

**ENSURING STRONG FEMA REGIONAL OFFICES:
AN EXAMINATION OF RESOURCES AND
RESPONSIBILITIES**

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGENCY
COMMUNICATIONS,
PREPAREDNESS, AND RESPONSE

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED ELEVENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

MARCH 16, 2010

Serial No. 111-56

Printed for the use of the Committee on Homeland Security



Available via the World Wide Web: <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

58-302 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2011

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) 512-2250 Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402-0001

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY

BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi, *Chairman*

LORETTA SANCHEZ, California	PETER T. KING, New York
JANE HARMAN, California	LAMAR SMITH, Texas
PETER A. DEFAZIO, Oregon	MARK E. SOUDER, Indiana
ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia	DANIEL E. LUNGREN, California
ZOE LOFGREN, California	MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
SHEILA JACKSON LEE, Texas	MICHAEL T. MCCAUL, Texas
HENRY CUELLAR, Texas	CHARLES W. DENT, Pennsylvania
CHRISTOPHER P. CARNEY, Pennsylvania	GUS M. BILIRAKIS, Florida
YVETTE D. CLARKE, New York	PAUL C. BROUN, Georgia
LAURA RICHARDSON, California	CANDICE S. MILLER, Michigan
ANN KIRKPATRICK, Arizona	PETE OLSON, Texas
BEN RAY LUJÁN, New Mexico	ANH "JOSEPH" CAO, Louisiana
WILLIAM L. OWENS, New York	STEVE AUSTRIA, Ohio
BILL PASCARELL, JR., New Jersey	
EMANUEL CLEAVER, Missouri	
AL GREEN, Texas	
JAMES A. HIMES, Connecticut	
MARY JO KILROY, Ohio	
DINA TITUS, Nevada	
VACANCY	

I. LANIER AVANT, *Staff Director*
ROSALINE COHEN, *Chief Counsel*
MICHAEL TWINCHEK, *Chief Clerk*
ROBERT O'CONNOR, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS, PREPAREDNESS, AND RESPONSE

LAURA RICHARDSON, California, *Chairwoman*

ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia	MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
HENRY CUELLAR, Texas	PETE OLSON, Texas
WILLIAM L. OWENS, New York	ANH "JOSEPH" CAO, Louisiana
BILL PASCARELL, JR., New Jersey	MICHAEL T. McCAul, Texas
EMMANUEL CLEAVER, Missouri	PETER T. KING, New York (<i>ex officio</i>)
DINA TITUS, Nevada	
BENNIE G. THOMPSON, Mississippi (<i>ex officio</i>)	

STEPHEN VINA, *Staff Director*
RYAN CALDWELL, *Clerk*
AMANDA HALPERN, *Minority Subcommittee Lead*

CONTENTS

	Page
STATEMENTS	
The Honorable Laura Richardson, a Representative in Congress From the State of California, and Chairwoman, Subcommittee on Emergency Communications, Preparedness, and Response	1
The Honorable Mike Rogers, a Representative in Congress From the State of Alabama, and Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Emergency Communications, Preparedness, and Response	3
The Honorable Bennie G. Thompson, a Representative in Congress From the State of Mississippi, and Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security ..	3
WITNESSES	
Mr. David Garratt, Associate Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security:	
Oral Statement	6
Joint Prepared Statement	7
Mr. Tony Russell, Regional Administrator, FEMA Region 6, Department of Homeland Security:	
Oral Statement	9
Joint Prepared Statement	7
Ms. Christine Gibbs Springer, National Academy of Public Administration:	
Oral Statement	10
Prepared Statement	11
Mr. Brock Long, Director, Alabama Emergency Management Agency:	
Oral Statement	14
Prepared Statement	15
APPENDIX	
Questions From Chairwoman Laura Richardson for David Garratt and Tony Russell	35
Questions From Honorable Dina Titus for David Garratt and Tony Russell	38
Question From Honorable Dina Titus for Christine Gibbs Springer	39

ENSURING STRONG FEMA REGIONAL OFFICES: AN EXAMINATION OF RESOURCES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Tuesday, March 16, 2010

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

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:07 a.m., in Room 311, Cannon House Office Building, Hon. Laura Richardson [Chairwoman of the subcommittee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Richardson, Thompson, Cuellar, Cleaver, Titus, Pascrell, Norton, Rogers, Olson, and Cao.

Also present: Representative Jackson Lee.

Ms. RICHARDSON [presiding]. Well, good morning. Welcome to the Subcommittee on Emergency Communications, Preparedness, and Response. This committee will come to order.

The subcommittee's meeting today to receive testimony on ensuring strong FEMA regional offices, an examination of resources and responsibilities.

I will now recognize myself for an opening statement.

Let me, first of all, say to the witnesses who are here, I promise to be gentle. That is a joke. This is my maiden voyage and, actually, this will be one that I will remember for a long time.

So we are very glad to have you here today, and I look forward to your participation.

When I think about the panel's testimony and we talk about FEMA's regional offices, there really is nothing more important in my mind because you are the direct contact that people will rely upon in times of disaster. This hearing marks the first of the subcommittee that I have been able to chair since assuming these duties, and I am particularly pleased to sit here beside our Ranking Member, Mr. Rogers, who I am looking forward to us doing good work on this committee as we move forward.

I would like to acknowledge Mr. Cuellar who is here. He was the former Chair. He has moved on to being the Chair of Borders. However, he is still very committed to this issue, remains committed to it. We will rely upon a lot of the work that he has already done thus far.

Further, I want to acknowledge our Chairman, Chairman Thompson, for his leadership. He actually entrusted me with the opportunity to do this job, and I am committed to not only fulfilling

the committee's objectives that we have laid out but also to be mindful of the goals that he has in mind and to be a good partner and to make sure that we achieve them.

I also look forward to, with this panel, with FEMA, to look at the post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006. When you look at the many reforms that were intended by FEMA, the tools that are necessary to really support our citizens in time of disaster, having our first responders available and prepared to do the work is critical for all of us.

Few reforms are more important than the ones designed to reinvigorate FEMA's ten regional offices. For FEMA to truly be effective, it must develop strong relationships with its State, local, and Tribal partners. For me, having come from local government, that is a particular focus that I think we need to kind in mind.

These relationships are best built and nurtured at the regional level. Headquarters should largely develop the agency's policies, and the regions should lead the implementation of those same policies. Of course, that is easier said than done. I am very encouraged though, however, that Administrator Fugate has taken some of the necessary key first steps to empower the regions to do that very task.

Shortly after being confirmed, Mr. Fugate delegated ten authorities at the regional offices. We want to use today's hearing to get an understanding from FEMA directly on how these regions have implemented those ten authorities and, more broadly, FEMA's future plans for further enhancing the region's participation.

The subcommittee wants to ensure that, as more responsibilities are delegated down, the regions have the staffing, the expertise, and the tools necessary to fulfill its duties. This, in particular, is true for the homeland security grant and preparedness programs. It is unclear to this committee at this point whether the regions currently have the capacity to manage the homeland security grant program.

For example, this fall, FEMA announced that the majority of homeland security grant projects would have to undergo an environmental review process. Putting aside the administrative burden that this requirement places on the grantees, our understanding is that there will be just one person in each region who will be responsible for reviewing hundreds of environmental reviews.

This, clearly, is a bottleneck that is waiting to happen. It is also unclear to this committee how the regions' preparedness and grant officers work together to ensure that the Federal resources are building State and local preparedness capabilities. FEMA's leadership recognizes that the grants and preparedness efforts were largely siloed at the headquarters and the announced reorganization in December was intended to better integrate these efforts. We need to make sure, though, that the regions don't make those same mistakes.

The National Academy of Public Administration, NAPA, explored FEMA's headquarters region's complexity in its report, "FEMA's integration of preparedness and development of robust regional offices." NAPA concluded that FEMA is making progress but, despite the progress, there were several recommendations that we will talk about today.

I look forward to all of your testimonies. With that, I would like to recognize our Ranking Member, the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. Rogers, for his opening statement.

Mr. ROGERS. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. I look forward to working with you in your new capacity as Chair of this committee and wish our colleague, Mr. Cuellar, well in his new endeavor.

Now, I would like to start by thanking our witnesses for taking the time to be here. I know this is not convenient, but it is very helpful to us to be able to draw on your knowledge and experience to better shape policies. So thank you for taking the time and trouble to be here.

I would like to especially thank Brock Long from Alabama, our director of EMA. He does a great job for our State and glad to know there is somebody on the panel that talks like me.

We have got a Member over here—even though she is from Las Vegas, she talks like me, too. You will find out in a few minutes when she introduces one of our guests.

[Laughter.]

Mr. ROGERS. I like it.

This hearing is being held to examine whether current resources and staffing within FEMA's ten regional offices is sufficient to support the administrator's vision as well as the post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act mandate to strengthen and enhance FEMA's regions.

The continued strengthening of FEMA's regional offices is essential to measuring the effectiveness of the agency partnerships with State and local emergency managers and, in turn, our Nation's level of preparedness. I look forward to discussing Administrator Fugate's recent memo delegating authorities to the regional administrators, including an update on the progress of the regions making—that the regions are making in implementing these new authorities as well as a discussion on the possibility of additional changes and reviews in the future.

This hearing also provides an opportunity to discuss FEMA's 2011 budget proposal for the regions and the specific ways in which the regions can build on their critical partnerships with the States.

