



## **NEMA COMMITTEE REPORTS**

### **2019 MID-YEAR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AND POLICY AND LEADERSHIP FORUM**

**NEMA Legal Counsel Committee**  
**March 29, 2019**  
**Meeting Summary**

**What Legal Counsel Need to Know from the DRRRA**

To accommodate schedules of some speakers, Committee Chair Brenda Bergeron rearranged the posted agenda. Adrian Sevier, FEMA Chief Counsel provided an overview of those aspects of the Disaster Recovery Reform Act (DRRA) of particular note for Legal Counsel. He highlighted the 48 discreet pieces of the DRRA and how implementation will take some time due to many provisions requiring changes in policy and/or regulations. For many of the provisions, FEMA is still working on gaining clarity with regard to Congressional intent and the path forward. Sevier outlined four specific provisions:

Section 1210 provides FEMA the authority to waive the duplication of benefit limitations at the request of a Governor and exempts Public Assistance and loans from being considered as a duplication. The intended target of this provision is the Community Development Block Grant – Disaster Recovery program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and loans from the Small Business Administration. Sevier does not anticipate widespread use of this provision due to limited applicability.

Section 1210(b) clarifies Congressional intent on use of Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) funds to pay for projects of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). In the past, FEMA deferred on these issues feeling it was for the Appropriations Committee to handle and USACE having the more specific authority. The priority for FEMA is ensuring states remain in control of HMGP usage.

Section 1215 is the popular provision increasing management cost allowance. There remains some confusion between authors of the legislation and FEMA regarding a possible conflict in the provision between “shall provide” and “not more than.” FEMA envisions this as providing reimbursement “up to” the maximum allowable, but costs must still be eligible.

Section 1216 is the debt waiver for Individual Assistance. Sevier clarified this will not mean a waiver of all debts but can be requested with some limitations. He expects more information being available in approximately 30 days.

**Legal Issues from Recent Disasters**

Will Polk outlined some of the recent issues experienced in North Carolina. He specifically highlighted:

- Managing expectations inside and outside of the Emergency Operations Center;
- Remaining aligned with legal counsel in the Governor’s Office;
- Working pre-event with local attorneys on interpretation of local laws;
- Understanding EMAC licensures and liabilities;
- Sheltering issues such as managing sex offenders and those who arrive with weapons; and
- Maintain an open dialogue with the FEMA Office of Chief Counsel.

Holly Welch brought some concerns from the EMAC Committee, all focusing primarily on “getting back to basics” with the EMAC articles. The articles highlighted include State Requirements (Article 1), Law Enforcement Limitations (Article 4), Licenses/Permits (Article 5), Liabilities (Article 6), Compensation (Article 8) and Reimbursement (Article 9). She stressed the importance of EMAC being a state owned and operated tool, so responsibility for success lies with states and not FEMA.

**Efficacy of Authorities and Declarations**

The final part of the agenda focused on some recent headlines about policy direction within the administration as it relates to declarations. FEMA clarified they see “tweets” as any other statement or speech made by an administration official. They will always require additional clarity on intent and legalities. Furthermore, while legally possible, FEMA knows of no instance where a declaration was rescinded. Finally, Sevier educated the committee on the difference between a “national emergency” and “emergency declaration,” as many recent headlines conflated these two issues regarding construction of the southern border wall. Sevier was clear on how a “national emergency” is specific to the National Emergencies Act of 1976 and in no way relates to an “emergency declaration” pursuant to the Stafford Act.

**NEMA EMAC Committee  
March 30, 2019  
Meeting Summary**

Mike Dossett, EMAC Committee Chair, provided introductions and called the meeting to order. Roll call was completed and there was a quorum.

**EMAC Coordinators Meeting**

Mike Dossett thanked all the Directors for sending their EMAC Coordinators to the first meeting that brought together the EMAC Coordinators in each of the EMAC Member States. The meeting was a great opportunity to share best practices, discuss the intent of EMAC law, and to exchange ideas on how to continually improve the EMAC system.

**EMAC Events Update and Director's Brief**

EMAC Executive Task Force Chair Michelle Kuzera provided an update on EMAC Operations since March of 2018: 4638 personnel have been deployed through EMAC in response to flooding, gas line breaks, the measles outbreak, an earthquake, hurricanes Florence and Michael, and wildfires.

