AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

THE PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 2007 BUDGET: ENHANCING PREPAREDNESS FOR FIRST RESPONDERS

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS, SCIENCE, AND TECHNOLOGY

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED NINTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

FEBRUARY 8, 2006

Serial No. 109–67

Printed for the use of the Committee on Homeland Security

Available via the World Wide Web: http://www.gpoaccess.gov/congress/index.html

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

36–543 PDF WASHINGTON : 2007

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512–1800; DC area (202) 512–1800
Fax: (202) 512–2104 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402–0001

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY

PETER T. KING, New York, *Chairman*

DON YOUNG, Alaska
LAMAR S. SMITH, Texas
CURT WELDON, Pennsylvania
CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, Connecticut
JOHN LINDER, Georgia
MARK E. SOUDER, Indiana
TOM DAVIS, Virginia
DANIEL E. LUNGREN, California
JIM GIBBONS, Nevada
ROB SIMMONS, Connecticut
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
STEVAN PEARCE, New Mexico
KATHERINE HARRIS, Florida
BOBBY JINDAL, Louisiana
DAVE G. REICHERT, Washington
MICHAEL T. MCCAUL, Texas
CHARLIE DENT, Pennsylvania
GINNY BROWN-WAITE, Florida

BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
EDWARD J. MARKEY, Massachusetts
NORMAN D. DICKS, Washington
JANE HARMAN, California
PETER A. DEFAZIO, Oregon
NITA M. LOWEY, New York
ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia
ZOE LOFGREN, California
SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, Texas
BILL PASCRELL, JR., New Jersey
DONNA M. CHRISTENSEN, U.S. Virgin Islands
BOB ETHERIDGE, North Carolina
JAMES R. LANGEVIN, Rhode Island
KENDRICK B. MEEK, Florida

SUBCOMMITTE ON EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS, SCIENCE, AND TECHNOLOGY

DAVE G. REICHERT, Washington, *Chairman*

LAMAR S. SMITH, Texas
CURT WELDON, Pennsylvania
ROB SIMMONS, Connecticut
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
STEVAN PEARCE, New Mexico
KATHERINE HARRIS, Florida
MICHAEL MCCAUL, Texas
CHARLIE DENT, Pennsylvania
GINNY BROWN-WAITE, Florida
PETER T. KING, New York *(Ex Officio)*

BILL PASCRELL, JR., New Jersey
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
NORMAN D. DICKS, Washington
JANE HARMAN, California
NITA M. LOWEY, New York
ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia
DONNA M. CHRISTENSEN, U.S. Virgin Islands
BOB ETHERIDGE, North Carolina
BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi *(Ex Officio)*

CONTENTS

Page

STATEMENTS

The Honorable Dave Reichert, a Representative in Congress From the State of Washington, and Chairman, Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Science, and Technology 1
The Honorable Bill Pascrell, Jr., a Representative in Congress From the State of New Jersey, and Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Science, and Technology 3
The Honorable Bennie G. Thompson, a Representative in Congress From the State of Mississippi, and Ranking Member, Committee on Homeland Security 5
The Honorable Donna M. Christensen, a Delegate in Congress From the U.S. Virgin Islands 28
The Honorable Charlie Dent, a Representative in Congress From the State of Pennsylvania 17
The Honorable Bob Etheridge, a Representative in Congress From the State North Carolina 23
The Honorable Michael McCaul, a Representative in Congress From the State of Texas 18
The Honorable Stevan Pearce, a Representative in Congress From the State of New Mexico .....
The Honorable Mike Rogers, a Representative in Congress From the State of Alabama 21

WITNESS

The Honorable George W. Foresman, Under Secretary for Preparedness, Department of Homeland Security:
Oral Statement 6
Prepared Statement 9

APPENDIX

The Honorable George Foresman Responses to Questions 41

THE PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 2007 BUDGET: ENHANCING PREPAREDNESS FOR FIRST RESPONDERS

Wednesday, March 8, 2006

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS,
SCIENCE, AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:10 a.m., in Room 311, Cannon House Office Building, Hon. David Reichert [chairman of the subcommittee], 'presiding.

Present: Representatives Reichert, Rogers, Pearce, McCaul, Dent, Pascrell, Norton, Christensen, Etheridge, and Thompson (ex officio).

Mr. REICHERT. Good morning. The Committee on Homeland Security Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Science, and Technology will come to order. The subcommittee will hear testimony today on the administration's proposed budget for fiscal year 2007 for the Department of Homeland Security's new Directorate of Preparedness.

I would first like to welcome our witness and thank him for taking time out of his busy schedule to be with us today. We thank the Honorable George Foresman for being here. We know you have a busy schedule. We appreciate you taking time to be here with us today. We look forward to your testimony and also to your answers to the questions that were posed to you this morning.

This appearance is your first since joining the Department of Homeland Security 2 months ago as its first Under Secretary for Preparedness. On behalf of my colleagues we are pleased that you are here and greatly appreciate your valuable time.

The purpose of this hearing is to review the administration's proposed fiscal year 2007 budget request for the Department's new Directorate of Preparedness and its affect on the preparedness of our Nation's first responders. Shortly after Homeland Security Secretary Chertoff assumed office in 2005 he launched a top to bottom review of the Department's policies, programs and procedures. Secretary Chertoff announced the results of this review, referred to as the second stage review, or 2SR, in July of 2005, and as a result of that review the Secretary realigned the Department's organizational structure. The realignment included consolidating all the Department's existing preparedness activities and programs, including the Office for Domestic Preparedness, the U.S. Fire Administra-

tion, the Chief Medical Officer and the Office of Infrastructure Protection into a new Directorate of Preparedness.

The Directorate's primary responsibility is to build and sustain our Nation's preparedness at all levels of government, to prevent acts of terrorism and minimize the efforts of nonterrorist-related events in the United States, reduce America's vulnerability to terrorism, especially those involving weapons of mass destruction and enhanced Federal, State and local response to acts of terrorism and other emergencies, both natural and manmade.

The Preparedness Directorate, ably led by Under Secretary Foresman, is supposed to do these things by identifying, assessing and evaluating risks, by funding activities to reduce those risks, and by coordinating preparedness activities and programs of all levels of government.

The President's fiscal year 2007 budget request for the Preparedness Directorate is approximately $3.4 billion. Some of my friends on the other side of the aisle will undoubtedly complain that the administration's budget request decreases overall spending on first responders from fiscal year 2006 on enacted levels. I will not and cannot dispute that fact, but at a lower level of spending for certain grant programs should not be equated with a lack of commitment to first responders or homeland security. Indeed, no other administration in the history of our great country has requested more funds for first responders. Since September 11, 2001 the administration and Congress have made an enormous investment, over 28 billion in State, regional and local preparedness programs. Much of this funding, however, remains unspent.

If the President's budget request is combined with yet to be awarded funds for 2006 and amounts from prior years that State and local governments have not yet obligated, the result is that more than 5 billion in funding will be available for State and local preparedness activities in fiscal year 2007.

Until the problems causing these backlogs are resolved, the reductions in certain homeland security grants programs demonstrate the President's fiscal discipline. So rather than merely continuing to increase Federal funding, the administration's proposed budget attempts to resolve this problem by reforming the grant making system, consistent with the reform contained in H.R. 1544, the Faster and Smarter Funding for First Responders Act. The administration intends to allocate the vast majority of Federal preparedness grants on the basis of risk and need and to assure that States and local governments use such funding to achieve minimum baseline levels of preparedness in accordance with the national preparedness guidance.

It is also important to note that the administration's budget request substantially increases funding for certain grant programs. For example, the President's budget includes an over $80 million increase for the Urban Area Security Initiative, a $214 million increase in grant programs dedicated to critical infrastructure protection, and $98 million of increase for the State homeland security grant program.

The budget request for the Preparedness Directorate also proposes funding increases for the Chief Medical Officer, U.S. Fire Administration and the Office of National Capital Region Coordina-

tion and establishes a new $50 million program for the so-called National Preparedness Integration Program to help States and local governments improve preparedness for catastrophic events.

As a former first responders for over 33 years and a former sheriff of King County in Seattle, Washington, I am committed to our Nation's public safety and homeland security. Those here who know me know of my passion for the COPS program. While our committee has no jurisdiction over the COPS office, I am opposed to the proposed reduction for it and continue to support the grant programs in COPS. COPS allow funding for personnel at the local level.

I have no doubt that my good friend from New Jersey will discuss his opposition to the proposed reductions in Fire Act grants and the SAFER program. I share his support for these specific grant programs as well as the desire to see them adequately funded. Nevertheless, while a proposed budget is not perfect, I believe it includes many important new initiatives that will make the Preparedness Directorate a success.

Despite my concern about some of the proposed reductions, I do not believe the President's budget request for the Preparedness Directorate will harm first responders of our Nation's security. If it did, I would not support it. As the saying goes, once a first responder, always a first responder.

Under Secretary Foresman, I am eager to hear your testimony, especially your vision for the Preparedness Directorate, and I am also eager to remain engaged with you as we further discuss how to improve our Nation's preparedness.

The Chair recognizes Mr. Pascrell for his statement.

Mr. PASCRELL. Thank you, Chairman Reichert. I am glad to have the opportunity to discuss the fiscal year 2007 request for the Department of Homeland Security's Preparedness Directorate and potentially find out just what on earth the administration was thinking when they put this budget together.

Now that we have prefaced what I am going to say, you know I have the greatest respect for you, Mr. Foresman. Anybody who can last 3 years in your department, you are a minor walking miracle.

I understand this is the first time that you have testified before Congress since your confirmation this past December. You really couldn't have picked a worse time to sit before us, but we are here as friends.

You are well respected in the emergency management and first responder community. You have a notable record of public service, and I say that sincerely. We all have faith in you, faith in your confidence, faith in your passion for the responsibilities that fall under your purview. You are not just the messenger. But this administration's budget is unacceptable.

I am being very charitable in my comments this morning because we have a mixed audience. I don't think for a minute that you are happy that your directorate was cut by more than $600 million. You have an enormous challenge. To be honest, I don't know how the Preparedness Directorate plans to meet its critical goals, given the large proposed cuts the President wants you to absorb.

Let us take a look at the facts. The President's budget reduces the Emergency Management Performance Grant Program from $185 million in 2006 to 170 million in the coming year. This is a $15 million cut that places State and local governments in a precarious position. They were just in town a few weeks ago. The Secretary spoke to the group and everything was wonderful, but it is not. EMPG grants are the primary source of Federal funding to State and local governments for planning, training, exercising, hiring personnel for all facets. This is a fact of life.

Given that the hurricanes of last year exposed serious shortfalls in our ability to respond to terrorist attacks and natural disasters, why the administration would cut this program is beyond me. We are not talking about a lot of money here, but it really is symbolic more than anything else of why in view of what has happened in 2005, why we would cut this budget for the coming year.

The President's budget cuts the funding for the Firefighters Grant Program by nearly 50 percent. I know a little bit about this program. When we introduced it in 1999 it was finally passed and signed by President Clinton in 2000. It had 284 cosponsors of that legislation and crossed the entire political spectrum long before 9/11 to respond to basic needs of the 32,000 fire departments throughout the United States of America, both career and voluntary.

So by cutting this program from $545 million to $293 million in fiscal year 2007 is something we need to take a look at. The program has proven to be effective in providing local fire departments with the tools they need to perform their day-to-day duties, before 9/11 this bill passed, became the Act, as well as enhancing your ability to respond to large disasters.

This program had applications of up to $3 billion this past year and we were only able to respond by $545 million. Why in God's name with such urgent needs within these departments are we cutting this program?

I know exactly what the administration attempted to do by melding this program with the other disaster programs and the terrorist programs so that we will block grant it almost and therefore absorb and therefore supposedly save money on the backs of first responders. We are talking out of both sides of our mouths. The numbers speak for themselves.

The President has proposed completely eliminating the SAFER Program. This was a bipartisan program to respond to the staffing needs of the volunteer fire departments in this country as well as the career departments. He is going to zero it out. The will of the Congress is ignored by the administration. We are handmaidens at best. We are playing second fiddle at worst.

Darn it, under the Constitution of the United States we have an ability and the right to have something to do with the budgets that are submitted by the executive branch of government. What has been done to the SAFER Program is unconscionable. It is immoral.

Now given that the National Fire Protection Association has reported that two-thirds of America's fire departments do not meet the consensus fire service standard for minimum set safe staffing levels, why the administration would cut this program is beyond me. And if the response is, as some in the administration have

said, this is not a Federal responsibility, then what we should do is do away with all the fire programs and do away with all the cop programs and say to local municipalities these are your jobs; whether you have the wherewith all to do it, do it, find a way to do it anyway. I don't know if that is what you are saying, but that is what some of the folks in your department are saying.

The President's budget neglects the needs of local law enforcement by once again zeroing out funding for local law enforcement terrorism prevention programs, which plays a key role in assisting local law enforcement agencies in information sharing, threat recognition and mapping, counterterrorism and security planning, interoperable communications and terrorist interdiction. The program was funded at $385 million in 2006. Why the administration would cut this program is beyond me.

I could go on but I suspect that many of the other cuts in this budget, from the National Domestic Preparedness Consortium to the Metropolitan Medical Response System will be explored at some point during this hearing.

I want to conclude with this, Mr. Chairman. My hope is that as we proceed we will have a serious conversation about why the administration year after year tries to impose the most egregious cuts and elimination to programs that are designed to help our first responders. Thank God there are enough people on both sides of the aisle, since neither party is privy to this virtue; there is enough people on both sides of the aisle that say to the administration this is shared responsibility, this is a system of checks and balances according to, I read it again this morning, the Constitution of the United States, which is still a pretty valuable document.

I hope that the usual numerical sleights of hand are not attempted. I know that the Urban Area Security Initiative got a small increase, as did the State Homeland Security Block Grant Program, but we all know the small increases do not nearly offset all the other cuts elsewhere in the budget.

So the bottom line is there is a reason why every first responder I know, and I know a lot of them, vehemently disagree with this budget and I am going to take this budget to every part of this country, to both cops and firefighters and explain to them what is going on. The shell game is over. This budget is not acceptable. Please look at it as dead on arrival.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. REICHERT. Thank you, Mr. Pascrell.

The Chair now recognizes the ranking minority member of the full committee, the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. Thompson, for his statement.

Mr. THOMPSON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, ranking member. Welcome. This is the first time that you have testified before this committee since you have been confirmed. I would like to congratulate you on that process as well as your commitment to hang in there on the job and help us make America safer.

I am impressed by your background. I have encouraged the administration to look at qualified people rather than just political cronies, and obviously you are clearly more than qualified for the position. So I welcome you at this time.

That being said, I look at the budget, and just as my colleague from New Jersey indicated, it causes us great concern. It causes us great concern because when we talk about local firefighters and EMTs they look at a $600 million cut in this directorate and they say, Mr. Congress, we can't make it without that. Why is the Federal Government not helping this process, why are they cutting Law Enforcement, Terrorism Prevention Program, the Metropolitan Medical Response System, the SAFER fire grant, and other programs.

Then they go on to say well, now that you have created this thing called Preparedness Directorate, how does that fit in the role of response in the cut since you have separated? We are out here in the boondocks and we can't see the need for a separation.

So I think that you have many challenges before you. The former FEMA Director, who I don't claim to be an expert, but he at least said that with reorganization and the Preparedness Directorate being established caused FEMA not to be the robust agency that it needed to be. I think you ought to talk a little bit about that and how you see that pro or con impact on this budget.

The other thing is my district was impacted by Hurricane Katrina. As I look at this budget, many of the deficiencies and supposed lessons learned are not addressed in this budget. And we need help. We are less than a hundred days away from another hurricane season.