Finally, I would like to hear from the National Academy of Public Administration as to—as well as our State emergency management director on how FEMA can streamline and improve its regional operations to create a more efficient and effective organization.

To that end, one of the issues I hope to discuss is the disaster declaration process, how we can help make this process more transparent and timely as it moves from region to headquarters and up to the President's determination.

Again, I want to thank our witnesses for being here.

With that, Madam Chairwoman, I yield back.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Thank you.

The Chair now recognizes the Chairman of our committee of the whole homeland security, the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. Thompson, for an opening statement.

Mr. THOMPSON. Thank you, Chairwoman Richardson, for convening such an important hearing this morning.

I have no doubt that you will continue the great work of Chairman Cuellar in your new capacity as Chair of this subcommittee, and I look forward to working with you.

I want to thank our witnesses for being here today to discuss FEMA's efforts to strengthen its regional offices. Any local emergency manager will tell you that the regional offices are FEMA's front line for facilitating emergency management programs. That is why the committee made sure language was included in the Post-Katrina Emergency Reform Act—PKEMRA—to bolster the role of the regional offices.

Hurricane Katrina demonstrated that we needed better coordination between headquarters and the regions, stronger regional preparedness, and more autonomy for the regional administrators to make timely decisions.

I was very encouraged to see Administrator Fugate tackle these mandates by delegating many new authorities to the regional offices. Now, regional administrators will be empowered to hire senior-level staff, provide stronger oversight, and further expedite disaster assistance to State and local governments. This is an important step but much more work needs to be done.

According to a recent report from the National Academy for Public Administration, the regions may not have the capacity to handle all of their new responsibilities. When the regions were asked by NAPA what does being a robust regional office mean, the No. 1 response from all those surveyed was more personnel.

Unfortunately, NAPA also found that FEMA has a weak 5-year strategic human capital plan that does not meet PKEMRA mandates. Since becoming Chairman, I have consistently called on FEMA to build a larger, more qualified, and diverse work force. Completing a comprehensive 5-year human capital plan, and properly staffing the regional offices must be a priority for FEMA.

NAPA also highlighted the need for better communication between FEMA headquarters and the regions as well as a possible transfer of additional authority to the regions. I strongly urge FEMA to further analyze NAPA's recommendation and make any needed adjustments to its new regional office strategy.

We must ensure that we are not setting up the regional offices for failure. They must have the staffing authority, funding, and expertise to carry out all of their missions. Again, I commend Administrator Fugate for taking bold steps to empower the regions, but many questions still remain, including how the new reorganization at FEMA headquarters will impact the regions.

I thank all the witnesses for joining us today. I look forward to hearing their testimony. Since the Ranking Member talked about accent, I hope you now know there are three of us who sound alike.

[Laughter.]

Mr. THOMPSON. I yield back.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Other Members of the subcommittee are reminded that, under the committee rules, opening statements may be submitted for the record.

I welcome the panel of witnesses. Our first witness is Mr. David Garratt, associate administrator for mission support at FEMA. In this capacity, Mr. Garratt is responsible for finance, human capital,

acquisitions, security, information technology, facilities, and support services at FEMA.

Mr. Garratt has served in a number of leadership roles at FEMA including acting deputy administrator.

Our second witness, Mr. Tony Russell, was appointed as the regional administrator for Region 6 in December 2009. In this role, he is responsible for all FEMA operational decisions and policy implementation within the States of Texas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Arkansas, and Louisiana.

Prior to this appointment, Mr. Russell served as acting director of the Louisiana Transitional Recovery Office.

Our third witness, Dr. Christine Springer, is a national academy fellow and will be introduced by Ms. Titus of Nevada.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman for a brief introduction.

Ms. TITUS. Thank you very much, Madam Chairwoman. I look forward to serving on this committee with you.

To the Ranking Member, I appreciate that statement because my mother thinks I am losing my accent.

[Laughter.]

Ms. TITUS. So I am really delighted to introduce my friend and colleague, Dr. Christine Springer. Dr. Springer is the director of the executive master's degree program in emergency and crisis management at the University of Nevada and Las Vegas.

I am proud to have a colleague from UNLV testify before this committee, and I am pleased that she is able to join us today. She comes on behalf of the National Academy of Public Administration where she participated in writing the previously mentioned and oft-cited NAPA report, "FEMA's integration of preparedness and development of robust regional offices. An independent assessment."

I look forward to hearing her perspective on this important subject. I am sure that her presentation will be most informative. I base this assumption not only on her impressive resume and extensive experience but on my first-hand opportunities to have had her as a guest lecturer in some of my classes at UNLV.

So thank you, and welcome to you, Dr. Springer, and the other witnesses.

Ms. RICHARDSON. I thank the gentlewoman. Certainly, you have not lost your accent.

[Laughter.]

Ms. RICHARDSON. Our fourth witness, Mr. Brock Long, was appointed director of the Alabama Emergency Management Agency in January 2008. He serves as the Governor's cabinet-level State coordinating officer for all declared disaster events in Alabama.

We are pleased to have all of you present and greatly appreciate your testimonies today.

Without objection, the witnesses' full statements will be inserted into the record, and I now ask each witness to summarize his or her statement for 5 minutes beginning with Mr. Garratt.

I should tell you that our former Chair used to run these meetings so well that, if you weren't here at first half an hour with Mr. Cuellar, the meeting would be done. So I have got tough shoes to fill but, Mr. Garratt, we look forward to your summarized testimony.

STATEMENT OF DAVID GARRATT, ASSOCIATE ADMINISTRATOR, FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. GARRATT. Thank you. Good morning, Madam Chairwoman and Ranking Member Rogers and other Members of the subcommittee.

I am David Garratt. I am the associate administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency. Joining me is my colleague, Tony Russell. He is a regional administrator from FEMA Region 6 that encompasses the States of Texas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Arkansas, and Oklahoma.

On behalf of FEMA and the Department of Homeland Security, we appreciate the opportunity to testify today about our regional offices, their resources, and their responsibilities.

As you know, FEMA's mission is to support our citizens and first responders to ensure that, as a Nation, we work together to build, sustain, and improve our capability to prepare for, protect against, respond to, recover from, and mitigate all hazards.

This is not a mission for the faint of heart or for the fluid of commitment. It requires great personal and professional dedication, constant engagement with our partners at every level of government and across the private sector and the authority, ability, and resolve to act quickly and decisively to respond to the events developed on the ground.

FEMA's administrator, Mr. Craig Fugate, strongly believes that emergency management organizations are most responsive and effective when the unambiguous authority to make necessary operational decisions is delegated to the lowest command levels possible. Administrator Fugate's vision, shared without reservation by members of his senior staff and senior department leadership, is that headquarters is responsible for the rules and tools, and the regions in the field are the implementers.

In other words, the role of headquarters is to prescribe policy and develop systems to support National policy, but personnel in the regions and fields are responsible for actually implementing the policy and preparing for, responding to, and recovering from and mitigating all hazards.

Soon after he was sworn in, Administrator Fugate made it a priority to ensure that FEMA's regional and field organizations were appropriately equipped and fully empowered to exercise those operational responsibilities. Accordingly, in July of last year, not long after taking office, Administrator Fugate issued a memorandum which began what is an on-going process of realigning key operational responsibilities and authorities to and, in some cases back to, our region offices.

This on-going regional delegation and empowerment effort reflects a fundamental institution shift toward a more decentralized approach to disaster management and recognizes three important principles. First, that our regional colleagues, as a result of their regular and routine inactions with their principle customers, had developed relationships and are far more likely to have an acute understanding of the unique capabilities of the State, local, and Tribal governments in their respective geographic areas of responsibility.

Clearly, they are in the best position to effectively communicate with local stakeholders and work proactively to address regional issues both day-to-day and during emergency operations.

Second, empowering the regions will help reduce unnecessary bureaucracy. Overly complex decision-making chains inevitably contribute to costly delays in providing needed support and may episodically result in operational paralysis.

Micromanagement and mismanagement go hand in hand and are fatal to timely and effective emergency management. We simply cannot allow a micro-managerial reliance on overly centralized decision-making to undermine our responsiveness and hinder our ability to react swiftly and successfully to the needs of our partners and customers.

When, under emergency conditions, the top priority is to save lives and assist disaster survivors, regions must be empowered to take necessary action.

Finally, delegating responsibility to our regional offices will reinforce their authority and operational relevance as well as fortify them with a greater sense of direct ownership in FEMA's multi-faceted mission. This shift is a strong signal of National confidence to our regional staff as well as to the jurisdictions with which they regularly interact and support.

By strengthening our regions, FEMA effectively strengthens its relationships with and responsiveness to our State, local, and Tribal customers.

Administrator Fugate and Secretary Napolitano recognize that strong regions require strong leaders, and both are committed to pursuing, selecting, and assigning regional administrators to have a demonstrated ability in and knowledge of emergency management and homeland security. The gentleman sitting immediately to my left is a perfect example of this.

We firmly and fundamentally agree that these key leadership positions are no place for emergency management novices and will continue to ensure that only experienced and qualified emergency managers fill these critical positions.

In conclusion, I want to emphasize that this regional empowerment initiative represents not a devolution of responsibility and authority from headquarters to our regions but the evolutionary recognition that our regions must grow into stronger and more capable extensions of our National emergency management capability.

We look forward to working with the subcommittee and all of our stakeholders to continue these efforts to bolster our regional efficacy and meet FEMA's mission.

Thank you.

