



## 2018 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

### **SUPPORT BASELINE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT CAPABILITIES**

#### ***Emergency Management Performance Grants***

*With the dollar-for-dollar match, EMPG allows state and local officials to manage 35,109 events last year without a Federal disaster declaration. Continue funding this vital program and accommodate a 5 percent inflationary increase to \$368 million.*

### **SUPPORT STATE-TO-STATE COOPERATION TO DRIVE DOWN DISASTER COSTS**

#### ***Emergency Management Assistance Compact***

*States helping each other in responding to a disaster in lieu of Federal asset drives down disaster costs. Expanding EMAC from \$2 million to \$4 million annually will allow for modernization, integration, and expansion of EMAC and national mutual aid.*

### **STRENGTHEN MITIGATION, RESPONSE, AND RECOVERY PROGRAMS**

#### ***Provisions of the Disaster Recovery Reform Act***

*Amend response, recovery, and mitigation statutes to increase the management cost to 12 percent, build a robust pre-disaster mitigation doctrine, and allow for a more coordinated Federal review of post-disaster projects.*

### **REAFFIRM A COMMITMENT TO NATIONAL PREPAREDNESS**

#### ***State Homeland Security Grant, Urban Area Security Initiative, and Education & Training Programs***

*Needless and unjustified cuts to preparedness programs undermines the ability of state and local officials to continually answer the Federal and national call to reduce risk, more readily respond to events, and build the leadership of tomorrow.*

### **REASSESS THE DISASTER CAP ADJUSTMENT**

#### ***The Disaster Relief Fund and Wildland Fires***

*Congress must move swiftly to address needed updates to the Disaster Cap Adjustment under the Budget Control Act and appropriately account for funding wildland fires without trampling the tenets of the Stafford Act and assistance to states and locals.*



**SUPPORT BASELINE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT CAPABILITIES**  
*Emergency Management Performance Grants*

In FY17, 137 disasters required a major or emergency declaration through the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Beyond that, 35,109 events required state or local assets, but did not reach the level of a Federal declaration. Capabilities afforded through the Emergency Management Performance Grant (EMPG) allow these events to be managed without additional Federal expenditures.

**Federal Value.** EMPG represents one of the best bargains for the Federal investment. With the 50-50 matching requirement, of which many grantees over-match, the true investment in these capabilities is twice the Federal expenditure. In 2017, Congress committed \$350 million to EMPG, but when the match is factored in, the true impact exceeds \$700 million.

**State Accountability.** While the number of Federal disaster declarations remains relatively consistent year-to-year, states absorb any increase in disaster activity not rising to a Federal declaration. For example, despite EMPG being level-funded at \$350 million since 2013, the number of exercise participants, training courses and personnel receiving training, impact of outreach campaigns, alert and warning systems, and number of mutual aid agreements continues to rise.

**Misguided Budget Request.** The President's FY19 Budget Request needlessly recommends a funding level for EMPG of \$279 million – a 20 percent reduction. Even the budget documents cite EMPG as being for states to “achieve target levels of capability in catastrophic planning and emergency management.” Not only do grantees annually maintain the stated goal, but EMPG also enables training and exercise programs, public awareness and outreach campaigns, communications and warning systems, and mutual aid compacts. Furthermore, when factoring in the 50-50 match requirement, the \$71 million proposed reduction could equate to upwards to \$142 million in lost activity.

**Requested Action**

- In concert with local emergency managers, NEMA is requesting a 5 percent inflationary increase of EMPG from the current \$350 million to \$368 million.
- Members of both the House and Senate should ***include EMPG in Member Request Letters/Submissions*** to their respective Appropriations Committee during consideration of the FY19 budget. The below information may be of assistance in crafting the request:

ACCOUNT:	Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)
PPA:	Federal Assistance
PROGRAM:	Emergency Management Performance Grants
FY18 FUNDING LEVEL:	\$350,000,000
PRESIDENT'S REQUEST:	\$279,000,000
MEMBER REQUEST:	\$368,000,000 (not less than \$350 million)
JUSTIFICATION:	EMPG directly reduces the need for Federal assistance in responding to events requiring emergency management. With the 50-50 match requirement, any investment in EMPG is essentially doubled with state and local dollars.



**SUPPORT STATE-TO-STATE COOPERATION TO DRIVE DOWN DISASTER COSTS**  
*Emergency Management Assistance Compact*

States helping each other in responding to a disaster in lieu of Federal asset drives down disaster costs. This is the premise upon which the Emergency Management Assistance Compact (EMAC) is built.