Many members of this committee attended the bipartisan trip last week. We will be going back as a committee in about 2 weeks to the area to look at it. And I think we need to know based on experience of Katrina and Rita and this budget whether we will be safer as an entity or whether we are just as vulnerable as we were during Katrina.

So, Mr. Under Secretary, I look forward to your testimony and I look forward to your addressing some of the questions.

I yield back.

Mr. REICHERT. Thank you, Mr. Thompson. We are pleased to have our distinguished guest with us this morning. The Chair now recognizes the Honorable George Foresman, Under Secretary for Preparedness, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, for his testimony.

STATEMENT OF HON. GEORGE W. FORESMAN, UNDER SECRETARY FOR PREPAREDNESS, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. FORESMAN. Good morning, Chairman Reichert, Congressman Pascrell, other distinguished members of the committee. Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today. I am here to talk about the fiscal year 2007 budget request for the Department of Homeland Security's Preparedness Directorate, an absolutely essential element to the success and safety of America as we look towards the next hurricane season or the next emergency or disaster.

I look forward to answering your questions about the President's budget request, but first I would like to provide you with some background about the directorate, my goal and vision for strengthening America's preparedness, and how the President's budget will allow us to meet these goals.

The Department of Homeland Security was created as an all hazards risk management organization designed to prevent, protect against, mitigate, prepare for, and manage crisis situations across the broad continuum of risks. This is important. Over the past 20 years as a nation we have not had a comprehensive national approach that was flexible enough to react to changes along the continuum of risk. Secretary Chertoff's leadership, combined with the natural maturity of our post-9/11 efforts, has led the Nation to a point that requires a change in the way that we think about the concept of preparedness.

Preparedness is not simply a step in the continuum of what we do to manage risks in the homeland. Rather, it is the umbrella over the entire continuum. It is much more than just an administrative function within the Department. The mission applies to each office and component within DHS, across the Federal interagency with our State, local, territorial, tribal and private partners, and our most critical element, the American people. It is a shared national mission, not simply a Federal activity. Simply put, Preparedness knits together the many parts to form the whole.

To strengthen preparedness, we absolutely must focus more acutely on integration and synchronization and communication within and among all of the elements of the preparedness equation. This requires that we preserve the critical individual missions, cultures and identities of organizations while coalescing them as part of a broader national effort.

Since I came into office 2 months ago I have come to appreciate that each of the seven offices and programs that collectively form the Preparedness Directorate have the ability when enhanced as a team and coordinated and synchronized with other offices across the Department, as well as our Federal, State, local and private partners, to accelerate the transformation of our national preparedness efforts into an efficient and organized system. It is a long term effort and it is imperative that we get moving in a more comprehensive fashion. I have seen progress in many of the areas in the Preparedness Directorate and across the Department in just my 2 months in office.

The President's budget that I am here to discuss today builds upon those successes that we have achieved. The budget also reflects what we must do to achieve more by building a stronger, more secure integration in unity of our national efforts.

Central to this effort is the creation of the National Preparedness Integration Program, or NPIP. The 2007 request for this initiative is $50 million, and would support the directorate by providing a centralized mechanism for promoting more effective integration and synchronization of preparedness across jurisdictions and all levels of Government and between the public and the private sectors.

By standardizing a common consistent doctrine to guide our planning, training, exercise and program management, we will be able to link and integrate currently independent activities across all levels of government and within the private sector. Standardization will also allows us to better measure performance so we can individually look at organizations and collectively as a system assess our progress.

We want to be able to answer your repeated questions in Congress of how much better prepared are we today than we were a year ago. Management matters and NPIP is absolutely critical to the Department's ability to manage the individual as part of the collective, because as we all know, in our system's approach what one organization does affects another's, especially in the context of homeland security.

The President's request for the Office of Grants and Training is $2.7 billion. Of this amount, $633 million is for the State Homeland Security Grant Program, which is an $88.5 million increase from fiscal year 2006 level. An additional $838 million is for the continuance of the Urban Areas Security Initiative, which targets funds to the Nation's highest risk urban areas.

Further, the request provides $600 million for a new Targeted Infrastructure Protection Program to supplement State, local and private infrastructure protection efforts based on critical vulnerabilities. The requested level of funding is a $213.9 million increase from the level of funding appropriated to the individual infrastructure programs in 2006.

The fiscal year 2007 request also provides $293 million for the Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program, as well as $35 million dollars for Citizens Corps Program, which represents a $15 million increase over fiscal year 2006. We are also requesting $170 million for the Emergency Management Performance Grant Program, which assists, as you noted, States in urban areas to sustain and enhance the effectiveness of their emergency management programs.

The request also includes $92.3 million for State and local training programs, $48.7 million for our National Exercise Program, which provides support to State and local exercises and for efforts to synchronize national level exercise activities. Also included is $11.5 million for technical assistance initiatives, as well as $23 million for program evaluation to better assess how previous grant funds have been utilized.

Across the entire Preparedness Directorate we have a plethora of activities that are being unified and synchronized, but one that I would like to point out in terms of my opening statement, HITRAC. HITRAC integrates threat analysis with vulnerability and consequence information to provide public and private infrastructure stakeholders with comprehensive risk assessments. HITRAC represents a spectrum approach, a unified approach to linking together our information analysis, infrastructure protection, as well as other activities in the Department to form a comprehensive picture of risk.

It is an excellent example of the positive tangible results that can be produced when the public and private sectors collaborate in areas of mutual concern, and in this case the fusion of intelligence and information. It is the kind of collaboration that was envisioned when the Department of Homeland Security was created, and we are committed to replicating this success across the entire department.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have other portions with regard to my opening statement, but I think you all have a plethora of questions that you would prefer to get to, and

with that I look forward to engaging not only in our questions and answers today but also in substantive dialog as we move forward.

[The statement of Mr. Foresman follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF GEORGE W. FORESMAN

Good morning Chairman Reichert, Congressman Pascrell, and other distinguished members of the committee. Thank you for the opportunity to appear today before the Committee to discuss the Fiscal Year 2007 budget request for the Department of Homeland Security's Preparedness Directorate. At the outset, Mr. Chairman, let me thank you for the support that you have provided to the Department and for your leadership in furthering our shared goal of ensuring the safety and security of our homeland. I look forward to answering your questions about the President's FY07 budget request, but first I would like to provide you with some background about the Directorate and its component organizations, my vision for the direction of the office, and our initial roadmap for getting there.

The Preparedness Directorate and the position of Under Secretary for Preparedness were created as part of Secretary Chertoff's Second Stage Review. Under the current structure, there are 7 component offices that report to me organized under the rubric of 'the preparedness directorate'; these are the Office of Infrastructure Protection, the Chief Medical Officer, the Office of National Capital Region Coordination, the U.S. Fire Administration, the Office of Grants and Training, the Office of Cyber Security and Telecommunications, and the Office of State and Local Government Coordination.

The Directorate was created, as the Secretary said last July, to coordinate "the full range of our capabilities to prevent, protect against, and respond to acts of terror or other disasters." The Secretary is absolutely right: in the early days the Department was often viewed as a terrorist-fighting entity, but its broad-spectrum mission as an all-hazards department has become clearer through time and understanding by officials at all levels of government, the private sector, and our citizens. Simply put, the Department was created by the Congress as an all-hazards risk management organization from day one.

I would observe that over the past 20 years, we have not had a comprehensive, national approach that was dynamic and flexible enough to react to changes in a continuum of risk. Our new and correct approach requires a change in the way we think about the concept of preparedness. This change is absolutely necessary to ensure our citizens are safer and more secure in the 21st Century.

The Secretary's definition reflects that preparedness is not simply a step in the continuum of what we do to manage risks to the homeland or the function of a single entity. Rather, it is the umbrella over the continuum. Simply put, preparedness is how we will knit together the parts to form the whole.

It is important to understand that under our current evolving risk management principles within the Department, Preparedness is not just an administrative function within the department. Our mission applies to each office and component within DHS, across the federal inter-agency, with our state, local, territorial, tribal and private partners, and with our most critical element—the American people. Our job is to create synchronization and integration within all of these elements. It is a shared national mission, not simply a federal activity.

To strengthen preparedness we absolutely must focus more acutely on integration, synchronization, and communication. In order to achieve a truly national preparedness effort, many pieces and parts need to come together better. We all need to clearly understand how this can be accomplished to promote meaningful strengthening. This requires that we preserve critical individual missions, cultures, and identities of organizations while coalescing them as part of a broader national effort.

Since the Department was established in March of 2003, the Department has testified at more than 515 hearings and has appeared at 5,116 Congressional briefings. At times, though, I know full well that the Department has been criticized for a lack of communication and responsiveness. And, from my perspective as a State official in Virginia, I did not always receive adequate information and feedback from the Federal Government. However, the information flow from DHS to state and local entities which began even prior to my arrival, has dramatically improved, and Mr. Chairman, I pledge to continue to improve our outreach to Congress, this Committee, as well as our State and local partners.

It is with this background and these guiding priorities in mind that I entered into office little more than two months ago. In that short time I have come to appreciate that each of the offices and programs that collectively form the Preparedness Directorate have the ability, when enhanced as a team and coordinated and synchronized

with other offices across the department and our federal, state, local, and private partners, to transform our national preparedness effort into an efficient and organized system. It is a long term effort and it is imperative we get moving.

And I have seen progress made in these areas just two months in office. However, the President's budget that I am here to discuss with you today is not just a reflection of the successes that we have achieved, but also what we must do to achieve more, by building a stronger, more secure integration and unity of effort.

Central to this effort is the creation of the National Preparedness Integration Program (NPIP). The FY07 request for this initiative is $50 million and would support the Directorate by providing a centralized mechanism for promoting integration and synchronization of preparedness across jurisdictions and all levels of government, and between the public and private sectors. By standardizing a common, consistent doctrine and approach to guide planning, training, exercise and program management, we will be able to link and integrate currently independent activities across federal, state, local, and private sector organizations. Standardization allows us to better measure performance so we can individually and collectively assess our progress. That is not the case today, and it keeps us from answering your most basic question: How much better prepared are we? This will allow us to evaluate preparedness from state to state and city to city—as well as nationally.

Management matters. And NPIP is absolutely critical to the Department's ability to manage the individual as part of the collective, because as we all know, what one organization does often affects other areas—especially in homeland security.

The Office of Grants and Training (G&T) is a key component of the Preparedness Directorate's mission to enhance the nation's readiness for acts of terrorism, as well as other strategic issues that are vital to national preparedness. Through the implementation of Homeland Security Presidential Directive #8, G&T is establishing policies that strengthen national preparedness for terrorist attacks, major disasters and other emergencies by implementing the National Preparedness Goal, improving delivery of federal preparedness assistance to State, local and tribal governments, and strengthening and supporting other capabilities required by state, local and tribal jurisdictions and other Federal agencies. Taken individually, each of G&T's activities—equip, train, exercise, evaluate and advise, and assess and coordinate—represent individual steps in a continuous cycle of preparedness.

Since September 11, 2001, DHS has provided nearly $18 billion to support our State and local emergency prevention and response community. In fact, more than $30 billion has been awarded government-wide. Of DHS funding, approximately $14 billion has been focused on homeland security and terrorism priorities, with nearly $22 billion government wide. DHS is currently in the process of providing an additional $2.6 billion in FY 2006 resources in homeland security. Further the Department has provided counterterrorism training to more than 1.2 million emergency personnel from across the nation.

Mr. Chairman, the President's FY 2007 budget request advances DHS's mission, and in turn the mission of the Preparedness Directorate and the Department, of enhancing the nation's security and preparedness. That request totals more than $2.7 billion for G&T to continue our strong commitment and support to the nation's first responder community. Of this amount, $633 million is for the State Homeland Security Grant Program, which is an $88.5 million increase from the FY06 enacted level. The Department would distribute these funds on the basis of risk and need while aligning with national priorities—similar to the approach taken in FY 2006. An additional $838 million is for the continuance of the Urban Areas Security Initiative, which targets funds to the nation's highest risk urban areas. To simplify the number of programs while continuing dedicated funding for law enforcement's counterterrorism efforts, the DHS proposes that no less than twenty percent of the State Homeland Security Grant Program and no less than twenty percent of Urban Areas Security Initiative Grant Program be used for law enforcement terrorism prevention activities.

Further, the request provides $600 million for a new Targeted Infrastructure Protection Program (TIPP) to supplement State, local, and private sector infrastructure protection efforts based on critical vulnerabilities. TIPP will directly enhance the Nation's level of preparedness by providing funds to owners and operators of key transit systems, port assets, and other critical infrastructure to prevent and respond to large scale incidents. TIPP would consolidate the existing, stove-piped infrastructure programs into a single grant program that would give the Secretary maximum flexibility to target funds based on the most recent risk and threat information. The requested level of funding is a $213.9 million increase from the level of funding appropriated to the individual infrastructure programs in FY 2006.

The FY 2007 request also includes a continued commitment to our nation's fire services by providing $293 million for the Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program.

And, as in FY 2006, G&T will continue to administer this program in cooperation with the United States Fire Administration. Since 2001, more than $2.4 billion has been awarded through the AFG program.

The FY 2007 request also includes $35 million the Citizens Corps Program. This represents a $15 million increase over FY 2006. I would like to take this opportunity to stress the importance of citizen preparedness. Citizen preparedness is essential to our preparedness as a nation. Recent outside surveys indicate that citizens are concerned about the threats facing the nation and are willing to participate to make their communities safer. Unfortunately, too many Americans have low awareness of local emergency plans, are not involved in local emergency drills, and are not adequately prepared at home. The increase in funding will help change the culture to ensure that everyone takes an active role in his or her safety and to increase the collaboration between citizens and emergency responders.

We are also requesting $170 million for the Emergency Management Performance Grants (EMPG) Program, which assists States in sustaining their emergency management programs. And, Mr. Chairman, G&T will continue to work and coordinate closely with FEMA on this program.

The request also includes $92.3 million for G&T's State and Local Training Program, and $48.7 million for the National Exercise Program, which includes management of the Homeland Security Exercise Evaluation System, Lessons Learned Information Sharing System, providing support for State and local exercises and for efforts to synchronize national level exercise activities and management of the national Top Officials, or TOPOFF, exercise series. Finally, the request includes $11.5 million for technical assistance initiatives for State and local agencies and $23 million for program evaluation to better assess how previous grant funds have been utilized.

The President's request continues the Department's significant changes to the way in which State homeland security grant funds are distributed. For FY 2007, the Department will continue to ensure that homeland security funds are awarded based on an evaluation of *risk and needs,* thereby ensuring that scarce resources go to where they are most needed. The distribution of homeland security funds based on risk aligns closely with the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission and the legislation that was considered by both the House and Senate during the last Congress. We will continue to work to improve and enhance risk methodologies while soliciting needed input and advice.

The Directorate's Infrastructure Protection Office is charged with working with infrastructure stakeholders across the country, a vast majority of which are owned and operated by the private sector, to increase the security of the nation's infrastructure according to a risk-based approach. This approach allows us to make better judgments about where to target our resources and prioritize our protection efforts. The FY07 budget request of $549.1 million will allow the Department to maintain its strong commitment to work with our public and private partners to ensure the safety the nation's critical infrastructure.

I want to point out a few programs that have furthered our infrastructure protection mission for which sustained funding will ensure a solid return on investment: The National Infrastructure Protection Plan (NIPP) establishes a common risk-based framework and national plan for critical infrastructure protection activities across all 17 Critical Infrastructure and Key Resources—CI/KR—sectors to ensure consistent and comprehensive identification of assets, assessment of risk, and prioritization of assets. It highlights best practices and initiatives already underway, and introduces features such as metrics so that we can quantify the success of the program. The NIPP is on track to be rolled out this spring, with Sector Specific Plans following.