[The joint statement of Mr. Garratt and Mr. Russell follows:]

JOINT PREPARED STATEMENT OF DAVID GARRATT AND TONY RUSSELL

MARCH 16, 2010

Good morning Madam Chairwoman, Ranking Member Rogers, and Members of the subcommittee. I am David Garratt, Associate Administrator at the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Joining me is my colleague Tony Russell, Regional Administrator of FEMA Region 6, which encompasses the States of Texas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Arkansas. On behalf of FEMA and the Department of Homeland Security, we appreciate the opportunity to testify today about our regional offices, their resources, and their responsibilities.

As you know, FEMA's mission is to "support our citizens and first responders to ensure that as a Nation we work together to build, sustain, and improve our capability to prepare for, protect against, respond to, recover from, and mitigate all hazards." This is not a mission for the faint of heart. It requires great personal and professional dedication, constant engagement with our partners at every level of government and across the private sector; and the authority, ability, and resolve to act quickly and decisively respond as events develop on the ground.

FEMA's Administrator, Mr. Craig Fugate, strongly believes that emergency management organizations are most responsive and effective when the unambiguous authority to make necessary operational decisions is delegated to the lowest command levels possible. Administrator Fugate's vision, shared without reservation by members of his senior staff and senior Department leadership, is that headquarters is responsible for the "rules and tools" and the regions in the field are the implementers. In other words, the role of headquarters is to prescribe policy and develop systems to support National policy, but personnel in the regions and the field are responsible for actually implementing policy and preparing for, responding to, recovering from, and mitigating all hazards.

Soon after he was sworn in, Administrator Fugate made it a priority to ensure that FEMA's regional and field organizations were appropriately equipped and fully empowered to exercise those operational responsibilities. Accordingly, in July of last year, not long after taking office, Administrator Fugate issued a memorandum which began what is an on-going process of realigning key operational responsibilities and authorities to—and in some cases back to—our regional offices. Among the delegated authorities are:

- The authority to issue mission assignments in excess of \$10 million. Previously, regions could only approve up to \$10 million without headquarters approval in the Enterprise Coordination and Approval Process (ECAP) systems.
- The authority to contract for aircraft to support requirements organic to that specific region. Previously, regions were required to rely on headquarters to find a contractor to fit the regional requirement. This was time-consuming and inefficient.
- The restoration of regional authority to approve requisitions for non-disaster goods and services, thereby reducing previous delays incurred when the regions were required to seek headquarters approval.
- The authority to select and hire staff in senior regional positions. Previously, such hires had to be approved by FEMA headquarters.

This on-going regional delegation and empowerment effort reflects a fundamental institutional shift toward a more decentralized approach to disaster management, and serves to develop more robust regional offices. Regardless of the impetus, the re-empowerment of regional and field offices recognizes three important principles.

First, our regional colleagues, as a result of their regular and routine interactions with their principal customers, have developed relationships and are far more likely to have an acute understanding of the unique capabilities and needs of the State, local, and Tribal governments in their respective geographic areas of responsibility. Clearly, they are in the best position to effectively communicate with local stakeholders and work proactively to address regional issues, both day-to-day and during emergency operations.

Second, empowering the regions will help reduce unnecessary bureaucracy. Overly complex decision-making chains inevitably contribute to costly delays in providing needed support, and may episodically result in operational paralysis. Micromanagement and mismanagement go hand in hand, and are fatal to timely and effective emergency management. We simply cannot allow a micro-managerial reliance on overly centralized decision-making to undermine our responsiveness and hinder our ability to react swiftly and successfully to the needs of our partners and customers. When, under emergency conditions, the top priority is to save lives and assist disaster survivors, regions must be empowered to take necessary action.

Finally, delegating more responsibility to our regional offices will reinforce their authority and operational relevance, as well as fortify them with a greater sense of direct ownership in FEMA's multifaceted mission. The shift sends a strong signal of National confidence to our regional staff, as well as to the jurisdictions with which they regularly interact and support. By strengthening our regions, FEMA effectively strengthens its relationships with and responsiveness to our State, local, and Tribal customers.

In October 2009, the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) concluded a study of FEMA requested by Congress and released its report, "FEMA's Integration of Preparedness and Development of Robust Regional Offices: An Independent Assessment." This report revealed that FEMA has made significant progress in better integrating preparedness across our functional fabric, as well as

in creating more robust regional offices. Specifically, the report found that FEMA has taken significant steps to create more robust regional offices, including developing and promulgating guidance to identify the respective preparedness responsibilities of headquarters and regional offices, and creating a regional advisory council in each region to represent stakeholders. The report cited clear efforts to improve the on-going working relationship between headquarters and the regions, and identified measures to review the success of evolving regional office authorities. Significantly, the National Academy of Public Administration's report stated that among these significant steps, FEMA "[d]elegated ten additional authorities to regional administrators, pursuant to a July 2009 memorandum from the Administrator". FEMA is pleased that the National Academy of Public Administration has recognized the agency's efforts to create more robust regions and highlighted the importance of the administrator's July 2009 memorandum to that objective; we also agree with the report's assessment that there is more work to be done and that additional opportunities for improvement and empowerment remain. We are committed to address these and other concerns raised in the report, while continuing to build on our recognized successes.

Strengthening our regions will ultimately involve more than just delegating responsibility and authority; it will also require optimizing manpower. Accordingly, the Deputy Administrator is personally leading a high-priority, senior-level initiative to examine how our positions are organized between headquarters and the regions, and reviewing how best to reposition resources to the regions to complement and to fully support the implementation of the programs in the regions. This effort may well drive additional functional management changes as we continue to decentralize for success.

Administrator Fugate and Secretary Napolitano both recognize that strong regions require strong leaders, and both are committed to seeking and selecting regional administrators who are both qualified and prepared to handle these additional responsibilities. The administration is actively pursuing, selecting, and assigning regional administrators who have "a demonstrated ability in and knowledge of emergency management and homeland security." We firmly and fundamentally agree that these key leadership positions are no place for emergency management novices, and will continue to ensure that only experienced and qualified emergency managers fill these critical positions.

In conclusion, I want to emphasize that this regional empowerment initiative represents not a devolution of responsibility and authority from headquarters to our regions, but the evolutionary recognition that our regions must grow into stronger and more capable extensions of our National emergency management capability. We look forward to working with this subcommittee and all of our stakeholders to continue these efforts to bolster our regional efficacy and meet FEMA's mission. Thank you.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Thank you for your testimony.

I now recognize Mr. Russell to summarize his statement for 5 minutes.

**STATEMENT OF TONY RUSSELL, REGIONAL ADMINISTRATOR,
FEMA REGION 6, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY**

Mr. RUSSELL. Good morning, Madam Chairwoman, Ranking Member Rogers, and Members of the subcommittee.

I am Tony Russell, the regional administrator of FEMA Region 6. As Mr. Garratt mentioned, FEMA Region 6 includes the States of Texas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Arkansas. I welcome the opportunity to testify before you today, particularly from my perspective as a regional administrator about FEMA's initiative to evolve authorities to the regions.

Simply put, Administrator Fugate believes that headquarters is responsible for the rules and the tools, and the regions in the field are the implementers. Headquarters will prescribe policy, and the regions will implement that policy.

In July 2009, Administrator Fugate issued a memorandum which began what is an on-going process of realigning key operational responsibilities and authorities to and, in some cases, back to our regional offices. This process addresses a key goal of the Post-Katrina

Emergency Management Reform Act, or PKEMRA, which called FEMA to develop more robust regional offices.

In October 2009, the National Academy of Public Administration, NAPA concluded a Congressionally-requested study of FEMA and released its report, "FEMA's integration of preparedness in development of robust regional offices. An independent assessment."

This report revealed that FEMA has made significant progress in better integrating preparedness across our functional fabric as well as in creating more robust regional offices, but that specific goals and outcomes to expand are these efforts were still needed.

The report found that FEMA has taken significant steps to create more robust regional offices, including developing and promulgating guidance to identify the respective preparedness responsibility of headquarters and regional offices and creating a regional advisory committee in each region to represent stakeholders.

FEMA is pleased that the NAPA has recognized the agency's efforts, but FEMA is also aware that additional opportunities for improvement and empowerment remain to which we are committed.

Additionally, Deputy Administrator Serino is personally leading a high-priority senior-level initiative to examine how our positions and organization between headquarters and the regions and reviewing how best to align resources to the regions to complement and support the region's new responsibilities.

This effort may well drive additional functional management changes as we continue to decentralize in ways that will continue to improve the agency's performance. In support of this effort and consistent with PKEMRA, the administration is actively pursuing and selecting regional administrators who have a demonstrated ability in and knowledge of emerging management and homeland security.

Administrator Fugate and Secretary Napolitano firmly and fundamentally agree that these key leadership positions are no place for an emergency management novice and will continue to ensure that only experience and qualified emergency managers fill these critical positions.

In conclusion, as a regional administrator, it is my view that this process of evolving authorities to the regions will be of great benefit in helping FEMA to achieve its mission to support our citizens and first responders to ensure that, as a Nation, we work together to build, sustain, and improve our capability to prepare for, protect against, respond to, recover from, and mitigate all hazards.

I look forward to responding to your questions. Thank you very much.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Thank you for your testimony.

I now recognize Dr. Springer to summarize her statement in 5 minutes.

**STATEMENT OF CHRISTINE GIBBS SPRINGER, NATIONAL
ACADEMY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**

Ms. SPRINGER. Thank you for inviting us. I was one of seven panel members that served at the National Academy and produced the independent assessment report last October. As part of our inquiry, academy staff conducted over 70 interviews with FEMA offi-

cials at headquarters and regions. We conducted site visits at FEMA's ten regional offices, 1, 3, and 6.