**Background.** For over 22 years, EMAC provides personnel, equipment, and commodities during a gubernatorial-declared disaster or emergency to assist with response and recovery efforts in other states. Since February 2017, states deployed over 18,000 personnel through EMAC in response to Hurricane Harvey, Hurricane Irma, Hurricane Maria, Las Vegas Shooter, winter storms, and wildfires in California and Montana. States also deployed liaisons through EMAC to the National Response Coordination Center (NRCC) and Regional Response Coordination Centers (RRCCs) to coordinate the state EMAC response with FEMA and other Federal agencies

**Investing in the Next Phase.** Sustaining and building upon the successes of EMAC must be a priority to drive down the costs of disasters. The current annual investment of \$2 million is the minimum necessary to support the system used to request and deploy assets; conduct planning, training, and exercises; and complete after-action reviews of large-scale disaster activity. Given the continued growth of state-to-state assistance and reliance on EMAC by the Federal response system, the true annual cost of administering the Compact continues rising.

Additional funds are necessary to fully integrate EMAC within all emergency support functions; help States assess EMAC readiness; increase the work done pre-event to speed response; identify opportunities to include local emergency managers in assistance opportunities; ensure EMAC integration with ongoing risk assessments; and modernize the system utilized in deploying personnel and assets.

**Requested Action**

- NEMA is requesting an increase in funding for EMAC from the \$2 million requested in the President's budget to \$4 million.
- Members of both the House and Senate should ***include EMAC in Member Request Letters/Submissions*** to their respective Appropriations Committee during consideration of the FY19 budget. The below information may be of assistance in crafting the request:

ACCOUNT:	Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)
PPA:	Operations & Support
PROGRAM:	National Protection Directorate
PRESIDENT'S REQUEST:	\$2,000,000
MEMBER REQUEST:	\$4,000,000 (not less than \$2 million)
JUSTIFICATION:	EMAC reduces the reliance on Federal assistance and drives down disaster costs by allowing states to help one another. The \$2 million increase will allow for modernization, integration, and expansion of EMAC.



**STRENGTHEN MITIGATION, RESPONSE, AND RECOVERY PROGRAMS**  
*Provisions of the Disaster Recovery Reform Act*

With each major disaster season, state, local, and Federal emergency management partners take advantage of lessons learned. The 2017 season demonstrated specific shortfalls in current response and recovery doctrine to which Congress can easily remedy. With an eye toward sweeping reforms recommended by NEMA in November 2017 and the Disaster Recovery Reform Act (DRRA) still being considered by Congress, NEMA recommends the following reforms be implemented expeditiously:

**Management Costs.** Even during a Federally declared disaster, state and local officials maintain primary responsibility for all aspects of an emergency management event, so a percentage of disaster assistance is allowed for disaster grant management. The difference between FEMA's management costs and those allowed to the grantee, however, is staggering. In their report of December 2014 (GAO-15-65), the Government Accountability Office (GAO) found FEMA obligated \$1.7 billion to states and locals for administrative costs between 2004 and 2013 while utilizing more than seven times that amount for similar costs. This disparity discourages states from taking more responsibility for disaster management and shifts costs to the Federal government.

**Requested Action:** Amend SEC 324 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C 5165b) to allow for not less than 9.25 percent be made available for management cost by grantees and sub-grantees.

**Frontload Mitigation.** Currently, most Federal mitigation programs are awarded only after a disaster strikes. This does little to truly prevent damages, loss of life and property, and drive down the costs of disasters. By increasing flexibility in existing mitigation program and realigning the allocation of funds, states and the Federal government can operate as better partners in conducting effective mitigation and fully utilize the 6-to-1 return on investment in mitigation as highlighted in new studies.

**Requested Action:** Amend SEC 203 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C 5165b) to allow the establishment of a National Public Infrastructure Pre-Disaster Hazard Mitigation Program and allow the President to transfer up to 6 percent of disaster costs into a fund made available to states for pre-disaster mitigation.

**Requested Action:** To allow states to adequately budget and plan for mitigation funds, realign the existing Pre-disaster Mitigation Program (PDM) and allow FEMA to distribute funds based on a formula vice the current competitive model.

**Unified Federal Review.** Amid the recovery from a disaster, multiple Federal agencies descend on the affected area with programs often offering competing requirements and conflicting timelines. Communities and survivors are forced to juggle the various requirements of each agency independent of one another.

**Requested Action:** Require the President to catalog all available disaster assistance and develop a strategy to align requirements, reviews, and timelines.