To implement the NIPP, DHS is working with each of the 17 CI/KR sectors to support the development and operations of Sector Coordinating Councils and Government Coordinating Councils. SCCs are self-organized, self-led bodies comprised of the owners and operators and their representative organizations, while GCCs are interagency government groups bringing together federal, state, local and tribal entities with significant equities in the sector. These Councils work together on planning, policy development, and risk management and mitigation activities for the sector.

As part of the Comprehensive Review program to conduct more detailed assessments of high risk sectors, the Office of Infrastructure Protection conducted comprehensive reviews of commercial nuclear power plants nationwide in 2005, and will continue to conduct similar reviews of other nuclear facilities until all are complete. In 2006, the program is being expanded to chemical facilities, and will be applied to other high-risk areas in 2007.

The Homeland Infrastructure Threat and Risk Analysis Center, or HITRAC, is the Department's infrastructure-intelligence fusion center. It is comprised of personnel from the Office of Intelligence and Analysis and the Office of Infrastructure Protection, and other components, to integrate threat analysis with vulnerability and consequence information to provide public and private infrastructure stakeholders with comprehensive risk assessments. HITRAC provides analytical support for the threat portions of risk formulas used to prioritize grants to State and local governments, including Port Security Grants and the Urban Area Security Initiative. HITRAC continues to refine the threat portion of the risk methodology used to support the grant process as it gains a better understanding of the data and access to more sources of Intelligence Community and law enforcement information.

Mr. Chairman, HITRAC is an excellent example of the positive tangible results that can be produced when the public and private sectors collaborate in areas of mutual concern—in this case, fusing intelligence to inform protection. It is the kind of collaboration that Congress envisioned when it created the Department of Homeland Security and we are committed to replicating its success across the Department.

The National Asset Database is the cornerstone of our nation's critical infrastructure protection efforts as it represents a repository of the nation's assets and resources. While the NADB's current capability provides for basic data prioritization and identification of critical infrastructure, planned enhancements include utilizing the Infrastructure Protection Analysis Capability to integrate consequence, vulnerability and interdependency data with threat information to prioritize assets based on risk. The NADB is the foundation of the Department's Risk-Based Approach and serves as the basis for allocating resources through such efforts as the Homeland Security Grant Programs, Site Assistance Visits, Buffer Zone Protection visits, Comprehensive Reviews, and other Protective or Preparedness programs.

The FY07 request for the Office of Cyber Security and Telecommunications is $235.4 million. This will allow the office to successfully meet its mission to work collaboratively with public, private, and international entities to secure cyberspace and America's cyber assets, and to build emergency preparedness telecommunications capabilities. To meet its mission, the National Cyber Security Division is strengthening the national cyberspace security response system implementing its cyber risk management program. The recent Cyber Storm exercise demonstrated that we have made significant strides in enhancing our national cyber security preparedness and helped us identify specific areas in which we can still make meaningful progress.

Integral to the mission of the Preparedness Directorate is the Office of the Chief Medical Officer (CMO) at DHS, who is charged with coordinating Department medical preparedness and response activities including coordinating the Department's activities on avian flu. The CMO ensures internal and external coordination of all medical preparedness activities to prevent and mitigate biologically-based attacks on human health or our food supply. This includes preparation for consequences of catastrophic incidents, many of which are medical in nature, by fully engaging with state and local authorities, associations of medical professionals, and other stakeholders that deal with the medical consequences of natural disasters or terrorist attacks.

The President has requested an additional $3 million in funding for the CMO in FY07. Among other things, this funding will ensure that the CMO's office can fully support its role in the National Disaster Medical System, which supports the teams of medical volunteers who performed so heroically during Hurricane Katrina. This will ensure that the CMO is adequately funded to fulfill its role in coordinating medical intelligence and surveillance activities of the Department, discharge the Department's responsibilities for Project BioShield, and coordinate with other Department organizational elements on their medical preparedness activities to provide technical guidance and direction.

The United States Fire Administration request is $46.8 million, which is a $2.3 million increase over the FY 2006 funding level. Mr. Chairman, since September 11, 2001, the U.S. Fire Administration, through the National Fire Academy, has spent $46.4 million to provide training to over 340,000 first responders. This budget increase will allow the USFA to continue to develop and upgrade courses, training, and materials while remaining current with evolving technologies, techniques, and threats. This includes the delivery of training to enhance the ability of fire and emergency services personnel and first responders to deal more effectively with emergencies of all kinds; the operation of the National Emergency Training Center in Emmitsburg, Maryland and the Noble Training Center in Anniston, Alabama; the collection, analysis, and dissemination of national fire data; research partnerships

to improve detection, protection, and suppression technologies; and programs to increase the capacity to prevent, mitigate, prepare for, and respond to emergencies.

The Office for National Capital Region Coordination (NCRC) is charged with a broad mission to oversee and coordinate Federal programs for and relationships with State, local, and regional authorities in the National Capital Region. In FY07, the President has requested $1.99 million to allow NCRC to continue its support of our regional partners, and the integration of Federal, State, local, and regional efforts, through advocacy, planning, information sharing, technical support, training and other means. In addition to coordination of large-scale, multi-jurisdictional efforts such as the NCR Strategic Plan, NCRC is often called upon to coordinate dozens of drills, exercises and events, planned and unplanned, in the course of a typical year. These include state funerals, July 4th celebrations, after-action reviews, and other special events.

The budget would also allow the NCRC to enhance interoperability efforts between Federal, State, regional, nonprofit and private sector partners, including the First Responder Partnership Initiative, a landmark multi-jurisdictional, interoperable identity management capability. In addition, it includes efforts to integrate State, local and regional partners into various DHS networks and systems, to ensure sustainable communications even in the event of emergency or power outage, among other capacities. Our regional partners have made a significant investment in these initiatives, which represent just a few of NCRC and the region's many successes.

The Office of State and Local Government Coordination (SLGC) oversees and coordinates departmental programs for and relationships with state and local governments. SLGC utilizes the information provided by state and local governments to assist the development of the national strategy and other homeland security activities. In partnership with other elements of the Department, SLGC maintains direct communications with state and local officials from across the country, providing unprecedented and immediate access to the Department. The FY07 request for the Office is $2.2 million, and will support our efforts to engage our state and local partners to better prepare our homeland.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I firmly believe that preparedness must permeate and infuse into our daily lives to become a culture of preparedness. To achieve a culture of preparedness, we must possess an intuitive understanding that as individuals and organizations we are all part of something bigger. We must be capable and connected. All of us must focus harder on integration and synchronization of differing parts instead of simply producing a series of independent products or activities with limited shelf life. Actions of one part affect the whole.

Mr. Chairman, this budget will get us one step closer that that goal.

Thank you once again for providing me the opportunity to speak with you all today and for your continued support and valuable input. I look forward to answering any questions you may have.

Mr. REICHERT. Thank you, Under Secretary. I do have a few questions and then we will move to the other members.

I am in agreement with my colleagues Mr. Thompson and Mr. Pascrell and some of what they have said in their opening statements. I do have great concerns, and I mentioned some of those in my opening statement, having come from the law enforcement field.

The reduction in COPS funding is worrisome to me. It not only assisted in the area of technology but more importantly in those areas where most of the money is spent, and that is the FTEs, the personnel cost. You and I have had a chance to talk a little bit about funding for those who are specifically assigned to intelligence gathering, intelligence analysis, those functions that are not traditionally law enforcement functions that are now assigned to local law enforcement across this Nation in each and every city and sheriff's office. We have deputies and police officers assigned to Federal task forces engaged in collecting information that pertains to our homeland security efforts.

With those concerns, the $35 billion budget, some of the increases, the $80 million increase for Urban Area Security Initia-

tive, I think it is a great move. The $214 million increase in grant programs for critical infrastructure, the $98 million increase in State homeland security grant programs, all good things, but that personnel side is still worrisome to me.

The thing that is also worrisome to me, and this will lead to my first question, is the backlog of a lot of these grant funds. Can you explain why so much of the money grants are in backlog? I know in my own State I think it is almost $150 million that still remain unspent.

Mr. FORESMAN. Congressman, let me address your question two ways. First, I had the opportunity to sit on the national task force that consisted of local, State and Federal officials several years ago that looked at the flow of funds from the Federal down to the State, down to the local level. We all recognize that by the time we get to the end of fiscal year 2006 we will have committed about $18 billion in funds to help State and local governments with their preparedness efforts. We also recognize that there is probably about 50 percent of those funds, maybe a little bit more that have yet to be expended, but they have in fact been obligated.

I think one of the things that we have to recognize is as we look at this continuum of efforts since 9/11, States and communities, as I like to say, were able to do the low hanging fruit in the early days, those things that they knew that they needed to get done, they had been priorities for a number of years. The Federal assistance helped them be able to do that.

And so those low hanging fruits have been plucked from the tree, if you will, and we are now at the point where States and communities are working on more long-term planning, training and exercise activities, equipment acquisitions that cannot be accomplished in a short period of time, and the important message here is the funds have been obligated. They may not have been actually expended, but obligated, meaning States and communities have spending plans against which those funds are going to be used.

The second part that I would offer to you is that States and communities have had to adjust their procurement practices. One of the things that we found in the post-9/11 environment, we were trying to use ordinary processes at the Federal, State or local level to do what was essentially an extraordinary level of enhanced strengthening of our national readiness immediately after 9/11.

Congressman Pascrell knows when we are at the local level, some local governments, for instance, cannot obligate money under their procurement systems unless they actually have the dollars in the bank. At the same time that States and communities have been going along making enhancements to their readiness by doing the planning, training and acquiring the equipment, they have also had to streamline their procurement processes, they have had to go back and in some cases actually change laws to make it so that they can obligate the funds before they actually have the money in the bank. So there are really two pieces to the equation. It is a process issue as well as just a work effort issue.

Mr. REICHERT. I am going to take a Chair prerogative here and ask one more quick question. Moving on to another topic, this is one that Mr. Thompson touched on briefly. Question, does it make sense to separate preparedness and response, and your personal

feeling on whether or not FEMA should be removed from the umbrella of Department of Homeland Security. Those questions are kind of tied together. Thank you.

Mr. FORESMAN. Congressman, as we have articulated, as the Secretary has articulated, preparedness has never been simply a function of FEMA. Preparedness is one of the steps in a continuum when you talk about preparedness, response and recovery and mitigation in the old context. In our post-9/11 risk management environment, preparedness is the umbrella over everything. It is the common thread that links together what we do to prevent, deter, to respond, to recover, to mitigate, and in fact we have not taken preparedness out of FEMA, nor have we taken FEMA out of preparedness. Every element in the Department has a preparedness culture or preparedness mission that they are involved with.

Frankly, what we do in the Department is linking together all of the independent to make it very much interdependent. Having been in this business for more than 20 years and having looked at the structure of the Department, I absolutely think we are in the right organizational posture right now, with the Preparedness Directorate, with FEMA in the Department. And I say that for two reasons. Historically, whenever a disaster occurs, we have seen that FEMA has had to deploy a lot of very talented men and women down field, if you will, to deal with the disaster at hand. I mean we have got thousands of people who are still today down in the gulf coast working on a day-to-day basis, and what that caused and from a practical experience in Virginia, if we had a disaster in Pennsylvania and everybody from the FEMA region was in Pennsylvania dealing with a disaster, there was no one to work with Virginia getting us ready for our next disaster.

So this organizational structure will allow us not only to deal with the immediacy of crisis events in FEMA's coordination of response and recovery activities, but it will also always allow us to keep our eyes on the next event, because there will be another event, and by having the Preparedness Directorate we are able to keep the forward focus, but most importantly we are able to link together across not only the Department but frankly the entire Federal Interagency a much more comprehensive approach to preparedness in this country than has ever been the case before.

Mr. REICHERT. Thank you.

Mr. Pascrell.

Mr. PASCRELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My first question is to the response you just gave to the chairman. What do you think the response is from the mayors and the Governors and the first responders to the answer that you just provided to the chairman on this question? Would they agree with you, disagree with you, and have they been consulted in terms of where FEMA is right now?

Mr. FORESMAN. Congressman, thank you, and I think that is an excellent question because one of the things I clearly understand, and the Secretary shares this, as does the other leadership in the Department, is the decisions that we make at the Federal level have national implications, which means there is a downstream impact on State, local, our tribal and territorial partners, as well as private sector partners. With the Hurricane Katrina after action report that is out from the White House now, of course the House re-

port is out, we are expecting the Senate report in the not too distant future, one of the things that we have been tasked to do in the Preparedness Directorate within the Department is to amalgamate all of these Katrina recommendations, including those about whether FEMA should or shouldn't be in the Department, and work through them in a very logical fashion.

We are bringing in this Friday, 2 days from now, stakeholders representing local and State government, representing a wide range of disciplines from fire to police to public works to public health and we are doing this as the first in a series of stakeholder outreach sessions because the first question that we have to be able to ask ourselves is we have many sets of recommendations that are out there and we need to engage our stakeholders to find out where their perceptions are with regard to some of these recommendations.

So I don't have the answer for you today but we do have the process and they will all be here on Friday.

Mr. PASCRELL. With all due respect, Mr. Under Secretary, it would seem the me that we need stakeholders before we do anything. It is the history of the Homeland Security Department to turn to stakeholders when they are in trouble. And whether you are talking about dealing with science and technology, whether you are talking about going out for contracts, before you do anything you need to establish standards and priorities which can only be established if the folks who have the boots on the ground are asked first and not last. It is the history of your department not to do that and that is why the wheels are coming off the bus.

I think the question that the chairman asked is right on target and I know that you are giving us, trying to give us a very basic history, but if you don't ask these fire folks and cops and EMTs up front, if you don't ask the business community and industry up front, and regardless of what the issue or the problem is, we are never going to get anything done, we are not going to be results oriented and all we are going to be doing is tripping over processes, which we are good at in Washington in both the Congress and the administration.

Now you say on page 5 of your testimony that the 2007 request includes a continued commitment to our Nation's fire services by providing $293 million. You know quite well that there was a request to basic needs of fire departments, not terrorism, but basic needs, $3 billion in applications in 2006.

Now not only didn't we reach or come close to responding to those basic needs, but now we are cutting back almost 50 percent, which gets us further away from these basic needs. You tell me, please, how is this a commitment to the first responders of the United States of America.

Mr. FORESMAN. Congressman, thank you. To your first point, the one thing I would offer is the reason we are bringing the stakeholders in Friday is this is the first step in the process so we want to have them in early in terms of what is the road ahead with all of these recommendations. So just to clarify. If I didn't communicate effectively, I apologize.

With regard to the commitment to the Nation's first responders, as we look at the nearly $18 billion that will be out there by the

end of this year, and if we look across the Federal Government's commitment to first responders over the course, well, frankly, to State and local governments nearly $30 billion since 2001, one of the things that we recognize is there is a dramatic difference between the need to have and the want to have and those things that are Federal responsibility versus a State and local responsibility.

Congressman if I might, please, with all due respect, what I would just offer to you is we had a survey that was done in 2001 that we asked, for instance, the fire service what their needs were with regard to in the post-9/11 environment and they identified about $3 billion worth of needs. By the end of this year we will have put about $3 billion out there.