We surveyed senior management at the region offices, facilitated a focus group, and also hosted an on-line State-level dialogue—dialogue of State-level stakeholders.

Our inquiry was based on, as you have noted, the post-Katrina legislation that prompted FEMA to emergency preparedness and a more resilient Nation. We were impressed in our inquiry by the commitment and dedication of FEMA officials, but we also learned of frustration when headquarters does not provide regional offices with genuine opportunities for input into critical management and policy decisions. That, we believe, progress has been made on, but more progress is needed.

We identified key challenges that still really exist even though progress has been made. Preparedness is not fully integrated across FEMA. Regional offices do not yet have the full capacity to ensure that the Nation is fully prepared. Stakeholders are not fully engaged, and FEMA has less than fully effective internal business practices, particularly, with regard, as has been noted, human capital planning and management.

We made seven recommendations, and these recommendations included that FEMA work more closely with internal and external stakeholders to develop a shared understanding of preparedness integration, establish better and much-needed outcome metrics and standards, monitor progress on an on-going transparent basis.

FEMA itself has acknowledged that progress in these areas needs to be made, and the regional offices have been empowered to develop capacity.

When we talked to survey respondents at the regional senior FEMA regional level, three-quarters of them reported increased relationships with States but fewer reported increased interaction with other stakeholders. That continues to be something that we need to work on.

As I close, let me turn my comments specifically to stakeholders. While many regional offices reported that some stakeholder relationships are improving, there is much more that needs to be done. A robust regional office, we believe as a panel, should be fully robust by having sufficient capacity to support efforts of stakeholders at every level and optimally and well-skilled work force to implement policies, a strong working relationship with headquarter components, and strong, effective working relationships with stakeholders.

FEMA has made significant progress in the post-Katrina era, but more progress is on the way. We look forward to it. Again, thank you for inviting the National Academy of Public Administration to testify on this important issue, and we stand ready to answer any additional questions and to work with you in the future.

[The statement of Ms. Springer follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF CHRISTINE GIBBS SPRINGER

MARCH 16, 2010

Mr. Chairman and Members, thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony today before this Subcommittee on Emergency Communications, Preparedness, and Response of the House Committee on Homeland Security. My name is Christine

Gibbs Springer. I am the Director of the Executive Masters Degree Program in Crisis and Emergency Management at the University of Nevada—Las Vegas’s Department of Public Administration, as well as a Fellow at National Academy of Public Administration (the National Academy). As a National Academy Fellow, I was one of seven members of an Academy Panel that released a report in October 2009, *FEMA’s Integration of Preparedness and Development of Robust Regional Offices: An Independent Assessment*. The focus of today’s hearing, “Ensuring Strong FEMA Regional Offices: An Examination of Resources and Responsibilities,” goes to the heart of the Panel’s study.

As background, the National Academy was asked by Congress to conduct an independent assessment of FEMA’s implementation of two key mandates within PKEMRA [Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006]: Preparedness integration and the development of robust regional offices. At its most fundamental level, the goal of PKEMRA is to build a more resilient Nation by improving America’s preparedness. In order to play its leadership role within the Nation’s preparedness system, FEMA must not only integrate preparedness across all of its component programs, but also establish an effective division of responsibilities between headquarters and the regional offices to reach all stakeholders to ensure we are a Nation prepared.

Over the course of our assessment, Academy staff conducted over 70 interviews with FEMA officials at headquarters and the regions, as well as with other interested parties. We conducted site visits to three of FEMA’s ten regional offices [I, III, VI] and surveyed senior management in the regional offices. In addition, we facilitated a focus group session with FEMA’s Regional Administrators and hosted an on-line dialogue with State-level stakeholders. As a member of the Academy’s Study Panel, I am here today to share with you the highlights of what we found and the challenges we believe FEMA still faces.

During the past decade, our Nation has faced significant natural and man-made disasters. After the devastation of Hurricane Katrina, PKEMRA mandated significant changes within FEMA to improve our National preparedness and with it our National response capability. The recent catastrophic seismic events in Haiti, Chile, Taiwan, and Turkey should remind us both that preparedness is critically important and that every disaster is experienced locally. While most daily emergency management situations are managed by local actors, FEMA plays a critical role in assisting stakeholders at all levels through training and education, exercises, and capacity-building grants. FEMA’s regional offices are responsible for nurturing and maintaining the critical relationships with stakeholders upon which preparedness is based. PKEMRA directed FEMA to develop “robust regional offices” to carry out this critical role.

Before discussing our findings, I would like to note that Panel members and staff were consistently impressed by the commitment and dedication of FEMA officials and staff, as well as their strong desire to make FEMA the premier National emergency management agency. During our interviews with headquarter and regional officials and in our survey of regional offices, we frequently encountered a candor and a willingness to identify problems and barriers to success while also offering concrete suggestions and ideas to address challenges and resolve issues. We also learned of frustrations when headquarters does not provide the regional offices with a genuine opportunity for input into critical management and policy decisions.

Based on a review of FEMA’s actions to implement PKEMRA, the Panel concluded that FEMA has taken significant steps to integrate preparedness and develop more robust regional offices. We believe that these efforts—undertaken by both the previous and the current administrations—should be recognized and applauded. Despite this progress, we identified several key challenges at the time of our review:

- Preparedness is not yet fully integrated across FEMA;
- Regional offices do not yet have the capacity required to ensure the Nation is fully prepared;
- Stakeholders are not yet full partners with FEMA in National preparedness;
- FEMA has ineffective internal business practices, particularly with regard to human capital planning and management.

To address these concerns, the Panel issued a total of seven recommendations. Among other things, the Panel recommended that FEMA work with internal and external stakeholders to develop a shared understanding of preparedness integration, establish needed outcome metrics and standards, and monitor progress on an on-going and transparent basis. From an organizational standpoint, FEMA needs to eliminate silos and other impediments to the full integration of preparedness.

As FEMA itself has acknowledged, regional offices are the agency’s front line in supporting stakeholders throughout the country. Recognizing the critical importance

of the regional offices, the Panel recommended that FEMA continue building their capacity consistent with Administrator Fugate's summer 2009 policy memorandum delegating additional responsibilities to the regions. Equally important, FEMA should develop a framework to evaluate how successful it is in building robust regional offices, while continuing to assess whether additional authorities should be delegated to the field. Based on effective practices elsewhere in the Federal Government, the Panel provided FEMA with key principles to use in strengthening the headquarters-regional office relationship.

FEMA can make most, if not all, of these needed changes. Our study found that senior FEMA regional officials recognize the urgent need to integrate preparedness, rebuild their capacity, improve their headquarters relationship, and more actively engaging stakeholders at all levels. In our April 2009 survey of senior FEMA regional managers, three-quarters reported that their region had made at least some progress in preparedness integration—yet almost 85 percent felt it would take at least 1 more year to achieve. Three-quarters of the survey respondents reported increased relationships with States, but fewer reported increased interaction with such stakeholders as private industry and Tribes. Most strikingly, over 90 percent of the respondents reported that considerable or moderate changes would be required for their regional office to become fully robust.

Clearly, much remains to be done. FEMA regional managers identified actions to improve FEMA's efforts in National preparedness. These included:

- Establish a vision for preparedness integration and increase commitment to their goal;
- Make programmatic and administrative changes to FEMA's grant programs including reducing the administrative burdens placed upon grantees (such as multiple reporting requirements, and grant applications);
- Engage and better serve the needs of stakeholders;
- Coordinate common goals within all FEMA divisions or Directorates to reduce HQ program stove-piping;
- Continue to empower the regions through increased staffing and authorities, as appropriate;
- Continuously improve the relationship between the regions and headquarters by recognizing and utilizing the knowledge and experience that exists within the regions; and
- Continue to expand available funding and consider potential structural changes within the regions to more effectively meet regional needs.

Many have asked: "What is a robust regional office?" Although PKEMRA did not define this term, the Panel believes that fully robust regional offices must have sufficient capacity to support efforts of stakeholders at the State, local, and Tribal levels; an optimally sized workforce with the requisite skills to implement headquarters policies and guidance; a strong working relationship with headquarters components and a commitment to emergency management goals; and strong, effective working relationships with stakeholders at all levels.

As I close, let me turn my comments specifically to stakeholders. While many regional officials reported that some stakeholder relationships are improving, we also noted that much remained to be done to actively engage stakeholders at all levels. As mentioned above, FEMA's regional offices are the critical point of interface with the non-Federal stakeholders who have primary responsibility for emergency management including preparedness. FEMA must continue to build and expand these relationships, empowering the regions to actively engage stakeholders and holding these offices accountable for doing so.

FEMA has made significant progress in achieving PKEMRA's mandate for preparedness integration and robust regional offices, but it faces continuing challenges in certain areas. It must build upon progress to date to fully integrate preparedness, to strengthen the capacity of the regional offices, establish working partnerships with stakeholders, and improve internal business practices that support mission-related programs. FEMA has the opportunity to develop a shared vision for National preparedness that actively engages and empowers partners, stakeholders, and citizens.

Again, thank you for inviting the National Academy of Public Administration to testify on this important issue. We stand ready to answer any additional questions you may have.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Thank you for your testimony.

Without objection, the gentlewoman from the State of Texas is authorized to sit for the purpose of questioning witnesses during the hearing today.