Kuzera reported the EMAC After Action Report for the 2017 Hurricane Season was completed in October of 2018. Two special assignment task forces were established as a result of the AAR: reimbursement and situational awareness. The AAR is posted on the EMAC website and available for download.

Director Dossett thanked Michelle Kuzera for her work on the EMAC ETF, exceptional support to EMAC Member states.

**Executive Task Force Leadership Transition**

Director Dossett asked if the Executive Task Force had a nomination for Chair Elect to the Executive Task Force. Michelle Kuzera stated The Executive Task Force unanimously nominated Jake Ganieany from Montana to serve as the Chair Elect to the EMAC Executive Task Force.

Director Dossett asked if there is a motion to accept the nomination of Jake Ganieany as Chair Elect to the EMAC Executive Task Force. Director Satula made a motion. Motion seconded by Thomas Travis. Motion approved.

**Emergency Management Policy: Reimbursement Recommendations**

Greg Shanks, the Lead for the Reimbursement Special Assignment Task Force (SATF) findings of the SATF.

The SATF identified eleven (11) recommendations for the EMAC Committee to consider as approved by the EMAC Executive Task Force:

1. The need for a standardized reimbursement form for compiling the reimbursement package. The proposed form is adapted from a FEMA PA worksheet to align with the EMAC process. The SATF would like to move forward with the standardized form to develop a pilot project for states to test and at the end of the pilot to take a vote to formally adopt the form. The form won't solve supporting documentation requirements, which is an issue. Some states are requiring excessive documentation for internal audits or possible future audits. Since these documentation standards differ from the EMAC reimbursement guidelines it has caused considerable issues.

2. EMAC Operations System enhancements to upload supporting documentation. The current system tracks dates but does not support reimbursement package uploads.
3. Revisions to the Reimbursement Section of the EMAC Operations Manual to support the changes proposed in #1 and #2.
4. Refine the EMAC Finance Coordinator role and require they take the EMAC Reimbursement online course.
5. Reimbursement phase tracking using the EOS.
6. Revive the EMAC readiness assessment tool for states to complete their self-assessment and improve their EMAC programs.
7. EMAC state site visits by NEMA to provide feedback for the improvement of EMAC implementation in states as part of a readiness assessment, training, Mission Ready Package workshop, and exercise.
8. Uniform processing of EMAC missions for FEMA Public Assistance projects.
9. Increase support during the reimbursement phase from the National Coordinating State (NCS).
10. Deploying EMAC Reimbursement A-Teams who specialize in helping a state prepare for EMAC reimbursement. The Reimbursement SATF will develop a reimbursement MRP template for states to build out specialty teams that states can request.
11. Quarterly reports for reimbursement provided by the Requesting State on the status of all missions.

Director Dossett thanked Greg for leading the SATF and the excellent work the SATF has done in identifying issues and providing recommendations. The standardization of EMAC reimbursement across all states is vital.

The question was asked how long the pilot would be. Shanks said the pilot will be used for the New Madrid exercise event, and some real-world use, and that it would take approximately a year to use the form and get feedback for changes. Director Dossett suggested the quarterly reporting is part of the reporting in the EOS and states could access the reports as needed. If states are using the EOS to track and upload reimbursements, the report is part of the system. It was stated that the recommendations can solve a lot of problems, but directors should work together to resolve issues. There was a motion to accept the recommendations by Director Budd (Wyoming) to accept the eleven recommendations as discussed. The motion was seconded by Director Willis (Colorado). The motion carried.

### **Recommendations for Situational Awareness**

Director Dossett thanked Alex Abdun-Nabi for leading the SATF for Situational Awareness. Mr Abdun-Nabi provided the background on the need for additional situational awareness as identified during the 2017 after action process. In general, the A-Team needed the following matrix of information: conditions on the ground including lodging, meals, and resource flow. How many resources are coming into the state and what logistical support they needed.

The SATF made the following recommendations to the EMAC Committee for consideration as approved by the EMAC Executive Task Force:

1. Adoption of an ArcGIS tool to collect and display situational awareness information and incorporating minor changes into the SITREP function within the EOS. The SATF developed two surveys using Survey123 and their accompanying dashboards. The first survey focuses on traveler information, transportation information, and lodging details. The second survey created is a ground condition survey, capturing; resource information and ground conditions.