I realize that needs change with time, but given what we understand about the needs from the fire service, there is a dramatic difference between the number of applications and dollar value of those applications and a very well understood approach about what are the absolute needs out there.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Secretary, with all due respect, this is why there is confusion which leads to collusion. You know what, your answer is not acceptable. I want you to know that right now. There were $3 billion in requests before 9/11. You go back to the request of the year 1999 after the Fire Act was passed, you will see $3 billion in needs.

And what you have attempted to do, this administration, Mr. Chairman, with due respect, what you have attempted to do is meld them together. I always use the pinochle term, meld, so they all go in one kind of block grant, it is not the proper technical term for this right now, so that everything becomes one and then priorities are not met.

So that in 2007, the year we are now going into, FEMA has gone all over the country preparing first responders for how to help them make out these applications for the fire grants. There is going to be $3 billion plus and we will have cut this down do $290 million. That does not make sense.

You cannot justify those cuts and look at the fire fighters of this country and tell them you are doing the best that you can for them and you are still committed. The administration, Mr. Chairman, is not committed, they are not committed to the cops of this country and they are not committed to the EMTs. This budget is proof of the pudding.

Mr. REICHERT. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. Dent.

Mr. DENT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Following up on some of the chairman's questions about the moneys that have been appropriated by the Federal Government to the States that have not yet been drawn down. I would like to ask you very specifically, Mr. Foresman, wouldn't it be appropriate for DHS grant recipients to have to provide to the Department an accounting of the funds that they are receiving? Are you getting any kind of accounting from the recipients?

Mr. FORESMAN. Congressman, we are. There is a process that goes into how these dollars are provided to the States. The first thing the States are doing is putting together a spending plan and a needs justification, if you will, that serves as the basis for their

request and then they are required to report back on the expenditure of funds and the process that they are making with regard to the utilization of those funds, and of course you all in Congress have put some requirements in terms of timeliness of these activities.

One of the things that we have to be careful about at homeland security is that we don't create additional requirements on them beyond the normal audit requirements or the normal accounting requirements that States and communities already have.

Mr. DENT. I guess my follow-up question, are there not out there appropriate software programs designed to help State and local authorities account for Federal grant moneys? I am aware of some of the programs from some companies that could help, some software programs. Are you aware of any?

Mr. FORESMAN. Congressman, we used basic spread sheet programs in Virginia and we track more than half a billion dollars worth of grant funds, so I am sure that there are plenty of solutions that are out there.

Mr. DENT. I have been familiar with a program called Quartermaster, and maybe at some other point, not today, go over that with you and your staff. I find that that is an interesting program.

My final question, then I am going to yield my time to Mr. McCaul, when will the Department release the final version of the National Preparedness Goal?

Mr. FORESMAN. The National Preparedness Goal is in the final stages of review and we expect that release to be very shortly. One of the things we have been doing is making sure we are going to be able to take into account the maximum degree possible the lessons learned out of Hurricane Katrina.

Mr. DENT. I yield the balance of my time to Mr. McCaul.

Mr. MCCAUL. Thank you, Mr. Dent, thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for being here today, Mr. Foresman. I have a very quick question. It focuses on the National Domestic Preparedness Consortium. It is a consortium as you know of about seven universities that have been—it has been very successful in training first responders.

In my home State of Texas at Texas A&M there is training for first responders. The Texas Task Force 1 came out of this consortium. They provided assistance after 9/11, did a fantastic job, then helped with Katrina.

However, the administration's proposed budget request significantly reduces funding for these training programs and I would like for you to explain why when we have such a successful program, why the administration has decided to cut this program.

Mr. FORESMAN. Well, Congressman, in the immediate days, and this even existed prior to 9/11, we didn't have a lot of technical expertise to develop some of the needed training programs to assist States and communities with putting the programs in place that would allow first responders, for instance, to be able to better deal with weapons of mass destruction, these of types of things. The consortium provided a real value-added infusion to those training efforts nationally. We are developing and maturing to a point where States and communities have taken the training programs that have been provided by the consortium and they are now in the

process of delivering those. We have got about 15 million State and local officials who have to be trained out there. We are slowly but surely moving our way down through that training activity. And what I would offer to you is we are at the point where we don't need to develop new training initiatives at this point but we need to sustain what we have, and that means delivery of the programs that have already been done.

Mr. MCCAUL. What role do you see for the universities to play with respect to training first responders?

Mr. FORESMAN. I think from the standpoint of all of our universities there are two elements, first we have to deal with the training issue, of what are the skill sets that you give to a first responder or health and medical worker, whomever it might be, to deal with a specific issue. The broader long-term implication we have to deal with in this country is how are we going to get the next generation of professionals ready to be, both in the public sector an private sector, the leaders sitting in my seat, the private sector making decisions about management of risk in the context of the post-9/11, post-Katrina environment.

I think a large part of where our colleges and universities are going to be most useful is making sure that we get that next generation ready because today we don't have a great deal of consistency when it comes to homeland security curriculums.

Mr. MCCAUL. I see my time has expired.

Mr. REICHERT. Thank you, Mr. McCaul.

Mr. Thompson.

Mr. THOMPSON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Under Secretary, there were several references to money in the pipeline and therefore the inference is that you don't need additional moneys because there is money in the pipeline. Am I to understand that moneys in the pipeline are unobligated moneys or are these moneys that are already committed to various activities?

Mr. FORESMAN. Congressman, these are going to be moneys that are already committed to various activities. And when I talk about money in the pipeline, what I would offer to you is we are looking at a single budget year and at this point we know from our discussions with our State and local partners, and the Secretary and I have both heard this from local officials at different places in the country, that they are meeting their equipment needs, short-term equipment needs. They are concerned about long-term sustainment. But at this point when we look at the continuum of dollars that are out there flowing for fiscal year 2007 with the money that is in the President's budget, the money that is in the pipeline, we are confident that that is going to meet the immediate needs for the next 18 to 24 months.

Mr. THOMPSON. So therefore you reduced the request based on the fact that there is enough money in the pipeline to meet every existing need that you know?

Mr. FORESMAN. No, sir. The request is an analysis of not only what is in the pipeline but also where we understand we are going with our maturity and the nature of our efforts here domestically. If I might.

Mr. THOMPSON. We are going to talk later.

Mr. FORESMAN. All right, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. I don't want to get caught up in the semantics. If it is in the pipeline and they are obligated, then if you ask for money the next year based on what you claim in the pipeline is meeting the need, that is a play on words. Our first responders and others are telling us that when you give less money the next year than you did the year before, you are actually reducing the effort, and by doing that and counting what is in the pipeline is a smoke screen. Nonetheless, let me go forward.

You have excellent credentials, no question about it. The last FEMA Director had no emergency preparedness experience. Do you think the next Director of FEMA should have emergency preparedness experience?

Mr. FORESMAN. Congressman, based on my discussions with the Secretary and the Deputy Secretary and based on my knowledge of the system, I feel confident that whoever is the next Director of FEMA from a permanent standpoint will have the appropriate credentials to ensure not only the Congress but the administration and the American public that they are very capable of performing the leadership mission in that organization.

Mr. THOMPSON. So that is the Secretary and Assistant Secretary's opinion. You are Under Secretary. Do you think a FEMA Director should have that experience?

Mr. FORESMAN. I believe a FEMA Director has to have experience at being able to effectively manage crisis events. Now good crisis management skills come in a wide set, from a law enforcement personnel, from a fire personnel, emergency management, so I won't tie it to a discipline but, yes, they need to have crisis management experience.

Mr. THOMPSON. Now, since FEMA has been taken out separate from the preparedness, how are you going to work with FEMA the next hurricane season, what is the connection?

Mr. FORESMAN. Congressman, let me stress we are the Department of Homeland Security, and, again, I have got to say it in the strongest of terms, FEMA still has a critical role in preparedness, and preparedness has a critical role in FEMA's accomplishment of its mission. Acting Director Paulison and I have met numerous times since I have been here. We are currently working on a process MOU which will define the very specific coordination mechanisms between the Preparedness Directorate as an administrative function and FEMA as component organization.

One of the things I will say is it is not going to be a two-page MOU that says kind of broad things. We are going to have very specific, tangible coordination mechanisms in place to make sure nothing falls through the crack.

Mr. THOMPSON. One more question.

Mr. REICHERT. Absolutely.

Mr. THOMPSON. So if something occurs, there is nothing in place for FEMA and the Preparedness Directorate to coordinate activities?

Mr. FORESMAN. No. No, sir. That is not what I said. We have interim relationships in place. And in terms of the management of the event, FEMA will be managing the event and they will be able to call on the Preparedness Directorate the same way that they

could call on the Coast Guard, for instance, to provide them tangible technical assistance in being able to deal with that event.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, I think it would benefit the committee substantially if whatever the relationship is at this moment, you provide that relationship to us in writing.

Mr. FORESMAN. Congressman, I would be more than happy to do that. Please understand I have spent 20 years in the business and when I was at—in a similar job in Virginia, I understand the importance of strong linkages between all the elements, and it is not just FEMA and Preparedness Directorate, it is everything in the Department. That is very much what we are trying to accomplish.

Mr. THOMPSON. I applaud you for the MOU but that is a work in progress. It is what we are experiencing now and what we have experienced in the past that causes us great concern. And, generally speaking, it takes substantial time to get things done in the Department, and in the interim I think we need some assurance that those linkages are in place, and so that is what I am looking for.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. REICHERT. Thank you, Mr. Thompson.

Mr. Rogers.

Mr. ROGERS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Mr. Foresman, for being here.

In my district I have the Noble Training Center which falls under your directorate, and as you know, it trains emergency managers and health care professionals in a hospital environment. Do you believe it is currently being utilized to its fullest potential?

Mr. FORESMAN. Congressman, one of the things I am currently in the process of doing, they liken it to drinking water by the fire hose, is looking at all of the mission activities across the Directorate. We are talking about Noble, the Center for Domestic Preparedness, and a host of other activities. I was up at the United States Fire Administration last week.

And what I want to make sure is from a foundational perspective that we right size the organization, that we have got the right business processes in place, and that we are getting the maximum efficiency. Because the more efficiency that we achieve in all of our training activity, the more first responders that can be trained at Noble or other sites or other activities through the Department.

I will be more than happy to get back to you once I have had an opportunity to do that evaluation.

Mr. ROGERS. What time line do you think you will follow on that?

Mr. FORESMAN. All of these briefings are scheduled to occur over the next 2 weeks and I actually am going to go down in the not too distant future to the Center and Noble and take a look at them myself and get an analysis. So 60 days I would say would be the outside. I can give you an initial indication in 14 to 21 days, if that is acceptable.

Mr. ROGERS. That is fine. In fact, when you make that trip I would like you to let my office know. If there is a way I can join you, I would like to do that. Though it may not be possible with our votes.

Mr. ROGERS. You mentioned the fact that it does fall under your Fire Administration, current management, and also made reference

the fact that CDP is a stone's throw away from it. Wouldn't it be more efficient for Noble to fall under the management umbrella of CDP as opposed to the Fire Administration?

Mr. FORESMAN. Congressman, I don't know the answer to that but, believe me, I am very much confronted with what is the right business model. I have got any number of administrative functions within the Directorate that are legacy activities that were brought with their components when they were folded in. So we will look at that, and I am a big proponent of efficiency and effectiveness because that allows us to put more dollars on customer delivery.

Mr. ROGERS. Excellent.

While you were speaking a little while ago with Congressman McCaul you made reference to the consortium and its funding levels. Do you know what level of funding is proposed for FY 2007 and how it compares to what is in FY 2006 for that consortium?

Mr. FORESMAN. I don't have the exact figure in front of me, Congressman, but when we looked at all of our allocations and looked at our budget requests, we tried to gauge where we were, and this goes to what Congressman Thompson was raising earlier. In the immediate post-9/11 environment we had to have a massive infusion of resources to get things up and running. The consortium is a good example where we had to put a lot of dollars into it to get the training programs developed, to get them out on the street. It is kind of like we used to say in the Fire Service that water hammer coming through the line.

And so we are getting—we are at the point where we are not doing as much development, we are doing more sustainment in a lot of these activities.

Mr. FORESMAN. And that is why our budget request is what it is for the consortium.

Mr. ROGERS. But I would like for you to find out for me and know exactly what that proposed amount is for the CDP. And as you do this review of efficiencies, I hope that you will look at additional responsibilities you can put into the CDP because it is an outstanding facility doing excellent work; and it can do more.

Lastly, along that note, one of my concerns about the delivery of that training through the CDP is that currently these professionals have to come to the facility, and they are coming from all over the world. But in a poor rural district like mine, most of the first responders are volunteers; and they have full-time jobs, and it is not practical for them to be able to get off at the plant, take 2 weeks to go up to the Center for Domestic Preparedness and get the training they need.

I would like to see more mobile training units sent out, because these people generally meet twice a month or once a week or whatever in the evening, for 2 or 3 hours. To see us do outreach and go out in these rural communities and train these first responders in a briefer way, do you have any idea about initiatives that are being considered to provide that kind of mobile training, because many of the districts are rural like mine?

Mr. FORESMAN. Congressman, I do not know the specifics, again, pending some of the components' briefs, but let me offer—I was up at the United States Fire Administration, the National Fire Academy, last week and I spoke to all the students up there. And it was

actually the couple of weeks during the year they have the volunteers. It is a combined volunteer/career week up there, and probably about half of the attendees were volunteers.

One young man came up to me and said he very much appreciated the training and education that he was getting, but his wife wasn't very appreciative because he was taking a week off from work without pay. And I was a volunteer, my brother is a volunteer, and I understand the significant impact.

But when we look at training efficiencies, wherever possible, we need to be taking training to the first responders rather than bringing the first responders to the training. It won't work in 100 percent of the cases, but we really need to put a premium on that.

Mr. ROGERS. I agree.

Thank you very much Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Mr. REICHERT. Thank you.

Mr. Etheridge.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Let me associate myself with my colleagues as it relates to budget numbers and questions, Mr. Secretary, because I think those are critical from what we said. But let me quickly move to a couple of very quick questions in my short period of time, and I will ask you to get this back in writing, and then I will get some verbal because, you know, when we think in terms of the response of homeland security, and FEMA particularly, you having come from the State level, you understand this.

If you were out there as a citizen, it doesn't matter how that disaster happened, whether it was by natural disaster or manmade with a terrorist—and we are more likely to have in America a lot more natural disasters than we are terrorist disasters; historically that has been true, and yet a lot of our focus now is moving in another direction for funding. So let me ask you several questions, and I would like to have this in writing and come back.

Number one, how many positions are there now currently in FEMA, how many positions were there prior to 9/11, how many positions in FEMA, in leadership, have less than 1 year experience?

And Number two, in that area beyond that, is there any predisaster mitigation funding in FEMA this year? My understanding is there are zero dollars in FEMA for that this year; is that correct?

Mr. FORESMAN. Congressman, I do not know but I will get back to you.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. If you get that in writing, I think that is important. Because you know as well as I do, if we can't do premitigation, that means you can't get prepared for the disaster you know is going to come from mapping floodplains, et cetera. So if you get that back to us, I would appreciate that. I think that is important, and it is a critical area.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Now let me move to another area.

State and local emergency managers, as you well know, work on preparedness every day. That is their job. And they see it as an integral part of the emergency management cycle of preparedness, response, recovery and mitigation. That is what they are into. And after all, the success of any preparedness plan hinges on the ability of people and organizations to respond and mitigate an incident.

As you well know, we get all caught up here in Washington on the big issues and for the local fire responder, it may be a wreck, it may be a truck that is turned over, and it may be that volunteer is out there 24 hours away from the job. And yet we sit here and wallow around about a few bucks we are going to send them, and they have given up far more than what we do here.