I now recognize Mr. Long to summarize his statement for 5 minutes.

**STATEMENT OF BROCK LONG, DIRECTOR, ALABAMA
EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY**

Mr. LONG. Thank you, Chairwoman Richardson. Congratulations on your recently being named Chair.

Ranking Member Rogers, Members of the committee, thank you for allowing me to appear before you today.

As the director of the Alabama Emergency Management Agency, my agency works tirelessly with Federal, State, and local officials to ensure that Alabama remains as self-sufficient as possible in preparing for, responding to, and recovering from all disasters.

Despite our best efforts, history continues to show us that disasters and events will occur that exceed the capability of local and State government. In these incidents, strong and effective relationships with our FEMA regional partners and FEMA National headquarters are vital to successful response and recovery efforts.

In Alabama, we enjoy a solid working relationship with our FEMA regional office in Atlanta, however, to improve on our collective emergency management capability, I recommend we either revisit or modify the following areas that I will summarize.

First, we need to promote a better understanding of State-specific priorities because, often, National initiatives do not necessarily reflect what is important to each State. For example, in Alabama, right now, what we are trying to accomplish is making sure that there is a local full-time emergency manager in all 67 counties. We do not have that at the local level right now. That is one of the most important levels, if not the most important level, in emergency management.

We are also trying to build vendor-managed life safety, life-sustaining commodity concepts where we can be self-sufficient for the first 72 hours in getting water, ice, and MREs out to those who have been impacted by disaster.

We are also trying to build our shelter capability during evacuations. If we can provide our citizens with more options and safe shelters closer to the coast when we evacuate for hurricanes, imagine the life safety opportunity that we have and the cost reduction we will see in just evacuations alone.

Second, we need to develop plans and policies and regulations that complement State and local initiatives to build capability and community resiliency. I applaud FEMA's recent efforts to improve authority; however, there are some policies that may stand in the way of our State's priorities.

An example of this, in my opinion, is the hazard mitigation assistance safe room policy. While I am trying to build shelter capability, this policy is very restrictive and makes it very difficult for us to accomplish this using hazard-grant mitigation performance funds as a result of a disaster.

No. 3, further empower FEMA regional offices with the authority to make critical response and recovery decisions during Presidentially-declared events. Here again, I applaud Administrator Fugate's efforts to extend the authorities down. One area that I think we need to also consider is to make sure that the regional

offices have full authority to mobilize and execute commodity contracts and logistics, making sure that there are not—there are minimal layers in getting water, ice, and MREs down to the States and, ultimately, to the incident level.

No. 4, staff regional offices to levels consistent with the programs and responsibilities they are charged with managing as a result of PKEMRA. It is my understanding that there are 32 additional responsibilities and requirements placed upon regional offices, and I think we have to ask the question: Are the regional offices staffed properly to handle and execute those?

Finally, provide States a great ability to build an engaged and prepared citizenry through tailored public awareness campaigns. Each one of our States is unique and different, and as a result, our risk and vulnerabilities are different. I would like to see a greater opportunity for us in receiving assistance through grants to help us tailor-make each one of our public awareness campaigns, because I often question if we are truly building a culture of preparedness within our citizenry.

We have to look at our citizens as the most important resource and, also, the most important resource in the partnership between State, Federal Government, and local government.

I have expanded on each one of these points in my written testimony. In closing, I want to reiterate we are making great strides towards refining emergency management processes through relationship-building across all levels of government and the private sector.

It is in the spirit of improvement and cooperation that I am honored to appear before you today. Thank you again for inviting me to be here. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have at the appropriate time.

[The statement of Mr. Long follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF BROCK LONG

MARCH 16, 2010

INTRODUCTION

Chairwoman Richardson, Ranking Member Rogers, and Members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to testify before you today. As Director of the Alabama Emergency Management Agency, I appreciate the opportunity to address how the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Regional offices work with our State.

One of our goals at the Alabama Emergency Management Agency is to build a prepared citizenry, coordinate all available resources down to the incident level during disasters, and be as self-sufficient and timely as possible. To meet this goal, an effective partnership between FEMA, the State, local jurisdictions, and our citizens is imperative. Despite our best efforts as a State to remain self-sufficient, the possibility of a disaster overwhelming our capabilities and requiring assistance from our Federal partners at FEMA is ever-present. Our preparedness, response, and recovery efforts depend upon solid relationships with FEMA, and we appreciate the assistance and guidance that we receive from FEMA Region IV.

During Presidential disaster declarations, States need assurances the FEMA regional offices and FEMA Headquarters fully understand the strategic priorities and capability shortfalls of the State. In the past 18 months, Alabama has experienced seven Presidential disaster declarations. While our relationship with FEMA Region IV is healthy and productive, these disasters indicate room for improvement. The strategic priorities of the States remain the foundation for improving the emergency management community's levels of preparedness and capability to respond and recover.

Each State has unique needs due to their geographic location, budgets, and staffing; however we all face the common challenge of meeting the specific needs of our citizens utilizing DHS and FEMA assistance, which is often guided by ridged policy and subjective regulation interpretation. By gaining an understanding of State priorities, FEMA could better construct a bottom-up approach to developing policies, regulations, and grant guidance. Also, FEMA regional offices should be given more autonomy and staff to manage Federal grants and programs in a manner specifically supporting State priorities.

REGIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES & AUTHORITIES

Many of the Federal programs initiated remain National in scope and fail to translate effectively or efficiently at the State level. Alabama's challenges are much different than other large and small States as classified by the *Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief Act* (Stafford Act). Unfortunately, disasters will never recognize National priorities, so flexibility must stand as the starting point of any National policy or regulation. By providing FEMA regional offices discretion to aid States in building local capabilities, the ultimate goals of self-sufficiency, saving lives, reducing the overall cost of disasters, and improving collective response and recovery times are closer to reality.

While FEMA regional offices remain responsible for added program requirements as a result of the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act (PKEMRA) and FEMA National initiatives, it remains imperative the level of authority provided to FEMA Region offices parallel these added responsibilities. Regions must also be staffed at proper levels to effectively administer grants, disaster assistance, and program requirements.

All disasters begin and end locally. When decision-making authority is delegated closest to the incident, collective disaster response and recovery will be more efficient and timely. The emergency management community applauds Administrator Fugate's recent decision to provide FEMA Regional Administrators with new decision-making authorities. The realignment of authority providing Regional Administrators the ability to approve State Management Administrative Cost for Public Assistance and the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program should also be commended. Despite these improvements there remain areas where additional authority should be provided to FEMA regional offices. For example, by giving FEMA regional offices the authority to order life-sustaining commodities such as, water, ice, and meals-ready-to-eat during a disaster response, logistical coordination is closer to the incident. This authority should be provided because FEMA regional offices have greater visibility of the incident's magnitude and severity. Additionally, they are better-positioned to activate and execute National-level commodity contracts.

In recent years Alabama supported FEMA's Gap Analysis Survey, but corresponding assessment programs must be modified accordingly. Without modification, there remains no mechanism to help jurisdictions mitigate identified gaps. These gap analyses facilitate good communication; however, there is rarely a commitment to assist the States in overcoming the identified shortfalls. PKEMRA and other National initiatives place an overwhelming number of requirements and responsibilities upon the FEMA Regions for administering programs, grants, and assessments. Unfortunately, these efforts fail to empower the FEMA Regions to execute these programs in a way that builds capability from the State and local level.

The leadership within FEMA Region IV continues to improve on its relationship and customer service to Alabama. For example, they recently designated a Logistical Chief and Operations Section Chief to work directly with Alabama. In previous years, Alabama would interact with these critical positions only during limited operational activations. Now, we are able to plan and exercise more frequently, and customer service is more consistent. Also, the FEMA Region IV directorate staffs are easily accessible and travel to our State Emergency Operations Center to explain new programs, requirements, and to mitigate outstanding issues.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE & THE APPEALS PROCESS

One area of concern that has a negative impact upon the State's relationship with FEMA is the lack of regional support staff within the Recovery Directorate. Often the State is left waiting for crucial appeal and eligibility determinations by the Region for Public Assistance projects after a disaster. For example, the City of Orange Beach incurred extensive damages to its coastline from Hurricanes Gustav (1789-DRAL) and Ike (1797-DR-AL). The declarations for these hurricanes came in October 2008; however, a final determination about the eligibility of the engineered beach was not determined until February 18, 2010. This delay exposed the city's in-

frastructure to additional tropical threats without its most cost-effective and valuable protective resource in place.

FEMA Regions and Headquarters also regularly exceed the prescribed appeals response time frames in 44 Code of Federal Regulations 206.206. According to these regulations, the FEMA Regional Administrator or Assistant Administrator for the Disaster Assistance Directorate will notify the grantee in writing of appeal decision or need for additional information within 90 days of receiving the appeal. For example:

- The Baldwin County appeal of an Office of Inspector General (OIG) Audit DA-09-03 was submitted to FEMA Region IV on November 16, 2009. To date, there remains no determination regarding this appeal.
- The City of Gulf Shores second appeal of 1605-DR-AL PW 792 was submitted to FEMA Headquarters on July 7, 2008 while the final determination regarding this appeal was received more than a year after submitted.

Many of these delays appear to be the result of staffing shortfalls in the FEMA Regional Recovery and Mitigation Directorates. FEMA National Headquarters should revise and enhance staffing levels within the FEMA Regional offices to directly support States, or grant further decision-making authority to the Federal Coordinating Officer at the Joint Field Office. It should be noted that the recent reorganization at FEMA Headquarters has not yet had an impact upon the States; however, we continue to support any reorganization of FEMA promoting additional customer service and timely decisions in support of all aspects of emergency management.