## 2018 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

### *Talking Points*

#### **REAFFIRM A COMMITMENT TO NATIONAL PREPAREDNESS**

##### ***State Homeland Security Grant, Urban Area Security Initiative, and Education & Training Programs***

In 2001, the Federal government requested the assistance of state and local governments in closing the gap between existing levels of preparedness and a “new normal” established in the aftermath of September 11. Officials across the country responded quickly and began planning for the coming task by reorganizing governments, realigning budget, and acquiring new subject matter expertise all while managing myriad Federal requirements and changes in doctrine. The diversity and impact of the threats continue evolving, but the task remains the same – *assist the Federal government in achieving specific tasks and elevate the level of preparedness nationwide*. This goal is achieved through planning, equipment, education, training, exercises, development of mutual aid agreements, communications systems, and countless other activities forming a system of preparedness.

**State and Local Commitment.** Funding from programs such as the State Homeland Security Grant Program (SHSGP) and the Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) assist in these state and local efforts. NEMA, in partnership with the National Governors Association, the Governors Homeland Security Advisors Council, the National Association of Counties, the National Homeland Security Consortium, and the Big City Emergency Managers Association, is conducting a nationwide study examining how Federal spending is providing a return on investment in terrorism preparedness from states and localities.

**The Need for Federal Support.** The President’s FY19 Budget Request recommends a 25 percent reduction in both SHSGP and UASI in addition to a \$129 million reduction in Education, Training, and Exercises. Programs such as the Center for Homeland Defense and Security (CHDS) and the National Domestic Preparedness Consortium (NDPC) – both eliminated in the budget request – form the bedrock of preparedness efforts. For example, CHDS has:

- Awarded 1,018 Master’s degrees to officials at all levels of government (including Federal) and maintains enrollment of approximately 160 students;
- Graduated 637 participants through the nine-month Executive Leaders Program;
- Conducted 383 executive education seminars with Governors, Mayors of metropolitan areas, and their respective cabinets; and,
- Offers all curriculum, learning technologies, and educational resources to institutional partners (375 to date) free of charge.

Programs such as this is how baseline leadership is created. Homeland Security is constantly evolving and emerging due to new and changing threats. The nation should take pride in programs such as CHDS and all it can accomplish with only \$18 million.

#### **Requested Action**

- Encourage Congress to reject the proposed 25 percent budget cuts to SHSGP and UASI programs to allow grantees the time to finalize the work demonstrating return on investment.
- Encourage Members of Congress support the continuation of education and training programs such as CHDS (\$18M) and the NDPC (at least \$98M) to further develop the leadership of tomorrow.



## 2018 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

### *Talking Points*

#### **REASSESS THE DISASTER CAP ADJUSTMENT** *The Disaster Relief Fund and Wildland Fires*

**Background.** The Disaster Relief Fund (DRF) is the account within FEMA which assists states, localities, and tribes after a disaster. Prior to the Budget Control Act (BCA) of 2011, annual appropriations for the DRF rarely covered the full cost of routine or emergency disaster activity throughout the fiscal year, and the account regularly required supplemental funding. The BCA fundamentally changed the Federal government’s approach to disaster funding from a reactive posture to a proactive one by creating a sequestration-exempt Disaster Relief Allowable Adjustment (Disaster Cap).

**Constrained Cap.** Due to the nature of the formula which determines the Disaster Cap, the available amount for the DRF continues a downward trajectory. Unfortunately, while disaster cost estimates remain relatively stable at \$7 billion (not including catastrophic disasters), the Disaster Cap fell from \$18 billion in FY15 to an estimated \$7.4 billion in FY19. In the absence of changes to the cap calculation, disaster funding will once again have to rely on supplemental funding for the DRF, and given legislative delays could require FEMA to halt critical assistance during response or recovery activities.

**Wildland Fires.** In recent years, FEMA received sufficient funding through its annual appropriation to support disaster needs in all but the most extreme cases, but the space available within the Disaster Cap continues to dwindle. This problem is only exacerbated when attempting to also address the much-needed fix to adequately fund wildland fires on Federal lands. The U.S. Departments of Agriculture (USDA) and Interior (DOI) currently exercise “fire borrowing” from components which greatly complicates budgetary processes and forces those fighting wildland fires to look elsewhere in the Federal government for solutions. The DRF – meant to support state and local governments under the Stafford Act – is not appropriate for funding wildland fires on Federal lands. Instead, USDA and DOI should be eligible for calculation into the annual Disaster Cap formula.

**Requested Action.** While the current cap expires in FY21, Congress must act immediately to ensure the continued flow of adequate disaster funds by:

- Adjusting the cap back to FY15 levels;
- Allow unused amounts to carry-over more than one year;
- Add USDA and DOI to the 10-year Disaster Cap calculation to adequately provide funding for wildland fires.