2. The second recommendation NEMA has already implemented. It is the development of an “Indicate Interest” button with the EOS where Assisting States can let a Requesting State know they are interested in making an offer of assistance.
3. The third recommendation is a review of the fields in the SITREP and identifying changes that would improve the format.

Finally, the new tools would have to be incorporated into the A-Team training course. The data would be used by Requesting States, NCS, NELT, RELTs, and NEMA only.

The plan is to pilot the use of the surveys in exercises and events over the next year. Director Dossett thanked Alex and work of the SATF members.

The question was asked where the data would be housed. Abdun-Nabi stated the data would be collected through NEMA’s ArcGIS account and available through the EMAC EOS. Question if this survey would be optional and what’s the bandwidth for a team to have time to do a survey when they arrive. Abdun-Nabi recognized the bandwidth concern but added each survey would take less than 5 minutes or less to complete through an email to the deployed personnel, and that it could be enforced through the state director and state policy level. Emphasis of the utility, and relationship building, and the importance of the data providing ground truth. It’s up to the individual state to decide whether their deployed staff would be completing the survey. Question on whether responders were pulled in, to provide input and test. Abdun-Nabi said most had deployed that provided input, but at this point it is a concept and has been tested for functionality and looking forward to piloting it. Director Dossett said that Kentucky rolled out something similar to Kentucky regional directors. Each survey took staff less than ten seconds and provided immediate data for decision making. Dossett also recognized there are some entities capturing data without state knowledge and directors aren’t approving the collection or dissemination of the data. Technical questions about Survey123; without access to the internet, could the survey be completed then uploaded when the device has an internet connection. Dossett said yes, and they’ve tested that within Kentucky.

There was a motion for the SATF to continue the development and pilot the use of the situational awareness with states made by Director Sheehan (Tennessee). The motion was seconded by Director Budd (Wyoming). The motion carried.

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Director Sheehan (Tennessee). The motion was seconded by Director McGowan (Michigan). The motion carried, and the meeting was adjourned.

**NEMA Mitigation Committee  
March 30, 2019  
Meeting Summary**

**Closing the Insurance Gap**

Paul Huang, Assistant Administrator for Federal Insurance of FEMA stressed the importance of breaking the repetitive cycle of insurance. He compared the average payouts during Hurricane Harvey for both Individual Assistance and the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The insurance conversation must also expand beyond just flooding and touch on other hazards of well. FEMA recognizes the inherent challenges, especially when many Americans can barely cover their basic homeowners' policies. To accomplish some measured changes, FEMA intends to rebuild public confidence in the NFIP program, update modeling and rate structure, and work toward making the program sounder financially and programmatically. Huang went over the President's FY20 Budget Proposal which includes a subsidy program and highlighted how FEMA is in discussion with Capitol Hill about whether the current \$20 billion in debt even should be paid back.

As the presentation shifted to discussion, Committee members commented how NFIP must be integrated with other programs and structured in a way for citizens unable to afford the premiums. Also, as more private companies continue showing interest in the flood insurance market, any transition from NFIP to a private insurer must be seamless to avoid exposure of policy holders.

**Next Steps on Integrating CDBG-DR with Emergency Management**

Mike Sprayberry (NC) and Stan Gimont (HUD) provided the state and federal perspectives on HUD's CDBG-DR program. Sprayberry stressed the importance of pre-planning. Outreach to other state agencies, an understanding of CDBG-DR, and the groundwork for planning requirements remain critical for success in those state yet to receive CDBG-DR. Even if a state feels they will never achieve CDBG-DR eligibility, an awareness of the process and requirements will ease a possible transition in the future.

Similarly, Gimont outlined how managing CDBG-DR must be done by adopting a long-range strategy. Despite receiving current data from FEMA (Individual and Public Assistance) and the Small Business Administration, the lack of authorization and time to implement the program is time consuming. HUD does maintain significant flexibility in waiving provisions to establish more appropriate guidelines, but this process should not be seen as a "cure all" for difficulties in managing the program. He also cautioned state directors to remain on the lookout for victims' rights and organizations representing low-income housing as they follow the program closely and do not hesitate to litigate.