FEMA POLICY

While FEMA leadership has recently taken needed strides to address previous policies and regulation interpretations, Alabama occasionally sees policies developed and implemented that were not coordinated across the different directorates within the agency or the States. As a result, these policies contradict State priorities. An example of this is FEMA's "Hazard Mitigation Assistance for Safe Rooms" policy. To maximize life safety shelter capability and improve evacuations, Alabama is working collectively with local governments to reduce the evacuation distance citizens travel to seek safe refuge by building a robust shelter strategy and capability. Shelters are in great demand as FEMA has received in excess of \$70 million dollars in Letters of Intent (LOI) for safe rooms and shelters as a result of Hurricanes Ivan, Katrina, Gustav, and Ike. Despite this need, the current safe room policy is overly restrictive, making it difficult for the State and locals to utilize Hazard Mitigation Grant Program funds for the construction of general hurricane evacuation shelters.

FEMA released a position paper in the fall of 2009 expressing concern over this policy and requesting Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) funds be eligible for safe rooms. While FEMA's response pointed to legislative obstacles, a review of Section 404 of the Stafford Act clearly outlines reducing hardship, loss, or suffering as eligible expenditures. Such interpretations stand as a perfect example of overly restrictive applications of the law inhibiting State's abilities to protect life and property.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A recent survey completed by the National Academy of Public Administration's (NAPA) highlights two recurring themes:

1. FEMA Headquarters must ensure better internal directorate integration and communication.
2. FEMA must build robust regional offices with increased authority, autonomy, and staff support.

Improving upon these areas will significantly improve FEMA's relationship with a vast array of stakeholders.

Finally, the most effective means to prevent disasters from evolving into catastrophic events is to first create a culture of preparedness within our citizenry. While National-level preparedness efforts and outreach campaigns are positive in theory, many of these efforts do not effectively reach citizens. National public awareness campaign strategies can be more effectively managed by giving States appropriate discretion and funding. Many programs mandated by PKEMRA and other National-level initiatives address how emergency management should prepare and build capability to respond; however, a disproportionately small amount of emphasis and funding is invested to educate citizens about their specific hazard vulnerability. Finally, our preparedness planning stops short by not effectively incorporating citizens as resources into our plans and initiatives.

The State of Alabama appreciates the good work FEMA and our Federal partners do for our citizens prior to and following a disaster. With minimal modifications, FEMA can certainly improve its working relationship with States.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify today and I stand ready to answer any questions you may have.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Thank you, Mr. Long, for your testimony.

I thank all the witnesses for the testimony and will remind each Member that he or she will have 5 minutes to question the panel.

I now recognize myself for questions.

Mr. Russell, can you please describe the staffing levels that your region has to manage the homeland security grant programs? Will you receive additional grants specialists under the fiscal year 2011 budget request?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, Madam Chairwoman. I think that, at the moment, you know, I have been in the job now for about 2½ months. At the moment, we have what we need to be able to effectively do our programs.

I say that only because it is done in a partnership between the region and between headquarters, also. If there is a point that we get to as this process evolves that I decide that I cannot perform my mission, at that time, before I get to that point, what I do is I go and I say I need more resources.

From that, I am assured that those resources will become available. So as I went through and I did an assessment of my capabilities, I felt, at this point, I have no shortfalls in my ability to perform my mission.

Ms. RICHARDSON. What do you have?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have—

Ms. RICHARDSON. How many people do you have?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have in my mission—I don't know precisely the exact number that I have in that one division, but I know that when I have talked to my division director, he is satisfied with what he has now in the context of what we are doing now.

We know that this is an evolving process, and I know that, as this process does evolve, if I do need to acquire more assets, then I will be the first in line to put my hand up to be able to get those.

Ms. RICHARDSON. How involved were you in the budget itself? Were you allowed to—were you just given a set budget and everyone was given the same thing? Or were you allowed to say I need a little more X in this particular category or more in every way?

Mr. RUSSELL. Ma'am, you know, as I am told—because I was not there yet when this all transpired—but as I did my review, I was told it was a give-and-take; meaning that we had input into the process, and then we were able to talk about what would be requirement in the field and, from there, be able to build the budget.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Garratt, to your knowledge, how involved are the regional coordinators in the budget? Where they given an opportunity to make changes? Or was it the same for every region?

Mr. GARRATT. Regions are engaged in the budget at different points in the budget process. For example, there are a number of headquarters organizations and functions—response and recovery, mitigation—that control lines of funding. Those organizations work directly with the regions to identify what their requirements are for those functional lines of funding and provide funding to the regions in support of their requirements.

So in that respect, regional staff work directly with their counterparts at headquarters to identify what the requirements are and then work to negotiate funding to support those requirements. In addition to that, regions receive a general budget to support their 1100 account, which is for travel—things of that nature.

So they are involved in the budgeting process from the very beginning, but the level and the tenor of their engagement is going to depend on the type of line of funding for which they are requesting support.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Are you aware of any regions that submitted additional requests for changes that were not met?

Mr. GARRATT. I would suspect, Madam Chairwoman, that there are probably requests every year within various functional areas that are adjudicated, and some are met and some are not met. I am not aware that there have been any critical requirements that any regions have identified that have not been met.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Are you aware of any that had to do with staffing requests?

Mr. GARRATT. Regarding?

Ms. RICHARDSON. In the regions, did any of them submit, in addition to their budget, a further request of staffing that has not been met?

Mr. GARRATT. I am certain that, in the past, Madam Chairwoman, that the regions have requested additional staffing requirements and that we have not been able to satisfy all of those requirements at that time. However, I would like to piggyback on that and say that, as my colleague, Mr. Russell indicated, our deputy administrator, Mr. Serino, recently had an all-hands. At that all-hands, he announced that he is committed to making 25 percent of FEMA headquarters existing vacancies reallocating those to the regions.

We have a team in process right now identifying how those—the needs and requirements for those—at the regional level for those vacancies.

So the agency is very committed to additionally fortifying and bolstering the number of staff at the regions.

Ms. RICHARDSON. I am going to pause for that moment because I am Chairwoman and my time has expired, and I want to set a good example.

So I will now recognize the Ranking Member of the subcommittee, Mr. Rogers, from Alabama.

Mr. ROGERS. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman.

Mr. Garratt, I understand that FEMA is conducting a comprehensive policy review. Is this still going on? Who is leading the effort? What is the status of it?

My understanding is that this has been on-going for quite some time.

Mr. GARRATT. Mr. Rogers, I think I am going to need a bit more detail. When you say a comprehensive policy review, is that a particular policy or just in general?

Mr. ROGERS. No. With regard to the region's offices and whether they have sufficient personnel.

Mr. GARRATT. Correct, sir. This is really kind of a multi-faceted process. As we indicated, some months ago, the administrator que-

ries of regions and asked them what additional authorities they needed. They provided that information, and then additional authorities were redelegated to those.

Since then, we have—the administrator at the NEMA conference last week met again with the regional administrators and said, okay, thanks. Appreciated that. Let us do this again.

He is, once again, charged the regions to identify additional types of authorities that they believe that they need to be more effective and to let us know what those authorities are. Regions will get together. They will identify what those are. Those will come up.

In terms of policies supporting the regions, those are an outgrowth of the additional authorities that we provide to the regions. So as we identify authorities that we are going to pushing back down to the regions, we will amend and revise the policies to support that.

Mr. ROGERS. Okay. So we are still on-going.

I would also like to ask you to clarify how FEMA's grant programs will operate between FEMA headquarters and the regions. Will they be affected differently?

Mr. GARRATT. That is an evolving process, Mr. Rogers. In fact, we do exact that to work differently. We do expect, again, as part of this process, to begin pushing various grant responsibilities that are currently managed at the headquarters level down to the regions.

But I can't tell you what the final form of that is going to be at this point. We anticipate that we are going to get additional grants personnel. But in terms of exactly what those responsibilities are going to be, don't have a fix on that yet, sir.

Mr. ROGERS. Okay. Thanks.

Mr. Russell, I want to stay on this same topic with you.

What type of oversight or support does the regional office provide with respect to State and local grants now?

Mr. RUSSELL. Sir, now, we provide—we are the ones that actually manage those grants now. So we work with the States and with the local partners to make sure that the grants are, in fact, being processed way that they should at the moment.

Mr. ROGERS. Okay. When you heard Mr. Garratt talk about trying to shift more of that responsibility to the regional offices, is that something you support and think would be better for the distribution of those grants?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, sir, Mr. Rogers. You know, my philosophy is that things are best done at the point of impact. So I think that the more ability that we have in the regions to monitor, to push our grants forward, I think that would be better and more efficient.

Mr. ROGERS. Great. Thank you.

Mr. Long, how long does it take the disaster declaration process generally to take once you have submitted a request to FEMA for a declaration? Is there a typical time line?

Mr. LONG. Ranking Member Rogers, honestly, the declaration process has become somewhat frustrating, in my opinion. The last two disaster declarations that we went through—Tropical Storm Ida, it took 32 days. The most recent denial that we had for extreme cold weather also took 32 days.

To me, that is an excessive time frame, however, there is very little transparency in that process as well.

Once our request—the Governor’s request goes to the FEMA region, it is not clear as to what the next steps are and where our request is actually in process.