My State director of emergency management, as well as a number of managers across this country, have told me that they believe the separation of preparedness from other functions is a bad idea. So my question is, how do you define the difference between preparedness and prevention?

And number two, how will the preparedness director coordinate his work with FEMA and other entities responsible for the response and recovery areas, whether it be natural or accidental or manmade?

I think this is a critical issue as it relates to what you are trying to do.

Mr. FORESMAN. And, Congressman, thank you for the question. You know I have had a number of conversations with Doug Hole and the others in North Carolina over the course of the years, both when I was in Virginia and now in this position.

I think that one of the critical components that we have to consider here is, under the old model we thought about prevention as being—or I am sorry, preparedness as being one of those steps in the continuum. And as I said earlier, we are talking about preparedness being the amalgamation, the integration, the synchronization of everything.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Excuse me just a minute. You said "the old model." Talk to me about what you mean by "the old model."

Mr. FORESMAN. If I might, let me finish this train and I will come back to you on that.

And so we have created a continuum of risk management. When I talk about the old model—and "old" may not be the right descriptive term. I think we continue to see our approach to risk management in this nation evolve, and the best example I am going to give you, this is over 20 years, if you took the Hurricane Katrina after-action report and the Hurricane Andrew after-action report or the Loma Prieta earthquake after-action report and laid them side by side, you are going to find identical lessons learned.

The scope is ostensibly a lot larger with what we are finding in Katrina than some of the past disasters, and what that tells us is, if we think about preparedness as a step in the continuum rather than the knitting together of all the pieces of the continuum, then you know we have the option of not doing it.

I think a large part of what we are trying to do here is, Congress has directed that we do a better job of managing risk holistically in this country. We have always focused on the last disaster rather than what are the potential next disasters. And in a continuum of risk we develop a robust system so that the first responder on the street doesn't have to worry about whether it is about terrorism or tornadoes, fires or floods, crime or anything else, they have a standardized, integrated, single process that is going to support them irrespective of what the crisis is.

We don't have that today. And we don't have that because we have not put a premium on taking prevention and deterrence, response, recovery and mitigation and all of those pieces and truly fusing them together not only in the context of emergency management, but in the context of how we govern.

And Congressman Pascrell was pulling out the Constitution. And I think there is a good example here.

Crisis management is about causing the three levels of government to be completely interoperable. But that is not what the Constitution envisioned. So we have got to respect those constitutional constructs, but find a way to make them completely interoperable; and that is what we are trying to do with this broader focus on preparedness.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. In your written response to me—Mr. Chairman, I see my time is up—would you please include in that also, I know we have had a long period where we have had no FEMA director. I know that is outside your jurisdiction. But in this written response I would like to know if we are going to have somebody permanently there to deal with, because if that is an important operation and we are now approaching hurricane season, I think the American people have a right to know that is a priority, and we need to have somebody in there with experience.

Mr. FORESMAN. And, Congressman, let me offer, both the Secretary and Deputy Sectretary have been exceptionally focused on the FEMA Director, and there have been ongoing discussions. And that is among, if not—the highest priority in this Department right now is getting a good, quality individual in that position who will make sure that they can provide the leadership to FEMA that FEMA needs. And, you know, that is the person who I am going to work with to make sure that we are successful across the entire Department.

FEMA is just one piece of the preparedness equation.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. But it is an important part.

Mr. REICHERT. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. Pearce.

Mr. PEARCE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Foresman, as I am looking at your budget, it looks like the administration is requesting less in the grant program. What was the thinking behind that?

Mr. FORESMAN. Congressman, we were talking earlier—in which particular grant program?

Mr. PEARCE. Just the overall homeland—I am looking here at the first—first responders.

Mr. FORESMAN. Well, what we are looking at in terms of our budget is, what are those dollars that are already in the system that are things in process, obligated dollars that are going to be spent over the course of the remaining grant cycle, as well as what are the needs.

And part of what I talked about earlier is, we are at a point where to accelerate our efforts immediately after 9/11, we had to put a massive infusion to do a lot of start-up activities, training and exercise, planning equipment acquisition. And while we are still having to keep that sustained effort up, it is beginning to level

out, and I think that is what you are seeing reflected in the budget request.

Mr. PEARCE. How about the drawdown of the accounts? Has that occurred? How much has not been drawn down from previous grants?

Mr. FORESMAN. Congressman, we know that, you know, by the time we get to the end of fiscal year 2006 we are going to have—about $18 billion will be out there; and I think about $11 billion, give or take, has been drawn down at this point.

But this is one of the areas that we are going to focus heavily on. Our new Assistant Secretary for Grants and Training, Tracy Henke—I have talked with Tracy about this and we have been focused on products in the Department, and that is absolutely critical, things like the National Incident Management System and the National Response Plan.

But we also need to give process tools to our State and local partners to make sure that we have good accounting processes in place, that we have the right procurement methodologies in place at the State and local level, because at the end of the day we need to be able to give you all real-time data about how we are doing with the expenditure of funds. We need to be able to monitor it from a Federal level perspective. States need to be able to monitor it in terms of their local governments.

Mr. PEARCE. So about $6 billion by the end of this year that will not have been drawn down?

Mr. FORESMAN. No, sir. What I would say is, there is about $6 billion right now. And we will get you the exact dollars. But that is what we are trying to do is make sure we are not leaving money on the table, that it is being effectively applied.

Mr. PEARCE. Why are the different groups that are applying for this money not drawing it down?

Mr. FORESMAN. There are a number of things.

Mr. PEARCE. Is it a States' process?

Mr. FORESMAN. No. It is a function of where they are with the procurement. Let me give you an example.

We have a jurisdiction, a couple of jurisdictions, in Virginia that had some major capital procurements that were in process, and those won't actually be delivered to them until September; so, therefore, they can't draw the money down until those are delivered.

So this is just a process issue. I don't think it is endemic of any systemic problem in terms of movement of money.

But we are talking to the stakeholders. And if we think there are any flow problems, we will make sure that we adjust.

Mr. PEARCE. Thank you.

Does your office deal at all with grants to fire departments?

Mr. FORESMAN. We do.

Mr. PEARCE. How do we coordinate the grants to the small, rural, volunteer fire departments? In other words, we just had a fire that—a grass fire that almost burned my hometown down, very similar to that thing that was going on in Cross Plains, Texas. And so we were able to go through and see that the local community, the fire department, had a nice waiting room that was paid for by a grant. But the volunteer fire departments were using 1990 equip-

ment, and 47 of the 50 units were from volunteer fire departments. And the local, you know, the full fire department that is authorized only had two or three units.

What guarantees do we have that the volunteer fire departments are getting some attention in these grants?

Mr. FORESMAN. Well, in terms of the fire grant programs, there is a certain targeted portion of it that goes to the volunteer service versus the career service. There is a peer review process involved in it.

And one of the things that we are trying to be very focused about is making sure that we have got an identifiable need that we are addressing when these dollars go out the door. At the end of the day, one of the biggest challenges is that this grant program, you could actually have a fire department receive a grant and the local jurisdiction may also be requesting a grant for the exact same thing, and the local government may not know that they are actually getting that grant because it is a direct Federal to local fire department delivery. It is not right or wrong.

But we have got to do a better job of making sure that the State and local partners have the transparency of what we are doing with those fire grants, which departments are receiving it for what, so that we make sure that, you know, we are getting maximum utilization out of the full gamut of the grant dollars that are down there.

Mr. PEARCE. I am still confused on who stands on behalf of and who represents on behalf of the volunteers, because, you know, it is obvious that that need, need for equipment to address fires, is not the basis. It is something besides that. If it were, then we would see these 1990 and 1980 trucks replaced before you went in and did waiting rooms and watchtowers and stuff like that.

Mr. FORESMAN. Well, and that is where I was discussing, Congressman, that it is a peer review process. We bring in both volunteer and career folks to do the evaluation of the applications rather than having someone who is not familiar with the fire service, not familiar with the needs of rural versus urban, career versus volunteer. We are trying to let it be a peer review process.

But I will be more than happy to go back and take a look at it and make sure that we are putting as much appropriate scrutiny into it as possible.

Mr. PEARCE. Based on what I see in the field, you probably need to get a review of the peer review process.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. REICHERT. Thank you, Mr. Pearce.

Mr. Thompson.

Mr. THOMPSON. One of the things that you can provide the committee with is, what is the present plan for this review application? See, because I am having the same problem with my end of it, and I have a need for basic trucks that are not coming in.

Then I see another department in another area getting imaging equipment, when some need a truck; and I am trying to figure out how we prioritize the applications.

Is it based on the plan that you people are looking at, so that when it comes to my district, they say, well, in this area you need rolling stock, in this area we need imaging equipment?

If you can just provide the members of this committee with whatever the plan is, that people are making judgments with it, then I would be very, very happy.

Mr. FORESMAN. And Congressman, we will do that. And having been around when the program is rolled out, you know, this is the one grant program that operates differently than all of the others; and there is a grant application and a grant request, but not necessarily a plan that is associated with it.

But we will take a look at it and get that to you.

Mr. REICHERT. Thank you, Mr. Thompson.

Mrs. Christensen.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am kind of taking a risk here having come in late. I may ask a question that has already been asked.

But my first question relates to what Mr. Pearce and Mr. Thompson were asking. When I was coming in, you were seeming to suggest that the reduction in your budget and some of the eliminations of programs are really due to a leveling off of funding after an initial investment had been made in the first responders, up front. Yet many fire departments and other first responders, though, are finding themselves unprepared.

And I wanted to know if there was an assessment made of the State level of preparedness that drove the reductions. What was—

Mr. FORESMAN. Congresswoman, absolutely, and thank you. The one thing that I also want to underscore is that when you look at our budget request last year versus our budget request this year, it is very close to being very much the same. But one of the things with regard to the fire service, as an example, in terms of activity, we went out and did a survey in 2001 and we said to the fire service, what are your needs? And they identified $3 billion worth of needs.

We have gotten to this point in time, and we have had $3 billion that have gone down to the fire service.

But I also understand that when you look at the application process, there were $3 billion worth of applications last year. And part of what we are having to work through is, what are those needs that exist across the first responder community as a whole, those that should be funded through the Federal Government versus those that should be funded through State or local government activities. And I will tell you, as we have gone about this budget request, we have very carefully considered—and "leveling off" is not the correct term; I would simply say that the climb is not as steep as it may have been in the immediate days after 9/11. But we are still very much focused on providing dollars to States and communities for preparedness efforts, dollars that weren't there in total prior to 9/11.

The fire grant program is a good example of one that was; I will acknowledge that. But some of these grant programs are new grant programs since 9/11.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Well, I still—well, let me ask you this.

As you assess what the Federal Government should pay and what local governments should pay, are you taking into consideration also the ability, the capacity, of certain communities to meet

what you would consider a local responsibility? Because some communities are a lot poorer than others.

Mr. FORESMAN. Congresswoman, when we look at this, we are not going to do a jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction or even a State-by-State evaluation; but we have to make some value-added decisions in terms of the risk management continuum.

For instance, you know, we are seeing major increases in infrastructure protection moneys this year. And you know one of the ways that you might look at it—and I won't necessarily say it is the right or the wrong way, but it is one of the ways—we got a lot of public-sector-focused activities in the immediate aftermath of 9/11 because we really didn't have a good handle, as a nation, on what we needed to do with regard to critical infrastructure protection. That has come into much greater clarity just in the last 18 months. And so we are enhancing our spending on critical infrastructure protection in addition to the first responders.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. In your statement, which I had a chance to go through, at least to glance at, you said that the office of the chief medical officer is integral to the mission of the preparedness director. I am still really unclear as to what that chief medical officer does.

I think you have a good person that comes with a wealth of experience and expertise, but I am not clear what that person does. And yet I notice that he has an increase of $3 million in his budget.

So, one, I would like to know, what does that person do vis-a-vis the Department of Health and Human Services and CDC, and is there also an increase for hospitals and public health commensurate with the chief medical officer, and where do they fit in your preparedness plans?

Mr. FORESMAN. Congresswoman, excellent question. When we look at the health and medical components, it is a theme that permeates every risk or every hazard that we are trying to confront in this country.

As you know, DHS is the overall domestic incident manager, and one of the core competencies that we have to be assured of, whether we are talking about at the Federal level or at the State and local level, is that we have got the capacity for health and medical coordination.

And pandemic flu is a good example. It may manifest itself in the agriculture community where USDA would be the lead. It may manifest itself with humans where HHS would be the lead. And the role of the chief medical officer is to coordinate across the entire Federal family or State and local partners to make sure that our overall incident management strategies and our technical understanding of what is going on from an incident management standpoint is informed by science.

And, you know, as a good example, we had an anthrax event here in the National Capital Region, or suspected anthrax event. And one of the great services provided by the chief medical officer, he was able to coalesce what were nonconcurrent decisions on what the science was saying about the incident at hand, and to a governor that I was trying to serve at the time, to the other governors, he was able to provide clarity on what was the right response action.

So he is a technical advisor, he coordinates activities such as the National Disaster Medical System. He coordinates some of our biosurveillance activities that we have got going on in the Department; but most of all, he becomes an integration point between what HHS is doing, what USDA is doing on an agriculture perspective, DOD, any number of other Federal agencies.

Mr. REICHERT. The gentlelady's time has expired. Thank you.

Mr. Secretary, how does—we have talked a lot about grants in rural areas and applications of grants and assigning of grants. How does risk and threat assessment play into your decision-making or DHS's decision-making in assigning grant applications?

Mr. FORESMAN. Congressman, thank you.

Probably one of the greatest challenges that we face as a country is moving to a much more risk-based system. And a risk-based system does not imply an either/or; it implies a graduated approach that allows you to put a concentration of resources where you have got the highest level of risk.

As we have developed our risk methodologies here in the Department, we have looked at threat vulnerability and consequence, for instance, in terms of something that may be a high threat but low consequence type of event. At the same side, it could be a high-vulnerability, low-consequence type of event. So we are trying to put some graduated scales on that.

But one thing that I understand about risk assessment, particularly as it applies to the allocation of dollars, is that we have got to provide clear transparency to our stakeholder customers and to you all as a Congress about how the methodology works, what data is informing our decision processes. And as we go about with doing risk-based funding, we are not ignoring one area to provide funding to another.

We are doing some balancing in terms of how we are applying resources in terms of either geographically or by a particular sector of the critical infrastructure or by a particular type of geographical area; and so we can do better at explaining exactly how that risk methodology works.

Mr. REICHERT. I think that is part of the confusion. There are so many grant processes and so many grants that apply to certain or specific needs across the country. Some fall into the area of being assigned or granted under risk and threat assessment analysis, and others are assigned and granted under other guideline requirements as they apply for their grants.

And I think that is—we are struggling a little bit, at least I am here today, when you talk about decreases in certain grant opportunities, decreases in your budget, but also increases in other grant opportunities. The $80 million for the UASI grant is one example, a $214 million increase in grant programs in critical infrastructure and others.

And you talk about the 50 percent unspent grant moneys that still are out there in the pipeline. All these come together. And I think for all of us, it just creates a little bit of confusion as to how the grants are processed and who and where—who assigns those and where they go and, you know, what is the process. So I think you have recognized that and you have mentioned that today in your statement.

Very quickly, one of the things that, you know, we are all very interested in in this subcommittee is interoperability. We know that $1 billion has been established by Congress for an interoperability grant program that is to be administered by the National Telecommunications & Information Administration. Do you believe that the administration is providing adequate funding, first of all, for interoperability?

Mr. FORESMAN. Congressman, you know, in addition to those funds, we know that if we look at some of that $18 billion that has gone down to the State and local level, probably about $2 billion has been allocated to interoperability. We have heard figures ranging from solving the interoperability issue from 12 billion to 18 billion and maybe even more.