**The New Predisaster Paradigm**

The Committee ran out of time before completing work on a one-page document on the short-, medium-, and long-term challenges and opportunities and alignment of state and local priorities of the new PDM program. Committee Chair Russ Strickland outlined how the committee will meet again via teleconference in the near future to determine next steps. He encouraged the committee to consider the full mitigation continuum and think bigger than the current PDM program. Pam Williams of the BuildStrong Coalition attended the committee meeting and outlined their common principles for the new program. Additional follow-up will be available once the committee completes initial work.

**NEMA Homeland Security Committee  
March 30, 2019  
Meeting Summary**

**CHDS Executive Education Program**

Dawn Wilson and David Fukutomi from the Center for Homeland Defense and Security (CHDS) presented recent changes to the Executive Education Program within the Center. The new program will be adaptable based on the needs of state directors and other state and local customers. This restructuring of the program comes with a significant number of gubernatorial transitions and the need to continually evolve executive education in the fields of homeland security and emergency management.

**The Relationship with Fusion Centers**

After the Annual Forum, the Homeland Security Committee outlined as a priority an examination of the relationship between fusion centers and emergency management agencies. To achieve this, the committee committed to explore the various governance models for fusion centers, look at some of the legal issues, and begin working on the next phase of the project which will include a brief survey of the NEMA membership and a report by the committee. Specific for this meeting, Brian Hastings (AL), Mark Ghilarducci (CA), Mario Sinatra (representing Patrick Callahan of New Jersey), and Jackie White (NM) outlined the governance models for their state.

**Alabama**

**Origin:** 3/03-DHS, 9/11 Commission; 6/03-ADHS, First in Nation; 2007-AFC for terrorism & crime  
**Governance:** AEMA-Cabinet Level -->GOV; AFC->ALEA-Cabinet Level -->GOV  
**Relationships:** Based on informal relationships; ALEA LNO support to SEOC operations (Disasters); AEMA provides LNO & C2 support to ALEA operations  
**Successes/Challenges/Examples:** Separate orgs, but SOLID coalition; Big events & sensitive complex ops

**California**

**Origin:** 2001: Established its first fusion center; 2004: Established 4 fusion centers (Regional Threat Assessment Centers, or RTACs). RTAC AORs are: Central CA, Los Angeles, Northern CA, and San Diego  
Later, established Major Urban Area Center in Orange County  
**Governance:** EM governance: Cal OES part of Governor's Office  
**Relationships:** STAC rep embedded in the State Operations Center during activations; STAS reports up to the HSA/State Emergency Manager  
**Successes/Challenges/Examples:** Increased info sharing; strong relationships with the Intel Community between/during incidents; Example: San Bernardino

**New Jersey**

**Origin:** Fully adopted after 9/11; Opened in 2006  
**Governance:** EM under the NJSP; Fusion Center under the NJSP  
**Relationships:** Collocated; Formal and informal connections  
**Successes/Challenges/Examples:** Rahimi bombings; EMAC deployments



## **New Mexico**

**Origin:** Created after 9/11; under Governor's Office of Homeland Security; Transitioned to DPS in 2004 and DHSEM in 2006

**Governance:** Reports to Cabinet Secretary (DHSEM Intelligence & Security) and CABSEC to Governor

Supports governance/oversight board (public safety partners)

**Relationships:** Certify in FEMA NIMS/ICS; Seat at EOC during events; Situational awareness to EOC/EM

**Successes/Challenges/Examples:** Improved client engagement, intel support, and info sharing; Embraced production model and on-demand support; DHSEM statutory authority negatively impacts; Lacks space to co-locate partners

Next, Samantha Laddich (NEMA Legal Counsel Committee) previewed some of the legal issues inherent to managing fusion centers, including some recent research she completed on the issue. Laddich discussed how information sharing across state lines can be particularly challenging. Further complicating the issue is that only 10 fusion centers nationwide operate with state statutory authority. She suggested the importance of a state-centric compact for fusion centers for officials to use in creating legal uniformity.

Finally, Mike Sena (National Fusion Center) and Kevin Saupp (DHS Intelligence & Analysis) highlighted some current fusion center issues from their perspective. Based on surveys, only about 40 of 2,900 fusion centers nationwide identify as being with "emergency management." The numbers are similar for fire and public health personnel. Through guidance, FEMA occasionally attempts to clarify the relationships between fusion centers and EOCs, and a common watch center is the most popular way to address this communication.