Mr. ROGERS. Specifically, how would you like to see it improved that would help you do your job better?

Mr. LONG. Well, if we have definitely—if there is life safety issues involved where individual assistance is needed and FEMA is rolling resources, I don’t see why a declaration could not take place within 24, 48 hours.

You know, quite honestly, if public assistance—if it is just a public assistance where infrastructure is damaged but there are no life safety and we meet our numeric indicators that FEMA provides, I am not sure why it would take a month. It should also be a matter of maybe 2, 3, 4 days.

Mr. ROGERS. Tell me more about the transparency concerns.

Mr. LONG. Quite honestly, when you call—when we make phone calls to the region or to headquarters, a lot of times, the answer we get is that the declaration request is in process and that is it.

Mr. ROGERS. Okay. Thank you very much, Madam Chairwoman.

Ms. RICHARDSON. The Chairwoman will now recognize the others for questions they may have to ask the witnesses. In accordance with our committee rules and practice, I will recognize Members who were present at the start of the hearing based on seniority of the subcommittee alternating between the Majority and Minority.

Those Members coming in later will be recognized in the order of their arrival. But with that, what supersedes all of that is recognizing the Chair of our committee, which is Chairman Thompson.

Mr. THOMPSON. Thank you very much, Madam Chairwoman. I might add that, for your maiden voyage as Chairwoman, you have done an excellent job. I compliment you on it.

Mr. Garratt, at what point will we have this 5-year capital—human capital plan for FEMA so we can look at it?

Mr. GARRATT. Good question, Chairman Thompson.

I can’t tell you at this point—give you a date when you are going to have that. What I can tell you is why I can’t tell you that at this point and what we are doing that is leading to that particular effort.

Since Mr. Fugate came on, he recently identified three key initiatives for this—for fiscal year 2010. One of those key initiatives is the work force enhancement initiative. As part of that, he essentially wants us to relook at how we hire. He wants to increase diversity. He wants to increase the interning programs. He wants to increase and improve how we manage our work force. He wants to have rotations, et cetera, et cetera. A lot of improvements that he envisions for this coming year.

Our work groups that we have stood up are currently shaping and fashioning what are going to be the initiatives to support that work force enhancement initiative. What comes out of those work groups will, in fact, inform what will be that 5-year human capital strategy. We are looking at potentially some fairly large changes in how we do business from a human capital perspective within the agency. We want to wait for that work force enhancement initiative

to conclude and understand how we are going to move forward before we complete a human capital plan.

Mr. THOMPSON. Six months? Nine months? So, I mean, you tell me what it accomplishes, but if you don't operate on a time table, we could be here 4 years or into another administration and we don't have it.

Will you get for the committee Mr. Fugate's expected time table for the implementation of this human capital plan?

Mr. GARRATT. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Dr. Springer, we are glad to have you. I always enjoy opportunities to go to your part of the country.

Can you, from a professional standpoint, tell me how difficult it would be to implement any reorganization without a human capital plan to go with or a staffing component?

Ms. SPRINGER. Well, from my experience, the human capital plan is pivotal to the reorganization and restructuring. Our panel determined that, frankly, one part of this restructuring that was necessary was to develop metrics that would allow regional office performance to be measured and to hold them accountable. FEMA concurred.

Performance standards particularly directed at outcome measure should be developed for regional offices. Metrics and standards, we found, was very important.

I would also like to mention it is not just what we found was—it is not just more staff. We found that skill sets needed to be different and enhanced. That is—

Mr. THOMPSON. Thank you very much.

Mr. Garratt, are you aware of the fact that the reputation of FEMA is that they tend to look for retired civil servants, other people to employ rather than just people from the ordinary work force?

Mr. GARRATT. I am familiar with that, Chairman Thompson. The administrator is extremely familiar with that as well which is why he is committed to turning that perception around.

Mr. THOMPSON. All right. Is it perception or is it reality?

Mr. GARRATT. It is certainly perception. The reality is that we do have a lot of former military, former retirees who are part of our permanent work force as well as make up a substantial number of our reserve work force. Very true.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, will you provide us the information statistically as to what that component is?

Mr. GARRATT. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Russell, who is your disability coordinator for your region?

Mr. RUSSELL. My disability coordinator, Chairman Thompson, I have a person who handles all my equal rights and all of my other things to deal with personnel, but I don't have anyone who is particularly the disability coordinator at the time.

Mr. THOMPSON. Last question.

Mr. Garratt, can you tell me why we don't have listed in our budget for this year for FEMA staffing for disability coordinators in the region?

Mr. GARRATT. Chairman Thompson, I fully expect that, as part of this on-going process, working with the regions that is being led by Deputy Administrator Serino, that disability coordinators will

be among those key positions that we will be providing positions for as part of the reallocation of positions to the region.

So I think the expectation is here that we will be reallocating headquarters positions to the regions, and one of them will be for the purposes of disability coordinators in each region.

Mr. THOMPSON. So if we had an emergency in Alabama today, who would have that responsibility in the region in Atlanta?

Mr. GARRATT. It would be shared between the headquarters disability coordinator and personnel, probably, performing an additional duty at the regional office.

Mr. THOMPSON. I would assume, Mr. Long, that is part of some of your concerns that you shared in your testimony about having specific priorities and things at the regional office so you will know who the contact person is to get specific information rather than being bounced around?

Mr. LONG. I would agree. Yes, sir. You know, FEMA has made some good strides, though. We have actually seen a logistics coordinator that has been assigned directly to the State, whether it is a disability coordinator or whether it is a logistics or operation chief that assigned directly to Alabama that services us, it is always a best practice because it gives us somebody that we can test, train, exercise with, and we don't just see them in the heat of battle when we have been impacted by a disaster.

Mr. THOMPSON. But you understand that planning and training is far better than in the heat of battle?

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir. Most definitely.

Mr. THOMPSON. Thank you. I yield back.

Ms. RICHARDSON. The Chair now recognizes Mr. Olson for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLSON. Well, thank you, Madam Chairwoman. Congratulations to my colleague from California on her appointment as the Chairwoman.

Thanks to the witnesses for coming today. I greatly appreciate your time, your expertise, and your willingness to sit down and educate us and make sure that we make better decisions for the people in our districts and for the people of America.

My first question is for Mr. Russell. Mr. Russell, a constant concern I hear from Galveston County is that the local FEMA team set up to assist in the Hurricane Ike recovery will soon be leaving and heading back to the Denton office 300 miles away, perhaps, as soon as April.

The job is not done on the ground, and we need that team to stay there. I understand that you have been meeting with local officials, State officials, stakeholders in the Galveston area, and these meetings have been going well. I am getting very positive feedback.

Can you give us an update on where things stand?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, sir. Congressman Olson, I am committed, first of all, to ensuring that the staff there will not leave until the job is done. What that means to me is that, until I get concurrence from the State that, in partnership, that we are at a position where that staff could leave and return back to their region for the actual close-out, then that staff is going to remain in place.

To me, that is a very important point that there is going to be a conjunction with our State partners before my folks leave.

Mr. OLSON. Thank you very much for that answer. I mean, again, they are very concerned that they will be pulling out a little early. I appreciate your commitment to keeping them there until the locals say we are good to go.

Question again for—another for you, Mr. Russell, and for Mr. Garratt.

Back to Galveston and Ike, I am sure you are familiar with the University of Texas medical branch there at Galveston, one of the best hospitals and medical schools in our Nation. They are located in Galveston, as you all know, and they sustained great damage during Hurricane Ike. A constant concern I hear from them is the length of time it takes FEMA to complete a project worksheet, up to 60 days in some cases.

Are there steps FEMA can take to reduce that amount of time? I would like you to specifically address the method used to estimate the cost of repair and mitigation as a means of achieving that goal of a quicker turnaround.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, sir. In fact, I am going down there next week to do a walk-through. I, too, share the thought that my goal is to always have the process as streamlined as possible. If we can work together as a team, and that means with the applicant, with the State, with the locals, with FEMA, and be able to come to conclusions faster; that is what I prescribe, too.

So I am going to do a walk-through. I am going to talk to the officials down there to see where we are at and what we can do to move forward as a team.

Mr. OLSON. Thank you very much.

Mr. Garratt.

Mr. GARRATT. I have nothing to add.

Mr. OLSON. I greatly appreciate that. I mean, it is incredibly important to that community. They had two hospitals down there—the Shriners Burn Hospital and UTMB—that were both significantly damaged. A lot of the health care moved off the island, and they are in the process of getting that back up and running.

I greatly appreciate your willingness to go down there and talk to them because it is a regional asset. I mean, they were one of the only Level 1 trauma centers, one of the three in our region, handling a lot of the work offshore on the drilling rigs and, also, the Texas—some of the refineries there on the Gulf southern part of the Houston ship channel.

When they went down, it put a tremendous strain on the trauma care throughout the region. So thank you very much for being willing to go down there.

Finally, one last question for you, Mr. Russell, and that is just because you are my Region 6 administrator.

But you know the devastation that was caused by Ike. The Texas coast suffers from storm-related disasters on a regular basis. Each disaster results in hundreds of millions of dollars, if not billions, in economic damages. I am aware of FEMA's efforts to buy and restrict building lots where there have been damaged structures.

I would like to hear your thoughts on the buying and retiring of building rights on undeveloped land where there is the possibility of future development in areas that are disaster-prone.

