the federal issues and begin identifying and highlighting best practices from state and local governments that are supported through non-federal funds.