I think part of the challenge we are running into is what is interoperability? What is it that we are trying to achieve in terms of interoperability? Are we talking about every first responder being able to talk to every other first responder, or every police department being able to talk to departments at the command level?

I think that in terms of where we are from a funding standpoint, we are putting the right amount of resources towards the interoperability solution. It is part technical, but it is also, large part, governance which we need to work with our State and local partners in making sure that we have clear plans in place for how we are they are going to achieve interoperability.

Mr. REICHERT. Do you believe the current structure in DHS allows for that organizational structure, that is, allow interoperability to be the priority that it should be for this Nation?

Mr. FORESMAN. Congressman, what I would offer to you is Secretary Chertoff, myself, Deputy Secretary Jackson, our Acting Under Secretary of Science and Technology, Jeff Runge, we have talked about interoperability at great length over the past 60 days. It has probably been one of the three issues that have consumed the most amount of my time since I have been at DHS.

The Secretary recognizes that we have got to do a stronger and better job with our interoperability efforts. And as we go about looking at what we are doing we will decide, you know, is it structured right? Are the business processes correct?

But at the end of the day, we understand the concerns that you all and the first responders have. And I have lived with it as a first responder where the interoperability solution for me was three mikes. And that is not a good solution.

Mr. REICHERT. Do you think that NTIA should have a responsibility for awarding $1 billion in interoperability?

Mr. FORESMAN. Congressman, what I would offer to you, our Assistant Secretary for Grants and Training, Tracy Henke, is over there talking to them today. We are going to make sure; we are absolutely committed to making sure to our State and local partners out there that we provide a Federal interoperability solution. Where it is administered from is not as important as making sure it is synchronized and integrated.

One of the reasons why we want to have the National Preparedness Integration Program is to be able to achieve these types of synchronization, to make sure the money that is going out through grants and training, the money that is going out through that pro-

gram and any other relevant dollars that are targeted towards interoperability are being targeted in a coordinated fashion across the entire Federal Government.

Mr. REICHERT. Just like we consolidated a number of different departments under Homeland Security, for efficiency reasons and knowing what the left hand and the right hand are doing together, I think that it is important for that $1 billion to be with grants and training. As you know, we have talked about that, too. And I think that creates some confusion in trying to get those two agencies to work together.

Mr. Pascrell.

Mr. PASCRELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to clear up, if I may, Mr. Secretary, things that you said in the original statement—not the original statement, but in the answers to questions of the chairman, how does one distinguish between—in dealing with first responders, distinguish between needs and wants?

Do you remember specifically what I am talking about?

Mr. FORESMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. PASCRELL. I want to take exception to that. Unless I misinterpreted what you said, fire grants, while under Homeland Security, is a very different vegetable than all the other Homeland Security grants, as you well know.

What is different about it? Is it competitive?

And if you look at the history of it, in 2000, 2001, 2002, there was a major effort for us to emphasize rural and small suburban communities throughout this Nation, so that one would not come away with the idea that the Fire Act was established just for large cities in the Nation. We did that. We were successful.

Members of Congress were not successful. The peer group review was successful. That was established, so that no Congressman, or group of Congressmen, could determine where Federal—the Federal Fire Act money would be spent.

This is a very different situation because those things are needed. It isn't that you wanted to make the situation better. You know that the average fire apparatus in this country, Mr. Secretary, is over 25 years of age. So when you look at what—in that example alone, what the basic needs are of that fire department, to assume that local communities can absorb this expense in their budgets is, to me, unrealistic.

This is not reality TV. This is the real thing. This is where the rubber really hits the road.

I have examined those applications. They are not only competitive, but they reflect the needs of those fire departments. These would be needs if 9/11 had never existed.

You said it better than I did: $3 billion in applications before 9/11, correct? Basic needs: only able to respond to a small portion of it, basic needs.

So I want to clarify that. There is no money in the pineline with the Fire Act. I will repeat, there is no money in the pipeline with the Fire Act.

We are talking about Homeland Security issues, dealing with terror basically. Very different. In the Homeland Security legislation that was passed after 9/11, you need to spend the money before you

get reimbursed, and you get reimbursed by the State. So for anybody from Homeland Security—anybody, including the Secretary—to stand before us, or sit before us, and act as if all of this is coming out of the same pool of money, I think that is a disservice to what this act is all about.

And I would like to ask you questions.

Many cities believe that the 311 systems can be used as a backup to 911, particularly when they are overwhelmed by an emergency situation. Local officials believe the incident reporting and tracking function of 311 provides a tool for analyzing patterns of seemingly disconnected entities.

It is my understand that the Department of Homeland Security has decided not to deem 311 systems as an eligible expense under Federal Homeland Security grants. Do you believe that this is a matter of law, or of administrative interpretation, and would you be open to amending the decision?

Mr. FORESMAN. Congressman, let me address two points, so that we are clear when we talk about need versus want; and I would like to address that first.

Part of what I was offering to you was, when I was in the fire service, we had to decide when we were replacing a piece of apparatus, did we want to replace the pumper with a pumper, which is what we needed, or did we want to replace it with an aerial apparatus, which is what we wanted? And so part of this goes back to being able to define what is the necessary piece of it.

The second part of that that I would offer to you is, the $3 billion in competitive grants—and you have raised an interesting issue here, and I want to go back and look because I think it will help all of us as we try to inform this on down the line.

Of the $3 billion in applications, one of the things that I think it would be interesting for all of us to look at is, how much of it was deemed to be ineligible in terms of program guidelines? How much of it—you know, for those that didn't get it, what was the reason for not getting it—was because the peer review process, which you and I both agree is a good process, had concluded that there was not a justifiable need?

We will try to do that.

Mr. PASCRELL. We made a conscious decision in the very beginning when we started off with 15 or 16 categories of fire grant to lower, to shrink it to seven or eight so that we could get more dollars to more communities throughout the United States. Isn't that the case?

Mr. FORESMAN. Well, I don't know, but I want to go back and look and get that data back to you.

With regard to 311, I don't have the specific details, Congressman, but if it is all right with you, we will provide you with a written response as a follow-up.

Mr. PASCRELL. I appreciate that. And also would you give this committee a detailed accounting of the $2 billion in interoperability that has gone out so far? And I would love you to send this to every member of the committee.

Can you do that within the next week?

Mr. FORESMAN. Congressman, I will not promise it within the next week. That figure comes from the crosswalk of all of the grant

programs where State and local spending plans have said they are going to use it for interoperability.

If we have got a spreadsheet that will allow us to press it out in a week, we will do it.

But one thing I have told the chairman, and I will reiterate to you, we need to be responsive to the Congress. I firmly understand that. But I also want to make sure that when we are responsive, I put realistic time demands on our people so that we meet your expectations and don't fall below.

Mr. PASCRELL. Two weeks, 2 weeks.

Mr. REICHERT. Can you give us a time when you might have that for us?

Mr. FORESMAN. I know the good folks behind me are going to write me a note here in a moment and tell you when you can reasonably expect to have that.

Mr. PASCRELL. Let's compromise on a month.

Mr. FORESMAN. All right, sir, and if I beat your expectations, I hope you will be happy.

Mr. PASCRELL. If I could have one other question.

Mr. REICHERT. Very quickly.

I can come back to you. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. Pearce.

Mr. PEARCE. Thank you. I just hate to pick on this interoperability. But we are giving out grants across the Nation, and is there any—technically any equipment that allows us to be interoperable? I need the short answer.

Mr. FORESMAN. I understand.

There is plenty of equipment that allows for interoperability, but a large part of this is getting a viable national standard in place which drives the private sector to ensure interoperability across the—

Mr. PEARCE. Same thing we have in computers. You would have department with different computers that could not communicate, different software?

Mr Foresman. Yes, sir.

Mr. PEARCE. Why are we giving out billions when we really don't have a national standard?

Mr. FORESMAN. Well, the billions are going out to States and communities. One of the requirements for how they use these dollars for interoperability is to have a plan that shows how it will achieve interoperability.

Let me give you an example here in the National Capital Region. The vast majority of all of the public safety agencies are on 800 systems, 800 megahertz systems. And what they had to do in their interoperability plan is show how, what the law enforcement and fire services are going to do to ensure that interoperability. That is the type of planning that comes before the application of dollars to technical solutions.

Mr. PEARCE. I know that—again going back to that fire in our local area—they had very expensive radio systems that were costing maybe $50,000 apiece. It was an exorbitant amount. And, again, the volunteer fire departments didn't have them. But the only ones that could communicate, really, were the volunteers with $200 radios.

I am telling you, if we are not going back and checking with these departments to find out how that those billions are being spent, we are just pouring that money out of its boot.

You had mentioned that threat vulnerability and consequences is the measurement formula for risk-based. Is that the formula for both UASI and the SHSGP?

Mr. FORESMAN. Yes, sir. Part of what we are trying to do in the Department is to make sure that we have got a wide range of assessment methodologies that we use for infrastructure protection, for grant funding, for biomedical readiness; and we are trying to ensure that level of consistency between all of those assessment methodologies.

Mr. PEARCE. So we are using about the same measurement, same formula, to determine where the grants go under both programs, the State Homeland Security Grant Program and the UASI?

Mr. FORESMAN. Congressman, we are not fully there, and I guess—let me caveat it this way.

We want to get to the point of where we have got some reasonable measures so that when someone asks the question about why is X jurisdiction or X State getting this amount of money versus another one, that we have full visibility and transparency. And we are currently doing an in-house review of these risk assetsment methodologies and these funding methodologies.

Mr. PEARCE. With all respect to our constituents from large States, the reason that we had such a fight in this committee is because risk is, in the end, going to come down to population in the minds of many of the people in Washington. And we have got the risk assessment to include many different factors for the SHSGP or whatever, the State Homeland Security Grant Program. But what I am hearing you say is that basically we are going to use the same threat vulnerability and consequence.

And having looked at the programs that—the actual cities and programs that had gotten through the system to be counted as high-risk areas under the UASI, I have deep concerns that all the money is again going to go to rural areas and border districts like mine where we have got significant vulnerabilities and significant threats, but not a very high population base. We are going to be sitting out on the edge and so—

Mr. FORESMAN. Congressman, let me stress—and if I did not communicate it effectively, I apologize. Just because you are rural doesn't mean you don't have a risk, and this is what we are trying to make sure of, that we have a systematic approach that takes into account—for instance, the hurricane on the gulf coast was a good example.

There are certain elements of infrastructure that are not in major metropolitan areas, but if you lose that infrastructure, it has not only an immediate impact on the area, but it has a dramatic national impact. And population density was, at one time, one of the first and foremost points that we used in it.

But we are getting better. Population is a factor, but it is not going to be the only factor.

Mr. PEARCE. I have seen a list of communities that qualified under the UASI. Do you have such a list for the SHSGP?

Mr. FORESMAN. In terms of how they rank?

Mr. PEARCE. Sure, of who—where you are going to dedicate the 83—is it 83 billion we are putting into that?

Yes, 83 million into the State Homeland Security Grant Program. What are the parameters? I have already seen the parameters for the other program.

Mr. FORESMAN. Congressman, what I would like to do is bring back to you a written response on that one, if that is all right for you, so that I make sure I get it right.

Because here is one of the concerns that I have addressed with the chairman: We have got to be very clear and concise as we communicate these things to you, because you need to answer the questions for your constituents.

And I would prefer on this particular one to provide you a written response so we can make sure it is clear and articulate, so you can answer the mail back home, if that is all right with you.

Mr. PEARCE. I would appreciate, but I would express the same thing Mr. Pascrell did. I am not sure it was you, but I think it was you and I were discussing last time you were here another deputy level, where the Homeland Security Department was on the certified communities program that we had been suggesting for almost a year, which would maybe—maybe you expressed a concern of how do we get training? How do we get the next generation of officials ready?

Those were your words and your concerns, and we addressed that almost a year and a half ago with a written proposal to the ODP, and it just died over there. And you had mentioned you are pretty unfamiliar with it. We have never heard anything, and that has been months, months ago.

And so, yes, I don't mind you getting back to me, but sometimes I get a little nervous, like Mr. Pascrell and the chairman.

Mrs. Christensen.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I had an opportunity to travel to Louisiana with the leadership this weekend, and three things, three complaints or three things that kept coming up: issues of FEMA, interoperability and the incident command.

Are you—you must have been asked this before, but just so that I understand. Because I know some of my colleagues would like to have FEMA totally outside of the Department of Homeland Security—I am not necessarily there—but are you comfortable with FEMA not being a part of the Preparedness Directorate?

Because in my experience with FEMA, which I think I have had a fair amount, preparedness is a part of what FEMA used to do; and we need that continuum between preparedness, response and recovery for it to work well.

Mr. FORESMAN. Congresswoman, I am 25 years in this business. I absolutely think we have got the right organizational structure. And having watched all of the reorganization that went on with the creation of the Department and what we have done with 2SR, which I think has further enhanced what Congress asked us to do with the creation of the Department, I absolutely think we have the optimal organizational structure.

It is less important about where the boxes sit on the chart and more important about making sure that we have a common culture, a common vision, a common synchronization of our preparedness.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Are we getting there? Are we getting to that?

Mr. FORESMAN. We are getting there, Congresswoman, but I will tell you right here and right now that we are not where we need to be. And I think the Secretary would acknowledge that as well, because from our standpoint, Katrina gave us a lot of great lessons learned. It was a tragic event, but we are going to take those lessons learned and we are going to apply them to what we do not only in FEMA and in the Coast Guard, but what we do with our partners at DOD and HHS, our State and local partners.

Our national plan review is going on right now. We are not getting all, you know, great news back from the State and local level in terms of their readiness for catastrophic events. And so we are talking about having an overarching approach to preparedness that will allow us to infuse and link together in a much stronger fashion than ever before.

And I have worked with FEMA for more than 20 years. FEMA has the potential to reach its stellar level of performance that I know the men and women over there are capable of.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. You also talked about "interoperability," meaning different things to different people.

Does the Department have a definition for local and States to try to reach to?

Mr. FORESMAN. We have provided definitional terms and requirements associated with the grant guidance, but I think we can do more.

I think we can provide additional clarity in what are the minimum expectations, that if we are going to provide Federal dollars that Congress appropriates for these purposes, we need to make sure that we are giving them clear expectations of what we are looking for as far as the back-end solution.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I think—I agree that everyone in different parts of the country thinks different things and approaches it differently, you know, that is so critical to being able to be prepared and respond.

You said several times that incident command rests in the Department of Homeland Security. And incident command did not operate in Katrina. What have you done in your directorate to strengthen that?

Incident command is something I was trained in a long time ago, long before I thought I was even going to get to be here. So it is not anything new.

It fell apart. What has been done to strengthen that now?

Mr. FORESMAN. Congresswoman, I would separate—you know, DHS's role is to be the domestic incident manager.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Incident manager?

Mr. FORESMAN. The incident manager.

The incident commander was the individual who was down on the specific site or in a particular jurisdiction, as you and I both know from years of experience in this.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. What is the difference? That may be confusing to the people on the ground.

Mr. FORESMAN. I think, at the end of the day, you have asked a legitimate question: Are we going to be better prepared for the next event than we were for this one?

Absolutely, we will.

We did not have a complete failure of our incident management capabilities associated with Katrina. We had very successful evacuations in parts of Louisiana—not necessarily New Orleans, but there were parts of Louisiana that did well.

Mississippi, Alabama did well, the Federal interaction with the State and locals.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Was that in spite of the Department or because of the Department?