## **Working with the NDPC**

Al Davis, of the National Domestic Preparedness Consortium joined the committee and made the pitch for support. The Consortium is once again slated for elimination in the President's FY20 budget proposal. Committee members reinforced the importance of the training provided and vowed to support the NEMA Legislative Committee as it included defense of the Consortium as a legislative priority for 2019.

**NEMA Response & Recovery Committee**  
**March 31, 2019**  
**Meeting Summary**

Andrew Phelps (OR) stepped in to Chair the Response and Recovery Committee. He opened the meeting with a welcome.

**Good360**

Jim Alvey, Director of Partnerships, Disaster Recovery

Good360 is a global leader in purposeful giving with the mission to provide a sense of renewed possibility to individuals, families, and communities impacted by disasters or other challenging life circumstances. One of the many ways they do this is to match up companies with State emergency management programs to assist the network in long-term recovery. With 70% of donations occur within the first two months after a disaster, and 60% of goods donated during times of disaster end up as waste, and only 5% of the funding gained is designated to long-term recovery efforts; the Good360 disaster recovery program identified a need to even out the recovery field and work with federal/state partners and companies/businesses that want to help to deliver a more cohesive network to assist in disaster recovery efforts.

**State-Led Managed Disasters and Public Assistance Model Panel**

Nancy Dragani, FEMA

Cody Schulz, North Dakota

Will Polk, North Carolina

Laura Adcock, Ohio

State-Led Managed Disasters – North Dakota embraced the state-led managed disasters concept primarily for the customer service aspect of the program. As Director Schulz explained, the people at the State level know the people and geographical terrain so it just makes it easier due to the already established relationships. North Dakota has three state agencies that partner with emergency management to respond in a disaster: Department of Transportation, the National Guard, and reservists that have engineering skills (retirees). And while the biggest challenge with managing your own disaster is staffing due to it being difficult to fill non-permanent or part-time positions as well as the uptick of tracking overtime; they lean on FEMA to help fill in the gaps where they may lack in capacity depending on the disaster. Ms. Dragani reminded that the guidance documentation is published. The program is not based on a money threshold, but is customized, through negotiations between the State and FEMA, based on the complexity of the disaster. The program is not mandatory but does provide States more options to scale their needs per how much and where they would prefer FEMA's assistance.

Public Assistance Model – The delivery model is more efficient but still has a few bottlenecks in the process and documentation requirements that overall can be addressed as more training becomes available. Procurement is very important especially when a State can maintain and ensure alignment with contracts and contractual processes to policy and procedures that help determine proper reimbursement.

**NEMA Preparedness Committee**  
**March 31, 2019**  
**Meeting Summary**

Eric Bornemann (VT), Preparedness Committee Chair, opened the meeting with a welcome.

**National Climate Assessment Report: The State of the States**

Keely Maxwell, U.S. Global Change Research Program

The U.S. Global Change Research Program published the fourth *National Climate Assessment Report*. More details of the report as well as a breakdown by region can be found at [www.globalchange.gov](http://www.globalchange.gov). Through an executive level briefing, Ms. Keely explored the trends in hazards risks and impacts, as well as adaptation and risk management from findings published in the scientific report. With a focus on impacts of wildfire, heavy rains/flooding, sea level rise, and heat, it is easily identifiable that climate change is non-linear. Ms. Keely identified how such threats can impact vulnerable populations. In addition, the report provides a way to measure impacts and predictions of future climate trends for adaptation and risk management strategies that could potentially impact how best emergency management programs prepare their facilities and operations. This report concludes as another resource to use when preparing for hazards and threats to communities.

**Does all that Planning and Preparedness Ever Payoff?**

Mike Sutton (AK)

Mark Roberts (AK)

In a simple word from Alaska, Yes. Director Sutton and Mr. Roberts shared an eye-opening testament of the treacherous Cook Inlet 7.0 Earthquake to prove how their cunning response was due to the strength in their preparedness activities. The takeaways: Every test, exercise and training are hugely beneficial. The Lifelines proved to be a natural fit. Be sure to include administrative and financial roles in those training exercises as well as partners. The public/private partnerships are heavily relied on during the Alaska response which proved beneficial as buckled roads were repaired and open to the public in days. Earthquake training in schools displayed that the students and teachers knew exactly what to do and when to do it. Down to the fact that the teacher told the students to grab your cell phones and text (not call) parents to let them know that they were okay. The lessons learned are always present and will be incorporated in their after-action reports, but the bottom line was Alaska was prepared and due to that preparedness, all lives were saved!