Mr. FORESMAN. Well, I don't know, because I wasn't in the Department. But what I am committed to doing is to taking the lessons learned from Katrina, those that are provided through the White House, those that are provided by Congress and others, because the States are doing them, any number of organizations are doing them. We are going to amalgamate all of those recommendations.

And I will tell you, I started off here earlier saying, look, the same lessons we learned with Katrina are the lessons that we learned with Andrew in many cases. And it tells us we didn't make systemic improvements to fix them, and we have to absolutely do that because that is what our citizens expect and deserve.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you.

Mr. REICHERT. Thank you.

Mr. Pascrell.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Secretary, would you support spending Homeland Security money based on the standards and competitive basis of the Fire Act and COPS program? Do you see yourself supporting that in the future?

Mr. FORESMAN. Congressman, I can't give you an answer, yes or no, but here is what I will tell you: that I am always committed to looking at what are the most effective processes for how we apply dollars to address the critical issues.

And, you know, certainly I would be willing to sit down and talk about the pros and cons with you.

Mr. PASCRELL. Do you know of any more productive process that was used in the COPS program and fire departments; and if so, would you tell me what it is?

Mr. FORESMAN. I don't know right off the top of my head, but given the opportunity to think through it, one of the exceptional opportunities I have had over 20 years is to deal with a lot of Federal grant programs.

There were some grant programs back in the early 1990s, late 1980s, that worked very well; and I would certainly be willing to sit down, Congressman, come in and discuss it with you, because if there is a better way to do business, we are always looking for better ways to do business.

Mr. PASCRELL. Just a final comment, Mr. Chairman.

I think the best way not to waste money is to have stakeholders involved in the process early on, those people that are out there on a daily basis working with us.

We already talked about port security, whether we are talking about communications, whether we are talking about first responders, I think intelligence. I think what is so important is that the stakeholders be involved early on by governmental agencies, rather than waiting for the—at the end to get their input and get their reactions to what we are coming up with. That doesn't work.

Mr. FORESMAN. Congressman, you have my personal commitment that we will engage the stakeholders actively and often. And as I said earlier, that is one of the reasons why they will be here day after tomorrow, because we don't want to get way down the road with a whole bunch of solutions with Katrina that don't represent stakeholder input.

Mr. PASCRELL. We are going to have a meeting with the Secretary early tomorrow morning. We are going to bring this up again.

And I thank you for your patience today. I thank you for your forthrightness, and I want you to know I have deep respect for your history.

But this budget is dead on arrival. So we will be very aggressive on both sides of the aisle, but we want to work together to demonstrate to the American people that we can rise above the situation.

I thank you.

Mr. FORESMAN. Congressman, thank you. And you have my personal commitment that we are going to work closely to make things better and more effective.

Mr. REICHERT. You made it.

Thank you for being here, and we just so much appreciate you taking on this responsibility and the experience that you bring.

I just have a couple of comments, too.

Just thinking back on my law enforcement career, and I know thinking back in your career, how much things have changed. And people expect things to happen now, today, right now; and, yes, we want progress made and, yes, we want to move forward and, yes, we want to be prepared for the next tragedy that—whether it is manmade or human made, the next extreme event that may come into this country.

But I think we also have to remember how far we have come and how much progress we have already made. If we don't remember that, I think we kind of tend to lose our encouragement and our excitement about looking ahead to the future and the things that we have yet to accomplish, that we know we can accomplish.

And I think back to my days when I started as a police officer early on in the 1970s, and what "incident command" meant then in the 1970s, what "interoperability" or "operability" meant then.

What "incident command" means to law enforcement is a totally different definition than what it means to the fire fighters who are the leaders in really defining and leading the way as to what incident command and incident management really are.

And what has changed, too, when I was the squad commander in the mid-1990s, and what incident command was and what it

means today, so and the definition of preparedness, and what it meant prior to September 11 and what it now means today.

It means a lot more. It includes prevention, things that we hadn't thought about pre-September 11, pre-Katrina.

So you have a great task in front of you. And we are here to help you. We have a lot of the same concerns that you have. And we want to be here to assist you in any way that we can.

We have asked you for some more information. We look forward to receiving that information.

And I have one little statement to read at the end that we are always required to read. And the members of the committee may have some additional questions for the witness; and we will ask you to respond to those in writing. The hearing record will be open for 10 days, and without objection, this committee hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:05 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

APPENDIX

FOR THE RECORD

QUESTIONS FROM REPRESENTATIVE MIKE ROGERS FOR UNDER SECRETARY GEORGE FORESMAN

Question: 1. To what extent do you view Homeland Security education as a key contributor to building national preparedness and where does this initiative rank in your responsibilities as Under Secretary?

Response: Homeland Security education is extremely important and applies equally to the Federal, State, local, tribal and territorial workforces. I believe that homeland security education is a "key contributor" in building national preparedness and should be at all stages of development for the Department's Federal workforce, as well as for the State, local, tribal and territorial workforces. This initiative ranks very high in my responsibilities as the Under Secretary for Preparedness.

Question: 2. As opportunities arise to provide education in the National Capital Region, should the Under Secretary for Preparedness play an important role in guiding that effort?

Response: Yes. The Preparedness Directorate is putting into place training and education programs for national preparedness. The Directorate is working with training and education experts in its component offices (including the Office of Grants and Training and the U.S. Fire Administration), with the Department's Homeland Security Institute and newly created Office of the Chief Learning Officer, and with other Departmental training and education assets (including the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC), the Emergency Management Institute (EMI) and the Center for Homeland Defense and Security located at the Naval Post Graduate School). The Office of National Capital Region Coordination will continue to assess and advocate for resources, information, research, and technical support to assist the efforts of State, local, and regional authorities in the National Capital Region.

Question: 3. Does the Department of Homeland Security currently sponsor a Masters degree curriculum in Homeland Security which could be effectively leveraged to serve the National Capital Region and be delivered by universities already conducting such DHS-approved curricula?

Response: Yes. Through the Preparedness Directorate's Office of Grants and Training (G&T), the Department sponsors a fully accredited Master's degree program in Homeland Security. This Master's program is provided by the Center for Homeland Defense and Security, located at the Naval Post Graduate School. This program consists of curricula vetted and approved for delivery by G&T, part of the requirements for receiving a grant to fund this program. The curricula could be incorporated or leveraged by another university, or as part of a larger consortium of training and education providers in order to serve the National Capital Region.

Question: 4. How do you plan to implement the recommendations in the White House "Lessons Learned" report to establish a Homeland Security University?

Response: Any Department of Homeland Security (DHS) institution of higher learning would cut across the entire Department. Therefore, it should be the combined responsibility of myself as the Under Secretary for Preparedness and the Department's Secretary and Deputy Secretary. Day-to-day oversight of a Homeland Security University could be maintained by either the Preparedness Directorate or by the Department's Chief Learning Officer.

The Preparedness Directorate is already developing a training and educational system that could serve to address portions of the education system called for by the White House "Lessons Learned" report. For instance, the Naval Postgraduate

School's (NPS) Center for Homeland Defense and Security conducts a wide range of programs focused on assisting current and future leaders in Homeland Security to develop the policies, strategies, programs and organizational elements needed to defeat terrorism in the United States. NPS offers:

- A fully accredited Master's degree in Homeland Security offered on a part-time basis (the first class graduated in June 2004);
- Mobile Education Team training seminars for Governors and other senior Homeland Security leaders; and
- Executive Education seminars on priority topics in Homeland Security, such as Intelligence and Fusion Centers, Public Information/Fear Management, Public Health.

It is imperative that Federal, State, local, and tribal officials are educated in consistent curricula that ensures shared understanding of homeland security missions, the differing responsibilities of the Federal government, and its State, local, and tribal partners, and strategic planning and policy development practices. To meet the unique challenges of homeland security, professionals at DHS and throughout the community can benefit from higher-education opportunities. Such exposure can enhance their performance, ensure they understand broad policy contexts, and further their careers. DHS and agency-wide learning plans seek to fulfill these needs. DHS is already making higher education available to the workforce—using a diverse set of providers—to develop subject-matter expertise, critical thinking, and leadership skills for today and into the future.

QUESTIONS FROM REPRESENTATIVE BENNIE THOMPSON

Interoperable Communication

Question: 1. Can you provide the Committee a detailed accounting of the $2 billion you state has been dispensed for interoperable communications? In your detailed account, please identify whether the grant dollars came from the Department of Homeland Security, Department of Justice, or other federal agencies.

Response: Please see the attached report *State of Interoperable Communications: DHS Funded Activities, Fiscal Years 2003–2005,* as well as the attached charts identifying Interoperable Communications spending for FY 2004 and FY 2005. [The information is maintained in the committee's file.]

3–1–1

The Department of Homeland Security deemed that 3–1–1 systems were not eligible for homeland security grants.

Question: 1. Can you please provide the legal or administrative basis for the decision?

Response: Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) funds are appropriated for the purpose of assisting state and local governments in building their capacities to prevent, protect, respond to, and recover from major events, including acts of terrorism. In Fiscal Year 2006, DHS has allowed grantees to leverage HSGP funds to address an "all-hazards" approach to emergency planning, response, and recovery. However, 3–1–1 systems do not fall under the statutory umbrella of the authorizing language of the HSGP, and therefore are not deemed an allowable cost under the HSGP.

Question: 2. Is the Department willing to review its position on 3–1–1?

Response: 3–1–1 systems provide access to non-emergency services, and are intended to help divert routine inquiries and non-emergency concerns or complaints from the public away from the 9–1–1 emergency system. Examples of calls intended for 3–1–1 systems include issues such as debris in roadway, noise complaints, non-working street lights, etc. DHS continues to believe that purchase of such systems is considered to be outside the scope of the Homeland Security Grant Program as it does not enhance a jurisdiction?s ability to carry out any of the mission areas for which Homeland Security Grant Program funding is provided.

Tracking Grant Funding

When you worked for the State of Virginia, you were a member of Secretary Ridge's special task force established to find out where federal funding was, and why local governments were concerned they were not receiving funding. The Task Force released a report in June 2004 recommending that "The Department of Homeland Security, in coordination with state, county, municipal, and tribal governments, develop an automated grant tracking system that would allow for the real time tracking of the distribution and use of homeland security-related funds."

Question: 1. Can you please tell me if this new grant tracking system has been deployed?

Question: 2. If so, what were the findings of the Department with regard to homeland security funds?

Response: In 2005, DHS formed a Task Force consisting of key DHS personnel responsible for the management and oversight of the Department's grant program administration. The Task Force, operating under the leadership of the DHS Under Secretary for Management, was tasked to identify and explore DHS' options for acquiring an enterprise-wide solution to more effectively and efficiently manage DHS grant programs and resources. The Task Force unanimously agreed that the business requirements and operational processes associated with disaster grants was vastly different from those associated with non-disaster grants and concluded that a single system could not reasonably meet the needs of both types of grants.

As a result, the Task Force focused its efforts on developing a comprehensive set of system requirements and applicable workflows to accommodate the identification of a non-disaster grant management solution for DHS. Ultimately, the implementation of a non-disaster system would position DHS to achieve two major goals: (1) consolidate the management of all homeland security non-disaster grants onto a single, integrated, lifecycle system and (2) facilitate the real time tracking, collection, analysis, and use of data pertaining to the distribution of billions of dollars in homeland security grant resources and assets.

As of June 2006, the Task Force is nearing completion of its requirements analysis and is working with OMB and the eGov Initiative to identify an internal solution and/or grants management service provider to manage its non-disaster grants by the end of the fiscal year.

Homeland Security Funds and Tribal Government

Question: 1. What effort is your office making to track and monitor the delivery of federal homeland security funds to tribal governments?

Response: All grantees are required to submit to DHS a report regarding their planned and prioritized expenditure of grant funds within 60 days of receipt of award, and an updated report semi-annually for the life of the grant. In addition, all grant recipients are subject to review, monitoring and audit at all times. Preparedness Officers within the Office of Grants and Training's (G&T) Preparedness Programs Division (PPD) provide oversight of the grant programs and monitor the progress made toward accomplishment of identified homeland security goals and objectives by of all of the 56 states and territories. These Preparedness Officers conduct regular administrative and programmatic reviews through frequent office monitoring efforts and site visits to ensure Native American communities are equitably targeted for funding and support appropriate for the identified threats and risks. The Preparedness Officers coordinate directly with senior State officials to address questions or concerns when they arise. The G&T Office of Grant Operations also conducts ongoing fiscal monitoring of grantees.

Additionally, PPD has a Preparedness Officer specifically assigned to coordinate and liaise with tribal governments and communities in an effort to ensure the effective delivery of Homeland Security programs, technical assistance support, and funds to tribal communities. To ensure full recognition of tribal needs the G&T/PPD Tribal Liaison works directly with the other Preparedness Officers as well as State, local and tribal governments to ensure the threats and risks faced by tribal communities are reduced and that efforts among State, regional and tribal jurisdictions are fully collaborative and coordinated.

Question: 2. What outreach efforts have your office developed to communicate to tribal nations about availability of homeland security grants?

Response: The Office of Grants and Training's (G&T) Preparedness Programs Division (PPD) Native American Liaison has attended several tribal training events and conferences and has made presentations regarding DHS programs and services at numerous events such as the National Native American Law Enforcement Conference in Las Vegas, the Annual Tribal Hazmat Conference in Montana, the FBI/ICE Tribal Gaming Enforcement Conference in Phoenix, the FEMA Emergency Management Training for Tribal Leaders.

Preparedness Officers have also met with tribal governments and representatives throughout the Country and provided focused communication dedicated to tribal leaders. PPD also reaches out to Tribal leaders and encourages their full participation in every Conference and training opportunity presented by our offices.

PPD also coordinates regularly with the DHS Headquarters Tribal Liaison, other federal partners and a number of Native American Associations such as the National Congress of American Indians, National Native American Law Enforcement Association, and the Southern and Eastern Tribal Association. Among the Department's goals is outreach to tribal emergency managers and community leaders through their own conferences and training venues to ensure the maximum expo-

sure of every tribal emergency response and management discipline to DHS programs.

Through these partnerships PPD has led the way in the creation of a number of coalitions and initiatives such as the Regional Four Corners Homeland Security Coalition (R4C) which is comprised of the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico and Arizona in partnership with the Navajo, Hopi, Jiccarila Apache, Ute Mountain Ute, Southern Ute and other tribes. This group is dedicated to fully integrated communications, information sharing and planning operations. Several States, including North Dakota and Minnesota have requested support from PPD in coordinating similar multi-disciplinary and multi-jurisdictional opportunities within their respective boundaries.

PPD also looks forward to any suggestions or opportunities to provide for the maximum exposure of DHS Programs and funding opportunities as well as those available from other Federal partners for all tribal communities.

Intergovernmental Coordination

In your written testimony, you stated that "the information flow from DHS to state and local entities. . . .has dramatically improved." However, a survey jointly conducted in the fall of 2005 by the National Association of State Chief Information Officers (NASCIO) and the Metropolitan Information Exchange (MIX), suggests the Department is falling short in fulfilling its basic obligations to state and local governments regarding the issue of cyber security.

Question: 1. Would you please elaborate on what specific improvements the Department has made in securing our nation's cyber assets and describe whether the Department of Homeland Security has taken sufficient steps and set up quality control procedures to ensure that government-wide coordination, particularly between DHS and state governments, is improving?