**IPAWS Progressive Moves**

Mark Lucero, FEMA

Mr. Lucero is a Branch Chief within the IPAWS program and was influential in the on-going pilot that pinpoints warnings/alerts geographically. The pilot extends until May for IPAWS to assess the reporting measures on the success of pinpointing locations that would need to be alerted. The National Alert, formerly known as the Presidential Alert, exposed that more people are signed into EAS. The FCC/IPAWS look to expand the number of characters for alerts to 360 in May. As a follow up for the committee, the Preparedness Committee will readdress a letter from NEMA to IPAWS expressing the procedure of ballistic missile warnings along with a revised IPAWS guidance document post the Mid-Year Forum.

**NEMA Private Sector Committee**  
**April 1, 2019**  
**Meeting Summary**

Chair Shandi Treloar welcomed the participants and guests and began the meeting with the introduction of the newly created Private Sector Lead Coordination Group. This group will be made up of state private sector liaisons with the goals of peer networking, sharing best practices and discuss opportunities and challenges to improve public-private partnerships.

Focus will be:

- Integrating the private sector into the fray for EM and building those partnerships;
- ESF 14
- Public private partnership

The chair then introduced Paul Stockton and Rob Glenn to discuss the private sector role in ESF-14.

Emergency Support Function (ESF) #14 – Long-Term Community Recovery provides a mechanism for coordinating Federal support to State, tribal, regional, and local governments, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), and the private sector to enable community recovery from the long-term consequences of extraordinary disasters. ESF #14 accomplishes this by identifying and facilitating availability and use of sources of recovery funding and providing technical assistance (such as impact analyses) for community recovery and recovery planning support.

The disasters in 2017 highlighted gaps in response implementation. The goal for ESF-14 is to be business led, government supported and enable interdependencies to provide standardization to all levels of government.

To maximize its impact, stakeholders must:

- Recognizing where they are now, and update the national response framework to become more streamlined for all stakeholders
- Better coordination has improved stakeholder engagement
- Community lifelines have been developed and pushed by both the government and the private sector
- Need to better understand those systems including the 16 sectors
- Looking at an interdependency task force
- Mitigate cascading failures across sectors
  - This is a major issue as again the idea of compounding problems is a nightmare for EM and the Private Sector
- National critical supply chains
  - Assessment and Analysis
    - Infrastructure and development
    - Planning can occur before the disaster
    - Better head start on recovery
    - Data sets is the way in which we are looking to go
  - Super connected system and the private sector vulnerabilities

- Lifelines owners are operationalizing analytics
  - Integrated planning
- Operational coordination
  - Further the way of standardization so that the partnerships are much more streamline and organized
- After 9/11 terrorism became part of the preparedness
  - Infrastructure threats are being posed to the cyber realm
    - China, Russia, DPK
  - There needs to be governmental support in the private sector and that they are going to be attacking those areas of critical infrastructure
    - Needs to be able to talk in that private public partnership
- Analyze cross sector dependencies to determine vulnerabilities.
  - Sequencing response activities can reduce vulnerability
  - Ensure lifelines are stabilized
  - Develop SOP to reflect ESF 14 evolution and recognize there is a trial and error to it  
Unified effort is key to moving forward
  - Collect, analyze data and share post event so all the states have that same information
    - Streamlined information and standardization will only serve to better both response time and cooperation in the future based on trust of the organizations and stakeholders

#### Comments:

- A state private sector liaison stated the need for communication
- Puerto Rico should have focused on the power grid instead of the food and water. Although it seemed important at the time it caused a longer period without power that ended up causing a longer delay in the restoration of the grid
- Make sure resources are not stretched too thin.
- States need communication with stakeholders

Committee Vice Chair Joel Thomas gave an update on activities of the Information Sharing Task Force.