Response: The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) appreciates the opportunity to provide additional information about the Department's intergovernmental coordination and coordination with State and local governments, specifically with respect to our efforts to secure our Nation's cyber assets. In this context, we would like to note the Department's response to the report from the House Committee on Homeland Security "Department of Homeland Security: Falling Short in Securing Cyberspace on the State and Local Level," which provides information about the Department's cyber security activities and programs while addressing many of the concerns raised in the National Association of State Chief Information Officers (NASCIO) and the Metropolitan Information Exchange (MIX) survey.

DHS would like to highlight a number of the activities and programs that were raised in the Department's response, which demonstrate our efforts to secure our Nation's cyber assets in coordination with other government entities.

First, in the context of the National Infrastructure Protection Plan (NIPP), which the Office of Infrastructure Protection developed as a guide for addressing Critical Infrastructure/Key Resources (CI/KR) protection, the National Cyber Security Division (NCSD) has robust collaboration with other government entities. In this context, NCSD has two roles. One role is to perform the duties as the Sector Specific Agency (SSA) for the Information Technology (IT) sector. As such, NCSD chairs the IT Government Coordinating Council (GCC), which is comprised of government entities with an interest in the security of the IT sector. Among other government agencies with responsibility for each of the seventeen sectors, NASCIO and MIX are both participants in the IT GCC and provide a State and local government perspective on IT sector-related critical infrastructure protection efforts and initiatives. NCSD, together with the IT GCC and the IT Sector Coordinating Council, comprised of private sector representatives, will develop the IT Sector Specific Plan (SSP). The SSP will address how the respective sectors will work to reduce the risks to their sector's CI/KR. NCSD's second role with respect to the NIPP is to assist SSAs in the development of the cyber aspects of their SSPs. For example, NCSD's cyber security checklist build on SSP guidance provided by the National Infrastructure Protection Plan Program Management Office and provides SSAs with guidance concerning the types of cyber security concepts that should be included in each chapter of their SSP's. Summaries describing cyber aspects of each chapter of the SSP also provide additional expertise to SSAs. NCSD is also developing a cyber asset identification methodology that SSAs can use to identify cyber assets should they not have their own approach. NCSD is in the initial development stages and will be piloting the methodology this winter. Finally, when contacted by SSAs, NCSD will review draft SSPs and provide feedback on formal drafts and final SSP's.

DHS also engages with State information officers and technology professionals to share information related to each State's cyber security readiness and resilience

through robust collaboration with the Multi-State Information Sharing and Analysis Center (MS–ISAC). The MS–ISAC serves as a conduit between and among all States and DHS. Among other collaborative initiatives to share information and respond to cyber incidents, DHS and the MS–ISAC are working together to initiate greater outreach to local governments. As such, we are developing a local government cyber security guide that includes best practices and actionable steps to help improve the cyber security posture of local governments.

Another important mechanism for collaboration with government entities is the Government Forum of Incident Responders and Security Teams (GFIRST), a coalition of cyber incident response teams from the federal agencies organized by NCSD's U.S. Computer Emergency Readiness Team (US–CERT). US–CERT produces guidance about cyber issues and vulnerabilities that are specifically distributed to this community, and works with the GFIRST to combat cyber attacks against federal government systems. GFIRST just held its Second Annual Conference, which brought together cyber incident responders from Federal agencies, State government, and the private sector, Chief Information Security Officers, cyber security vendors, and law enforcement personnel supporting cyber security issues.

The MS–ISAC has a compartment of the US–CERT secure portal, which enables information sharing between US–CERT and the States, and the MS–ISAC Chair is liaison to the GFIRST community to ensure information flow.

Finally, DHS has undertaken an initiative to implement the NET Guard provision of the Homeland Security Act. As such, DHS has conducted significant outreach activities to engage state and local government officials and facilitate a dialogue about their needs and requirements with regard to preparedness and response to an incident that impacts critical IT. Through this process, DHS has had an opportunity to identify additional needs and potential for other areas for collaboration with State and local governments and DHS plans to leverage that for future State and local engagement.

Question: 2. Would you consider the establishment of a DHS review board, made up of state and local information officers, to be a valuable exercise to promote the protection of our nation's cyberspace?

Response: The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) would welcome the opportunity to work with State and local Chief Information Security Officers and Chief Information Officers, as they may choose to self-organize, in order to further collaboration with these stakeholder groups to promote greater national cyber security. We do not presuppose the roles and responsibilities of a DHS "review board" and can not comment on the nature of such a mechanism for engagement. DHS already has a collaborative relationship with the National Association of State Chief Information Officers and the Metropolitan Information Exchange.

Cyber Storm Exercise

The Department of Homeland Security recently staged its first Cyber Storm exercise, a mock government-led cyber attack, to test the emergency defenses of both government agencies and leading private sector organizations. It has been brought to my attention that only one state government was directly included in this exercise and no local governments whatsoever. It is also my understanding that most emergency services are delivered by state and local authorities.

Question: 1. Given that Homeland Security presidential directive (HSPD)–7 specifically identifies the need for state and local government to "maintain order" and "deliver minimum essential public services" as well as "emergency services," does the Department intend to conduct a Cyber Storm exercise that would help state and local governments test these capabilities? If so, when might you envision such an exercise?

Response: The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) appreciates this opportunity to elaborate on State participation in Cyber Storm, the first government sponsored national-level exercise, as well as future efforts with both State and local governments to enhance cyber preparedness and incident response capabilities.

During Cyber Storm eight States participated at varying levels: three States, New York, Michigan and Montana, participated as full players during the exercise, Washington assisted in the main exercise control simulating State/local agencies and other States, and four other States, Nebraska, North Carolina, South Carolina and Texas, augmented the Multi-State Information Sharing and Analysis Center (MS–ISAC), which was also an exercise player. The Department's National Cyber Security Division (NCSD) also recently attended the MS–ISAC 2006 Conference, which was attended by 43 states, in order to share exercise lessons learned and support MS–ISAC planning efforts for future cyber-focused exercises.

In addition to State participation during Cyber Storm, our exercise team enlisted the expertise of a major academic institution which is currently a DHS grantee for the conduct of cyber exercises with local governments. The intent of their involvement is to prepare for potential participation by local governments in Cyber Storm II, currently planned for 2008. DHS believes this approach will ensure that the Department is prepared to provide the best learning environment for future participation by both the cyber incident response organizations, as well as general local government including first responders.

Further, NCSD will play a key role in the planning and execution of cyber aspects for state participants in the Top Official 4 (TOPOFF 4) exercise. Cyber related activities for the three State/territorial venues (Arizona, Oregon and Guam) will include the opportunity for a cyber specific tabletop exercise with state agencies, and the potential inclusion of cyber events within the full scale exercise.

The Office of State and Local Government Coordination

I understand that the President's FY2007 request for the Office of State and Local Government Coordination is $2.2M? In your written testimony you state that the funding will "support our efforts to engage our state and local partners to better prepare our homeland."

Question: 1. Could you please elaborate on what programs will be funded under this initiative?

Response: The $2.2 million funds the salaries and expenses for the full time Department of Homeland Security employees in the Office of State and Local Government Coordination (SLGC). These employees report directly to the Under Secretary for Preparedness and provide a direct communication channel with our stakeholders in the State, local and tribal governments.

The outreach that SLGC provides is essential to ensuring constant and open communication with State and local officials. It serves to ensure that State and local officials are consistently engaged in DHS initiatives and are aware of all policy decisions that will affect their constituents and local priorities.

Federal Duties in Assisting State and Local Governments

According to the National Strategy to Secure Cyberspace, the federal government has specific responsibilities to "provide specific warning information and advice about appropriate protective measures and countermeasures to state and local organizations." However, the Homeland Security Information Network (HSIN), which according to a DHS press release, "will result in more effective communications and more efficient responses to deter, detect, prevent, or respond to terrorist actions," has not been extended to the state Chief Information Security Officers.

Question 1.: While I understand that the Department has made considerable progress in connecting Homeland Security advisors, governor's offices and emergency management agencies across the country, could you please detail whether you envision state Chief Information Security Officers having a role in the HSIN?

Response: The States have an active role in the Homeland Security Information Network (HSIN), advisory groups. HSIN Program Office envisions that the State will make the appropriate choices with respect to membership within each of the State's advisory groups. The State's representation could clearly be the Chief Information Security Officer. However, that will be at the sole discretion of each State. When the HSIN deployment team visits the State, the Department requests the participation of the State senior operational and technical leadership.

RESPONSES FROM THE HONORABLE GEORGE W. FORESMAN FOR THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS, SCIENCE, AND TECHNOLOGY QUESTIONS*

MARCH 8, 2006

The Honorable Dave Reichert (WA)

1. Specific numbers on what percentage of the grant funds have been obligated

Please see attached for the weekly funding fact sheets prepared by the Office of Grants and Training*

2. IC funding breakdown

Please see attached for data detailing the amount of funding that States dedicated to interoperable communications under the FY 2004 and FY 2005 State Homeland Security Grant Program, Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program, and Urban Areas Security Initiative.

The Honorable Bill Pascrell, Jr. (NJ)

1. Stats on Fire Act grant—applications and ineligible applications

Please see attached for two PDF files detailing the application statistics for the AFG Program and the SAFER Program.

2. Written response on whether 311 systems are eligible expenses under G&T grant programs

Under current G&T program guidance, 311 systems are not an allowable expenditure. G&T allows for a wide range of items under the "Interoperable Communications Equipment" category, such as computer aided dispatch (911 systems), video teleconferencing, and satellite data services. However, 311 systems are considered to be too general-purpose in nature, without a clear nexus to use during a Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear or Explosive (CBRNE) event. The Department expects our state and local partners to share some of the responsibility of properly equipping emergency operations facilities.

The Honorable Bennie G. Thompson (MS)

1. Copy of the current process/relationship between FEMA and the Preparedness Directorate in the event of another disaster, given that the MOU between Acting FEMA Director Paulison and the Preparedness Directorate is still in draft form

A formalized MOU between FEMA and the preparedness Directorate is currently being negotiated, and is in draft form. This MOU will be provided as soon as it has been completed.

2. Written copy of the how decisions are made in the firefighter grant programs (ie: guidance provided to peer review panelist)

Please see hard copy information attached.

3. Description of the peer review process

Please see attached for a description of the peer review process.

The Honorable Mike Rogers (AL)

1. Under Secretary Foresman promised to get back to Congressman Rogers after an evaluation of the mission statements of the various training facilities under the purview of the Directorate, specifically the Noble Training Center

Under the provisions of Title V, "Emergency Preparedness and Response," of the *Homeland Security Act of 2002,* Section 502, "Functions Transferred, **(5),** DHS/FEMA/USFA assumed management of the Noble Training Center, located in Anniston, Alabama, from the Department of Health and Human Services on March 1, 2003. Until Fort McClellan was closed in 1999, Noble was a 100-bed U.S. Army hospital. When Fort McCellan closed, Noble was given to DHHS to serve as public health training facility. FEMA's goal for Noble is to create a state-of-the-art training center in DHS's training system and to enhance the training delivered at Noble to focus on preparing communities to deal with mass casualty incidents regardless of cause.

For Fiscal Year 2003, USFA picked up a legacy training program from DHHS and maintained the training schedule that DHHS had set up. DHHS had allocated resources in the amount of $4.3 million and a staff of 2 full-time personnel and 2 Vacant FTE for Noble. During FY 2003, USFA offered 7 courses for approximately 350 students.

When USFA took over Noble, the facility and infrastructure were inadequate in many ways and required significant work during FY 2003 and 2004. New phone and network systems were installed, training facilities were upgraded and dormitories for more than 150 students were cleaned up and made inhabitable. Contracts to provide facility support and security were awarded. USFA acquired state of the art medical training equipment including a computerized patient care simulator.

In FY 2004, USFA staff created an exercise-based healthcare leadership curriculum for Noble. During FY 2004, USFA offered 19 courses for 856 students. With the closing of the FEMA Conference and Training Center at Mt. Weather in September 2004, USFA/EMI classes that had been taught there were moved to Noble. In addition to hospital and public health courses, Radiological Emergency Response Operations courses, and training for FEMA disaster personnel. USFA/EMI also conducted training for Centers for Disease Control and Prevention personnel at Noble during FY 2004 and collaborated with CDP to offer the first joint Noble-CDP course in July 2004.

In Fiscal Year 2005, with refurbished dormitories in service and a new exercise simulation and training area, EMI planned to deliver 80 activities at Noble in FY 2006 for a total of 3,000 students. The Hurricane activity throughout the Guld coast

resulted in all of the classes schedules during the 1st Quarter of FY 2006 being canceled and the Center became a housing center for evacuees until February 2006.

FEMA's EMI and USFA's NFA are scheduling classes at Noble for FY 2006 with the intention that the Noble Training Center will be a full time Training Center as resources will permit.

The Noble Training center, while still under renovation as resources permit, currently houses:

- Integrated Emergency Management Course (IEMC)Classroom
- IEMC Policy Group Room
- IEMC Coordination Group Room
- IEMC Operations Group Room
- IEMC Media Center
- IEMC Exercise Control Room
- Extra EOC Training Room
- Computer/Telephone Room
- Break Rooms

The Noble Training Center provides the facility and support infrastructure to enhance the ability and capability of the USFA to carry out the USFA Mission.

USFA Mission Statement:

To reduce life and economic losses due to fire and related emergencies, through leadership, advocacy, coordination and support. We serve the Nation independently, in coordination with other Federal agencies, and in partnership with fire protection and emergency service communities. With a commitment to excellence, we provide public education, training, technology and data initiatives.

2. Rep. Rogers would also like his office notified when the U/S visits the Center for Domestic Preparedness in Anniston, AL

This trip did not take place as scheduled. Rep. Rogers was notified of the original itinerary and its cancellation.

3. FY'07 Budget request numbers from the NDPC and CDP

Please see attached for a chart detailing the funding request for the training, including the NDPC.*

The Honorable Bob Etheridge (NC)

1. How many leadership positions are open at FEMA?

FEMA currently has two Career leadership positions open and eight Career leadership positions "in the process" of being filled. "In the process" reflects recruitment activity ranging from: "the vacancy announcement is created and ready to be advertised," to, "a selection has been made and is pending OPM approval," There are also six Non-Career (political appointment) positions open.

2. How many individuals in leadership positions there for less than one year?

FEMA currently has twelve leadership positions staffed by employees that have been in that specific leadership position for less than one year. Of those twelve, only four are actually new to FEMA, and all of the other eight have been a part of FEMA leadership for more than one year.

3. Is there "pre-disaster" funding for FEMA?

The Pre-Disaster Mitigation (PDM) program was authorized by § 203 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Assistance and Emergency Relief Act (Stafford Act), 42 USC. Funding for the program is provided through the National Pre-Disaster Mitigation Fund to assist States and local governments (to include Indian Tribal governments) in implementing cost-effective hazard mitigation activities that complement a comprehensive mitigation program.

The PDM program will provide funds to states, territories, Indian trial governments, and communities for hazard mitigation planning and the implementation of mitigation projects prior to a disaster event. Funding these plans and projects reduces overall risks to the population and structures, while also reducing reliance on funding from actual disaster declarations. PDM grants are to be awarded on a competitive bases and without reference to state allocations, quotas, or other formula-based allocation of funds.

The program was funded as follows:

Funding Year	Appropriated Amount
FY2003	$150 M
FY2004	$150 M
FY2005	$150 M
FY2006	$150 M

The Honorable Stevan Pearce (NM)

1. How much of the grant funding has not bee drawn down?

Please see attached for the weekly funding fact sheets prepared by the Office of Grants and Training*

The Honorable Michael McCaul (TX)

1. Funding request for overall training, including the NDPC

Please see attached for a chart detailing the funding request for the training, including the NDPC.*

***Note:** [Attachments are maintained in the committee's file.]

○