- Many aspects have changed since they began
  - Updating to include lifelines so that the private sector can capitalize the importance of the information sharing practices
  - Sharing data amongst the states
  - Standardized templates for information sharing
  - Participation in Shaken Fury Exercise
- Information exchange standards are being updated and other standards are being assessed
  - What other standards are out there to change and modify the analysis?
- Hoping to publish a 2.0 guide to increase value to states and the private sector alike
- Looking at lifelines in the task force that the economy plays a super important role in regard to the national security

The chair asked the committee and audience to break into group and consider three questions:

1. Practical ways for directors to advance economic development;
2. Are there state policy and program challenges to working with the private sector;

### 3. What is the role of the emergency manager in policy changes.

Key themes from group discussion:

- Developing a framework so that emergency managers can determine the impacts and inform the decision-making process. States and communities understand their economic backyards best.
- Risk and Resilience
  - Some are hurting the economy and need to find ways to do better in this regard and how communities are changing
    - How can we better engage organizations?
    - Smart recovery and smart investments
- Must consider all aspects of the community:
  - Natural
  - Social
  - Economic
    - Relationship between what we are doing and how it is impacting society
    - Understanding data and analytics for future impacts
- Consider impacts of corporate cuts during disasters and the ramifications to local economies
  - More plastic waste (water bottles) after the hurricane or other disasters
  - Divide the various efforts in the short term, and long-term recovery policies
  - Transportation recovery
  - Micro loan concepts
  - Community based pre-disaster recovery plan and what they can do from the local level regarding the private sector
  - Looking at metrics
  - Looking not only at natural disasters but the opioid crisis, terrorism, school shootings and homelessness in addition
  - Looking at past disasters and resulting economic development needs to chart the entire life cycle and not just something that is at one point in time
    - Funding changes as a result of the disaster can alter economic development on every level
  - There are matching departments that are actively working with business, so partnerships should be developed with those entities for information sharing on programs and initiatives already in place.
  - Take the ICS training
  - Workforce retention and development
  - What kind of infrastructure is important to the impact zone?
  - Some states have, or are in the process, of hiring resilience officers to work with economists to more accurately determine the true impact to the local and state economy.

The chair thanked the participants for attending, reminded them to complete the post forum survey and, with no further discussion, concluded the meeting.

**NEMA Legislative Committee  
Monday, April 1, 2019  
Meeting Summary**

**A Capitol Hill Snapshot with Congressional Staff**

A tremendous number of Congressional staff participated in the committee meeting. Staff for every key committee outlined priorities in the coming year. Participants included staff from the House Appropriations Committee (majority), Senate Appropriations Committee (minority), House Transportation and Infrastructure (majority and minority), Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs (minority), and House Homeland Security (majority).

All staff delivered similar messages to the committee:

- They regularly utilize the EMPG Return on Investment Report, find the data useful, and reiterated the need for NEMA and IAEM to continue the annual exercise.
- Monitoring the implementation of the DRRRA and importance of stakeholders like NEMA to communicate firmly with the administration and keep Congress informed. Many also expressed the need for FEMA to move expeditiously, and to not allow OMB full control of implementation.
- Examination of the full suite of federal disaster programs, how they interact with one another, and those efforts required to streamline requirements while ensuring responsible use by grantees. This would include the efficacy of allowing the use of one federal program to fulfill match requirements of another.
- The focus on border security by administration leadership causes “mission creep” throughout the department. It will be important to statutory missions to be respected while implementing the border mission.
- With the administration’s proposed “National Priorities Security Grant Program,” stakeholders will need to more clearly define the benefits of the existing preparedness grants to either defend existing programs or support the new proposal.
- Ongoing disaster response, particularly the performance of the federal government in under-served areas such as Puerto Rico.

**Reviewing NEMA’s CDBG-DR Position**

The committee tabled this issue for further consideration after the Forum.

**Legislative Update from FEMA**

Jessica Nalepa, Director of External Affairs for FEMA discussed three key issues on which FEMA is working in the coming year. The passing of the DRRRA is just the beginning in terms of amending disaster recovery programs and they continually inventory issues for the next big package. As FEMA implements new and existing programs, they discover many which may need legislative changes, and encouraged state directors to highlight the same. Finally, the reauthorization of NFIP is an important priority for the agency and they remain in contact with Congress regarding what changes are needed and how best to address them, such as proposed subsidy programs in the FY20 budget request.