Mr. RUSSELL. Well, sir, you know, I think that, with me, I always like to look at what is the flexibilities of FEMA's programs now; work with our State partners to figure out what is the best course of action for them. So at this juncture, I am not familiar in detail with that particular item that you are talking about, but I can say this: I can say, whenever an issue is brought to me from my State partners, we sit down, we address it, and find a way to attack it to get it achieved.

Mr. OLSON. Well, thanks for your answer. Make sure you get the information to that. I appreciate the witnesses' time and yield back.

Ms. RICHARDSON. The Chairwoman recognizes Mr. Pascrell from New Jersey, who has had his own challenges this week with some of the floodwaters, for 5 minutes.

Mr. PASCRELL. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. Madam Chairwoman, I just return this morning from my district which is centered in the Passaic River Basin. As a result of the storm, this weekend, we are seeing some of the worst flooding in the area I have seen in 25, 30, 40 years.

The river—the Passaic River will crest at some point later today. The river already has risen to record heights and continues to threaten the surrounding populace. My question is going to be to Mr. Garratt.

Flooding continues to cause severe property damage. Several thousand residents have already been forced to evacuate. The rising waters, combined with downed trees, power lines, have led to the closing of many roads and bridges, not only throughout my area, but throughout the entire State of New Jersey.

Thousands and thousands are still without power. I surveyed the damage myself with the sheriff's department and with the State police and other rescue workers. They have been doing an unbelievable job since early Saturday morning in responding and getting local residents out of harm's way—over a thousand have been evacuated. Thousands have been evacuated.

I want to express, Mr. Garratt, my appreciation to the FEMA office here in the District of Columbia that has been working in coordination with my office. I am confident in the work that FEMA Region 2 will undertake to conduct a preliminary damage assessment with the State of New Jersey. We have lost lives. This is serious business. I don't have to tell you. We already have a declared state of emergency in the State.

Regarding the subject of this hearing, I want to go on the order and saying that I support additional authorities being delegated to FEMA's regional offices if they receive the resources necessary to handle these greater responsibilities. One cannot exist without the other.

In fact, I hope that FEMA National would give the regional office greater authority on other matters like choosing local contractors for projects within the region. Clearly, each region has different challenges, and the local people on the ground better understand what is needed than decision-makers here in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Garratt, can you comment on this issue of giving regional offices greater control over choosing local contractors for regional projects?

Mr. GARRATT. I think it is a great idea, Mr. Pascrell. As a matter of fact, our chief procurement officer, Mr. Jake Hansen, recently briefed our administrator on his plan to put an individual in each region who would be part of a—essentially—collective team but located in each region which would be local business engagement personnel for the right purpose of reaching out to and engaging local contractors in a way that we haven't necessarily done before.

So they would, on a day-to-day basis, operate within the regions doing exactly what you suggest. But in a major disaster situation, they could be assembled in a disaster area to do that in a more robust and a more focused and targeted way within the disaster area.

So, yes, we think that is a terrific idea.

Mr. PASCRELL. Let me ask this question. Let us assume that these new authorities we are talking about today are already implemented and a disaster was seen in many parts of the Northeast. How would FEMA's response be different? Would the regional offices have the resources in place today to effectively mitigate the damages these heavy floods and winds have caused? What is your opinion?

Mr. GARRATT. Tough question to answer because it really depends on the situation. We have, for example, some very large contracts that we can call on. Our individual assistance, technical assistance contracts, or public assistance, technical assistance contracts.

Those contracts enable us to essentially roll contractors out on a moment's notice to respond to disasters. We don't need to go out and compete those requirements to get somebody to perform that service. They are available now to do that. That is the value of having them on standby is that we have that capability ready to go.

What we are interested in doing is being able to migrate as quickly as we can away from that and then bring on local contractors once we get the situations stabilized. What we don't want to do is sacrifice our ability to move quickly for the sake of simply bringing on local contractors. What we want to do is find a balance that enables us to respond quickly with a standby contractor and then bring on locals now.

To the extent that regions can mimic what we do with these large contractors at a regional level, I think that is fine. That is one of the things that we are going to be working with regions on as time goes on is to see if we can essentially break—come up with smaller regional versions of these large contracts that we have.

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Chairwoman, we are not just talking about contractors. We are talking about authorities. You know, FEMA deals with a lot of entities and agencies. A critical issue.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Pascrell, your time has expired. However, you are dealing with a real emergency as we speak.

If there is no objection, I would like to extend one more moment, and then we will have a second round of questions.

But with respect to you and your constituents, if there is no objections. Okay.

Go ahead, Mr. Pascrell.

Mr. PASCRELL. Thank you. I just want to conclude by this. I am satisfied with what has happened between Saturday and this morning in terms of FEMA. I have been critical in certain areas, but let us say it the way it is.

So I wanted you to take that back, and we have got serious, serious problems here.

It looks like we are heading towards a 100-year record flood. That is where we are heading by 6 to 9 o'clock tonight. There is—you know, people have been evacuated.

Of course, these things happen—5 years, 10 years, 20 years. Nature has its way of dealing—we have our way of dealing. Lives have been lost, and we certainly want to do everything we can to help the State agencies, local agencies to do what they have to do.

I must say that this preparation was much better than the last time we had this in 1987. So thank you.

Thank you.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Thank you, Mr. Pascrell. Of course, we wish all of your constituents well.

Mr. Cao from Louisiana, you are acknowledged for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAO. Thank you very much, Madam Chairwoman.

First of all, I just wanted to say hello to Mr. Russell and Mr. Garratt. Mr. Russell and I have been working closely together in the past year to make sure that New Orleans recovery is on pace. I must say that has been progressing extremely well.

One of my biggest concerns, obviously, was last year with respect to the province at the local FEMA offices and with you coming down to address the issue. Changes were made and, therefore, the office became much more efficient and much more friendly.

My question—my first question to you here is: Are the steps that you have taken to improve the efficiency as well as the working environment at the local office—how can you ensure that these policies and procedures will remain in place to allow the FEMA officers a productive work environment as well as a friendly working environment?

Mr. RUSSELL. Well, yes, sir. Congressman Cao, I have a meeting with my folks in Louisiana one per week. I have an interim director, Mr. Mark Landry, down there now. He and I talk consistently to ensure that everything that we put in place continues to move forward.

We also are in close communication with the State, also, with members of the city to make sure that we continue to have the progress down there streamlined and make sure that we come to conclusions and get these projects done.

Mr. CAO. One of the issues that I had with FEMA and probably still have with FEMA is the competency in evaluating FEMA projects, especially, for example, on the issue of Charity Hospital. I know that FEMA refused to pay the State the replacement value of Charity Hospital.

It went through several years of back-and-forth and then, subsequently, it was put to an arbitration panel to decide. The arbitration panel issued a judgment within a week and a half saying that FEMA owes the State the replacement money for Charity.

It, to me, seems almost a slap in the face to FEMA who have consistently held that FEMA does not owe the State that amount.

What changes have you initiated to ensure that these problems in the future can be avoided where FEMA is not obstructing recovery but working in conjunction with State and municipalities and ensure that recovery is expedient as well as sufficient?

Mr. RUSSELL. Sir, I think that one of the things that you have probably seen is that we have people now working together. Instead of us doing our part of the PW process in one room and have the applicant in a different room, what you see now in Louisiana is folks coming together in the same room talking together trying to find solutions together. That was done with—that was done with University of New Orleans.

So I think you have seen some of the progress that we have made. What happened in Charity happened a while back, and it took time to get to where we are at now. But I think that you have seen the benefits of us coming together as a team and trying to solve it together.

Mr. CAO. The budget for FEMA for 2011 includes a cut in funding for emergency food and shelter. For example, post-Katrina food was shipped in trucks from areas as far away as Florida. Much of it was prepackaged and obtained at a cost significantly higher than food obtained elsewhere in the State and in neighboring States.

So I just want to, again, reemphasize a statement by Congressman Pascrell. Explain to me how regional offices can ensure that this type of waste doesn't occur during and after a disaster.

Mr. RUSSELL. Sir, what happens at the regional office is that we work with our State coordinators to make sure that we have the resources there when they are required to be there.

So my goal on the ground is to make sure that, when any of my five States may request food or water, ice or whatever the case may be, that we have it on time and on target for the survivors. So that is what I am going to be doing.

Mr. CAO. On the issue of—also, how can you be more efficient? How can you get your locals involved to provide a more cost-effective means of providing these basic needs for the people rather than trying to shift—for example, I was hearing that a peanut butter and jelly sandwich was charged to the Government at an amount of \$8.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Cao, your time has expired.

So, Mr. Russell, if you could summarize briefly.

Mr. RUSSELL. Okay. In quick summary, I just want to say to our goal is to make sure that once the stores and once the businesses are operational, then we are not there anymore, and the folks can then go to the stores and purchase things there.

Mr. CAO. Thank you very much.

Ms. RICHARDSON. The Chairwoman acknowledges Ms. Norton, from the District, for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. Thank you for this hearing.

Thank all of you for your important service in this area of American life.

For Mr. Garratt, as you are aware, the National Capitol Region has recently had a, perhaps, as far as I know, its first Presidential disaster declaration. We have had various kinds of FEMA help for

the December snowstorm. I believe the February snowstorm which the region—its various jurisdictions has requested, is still pending.

Where are you on fund allocation for the December snowstorm?

Mr. GARRATT. Funding for disasters depends on—or the flow of funding depends on the specific functional area. If we are talking about public assistance, the net funding is received as project worksheets are submitted and then obligated to headquarters.

Once they are obligated, the funding goes to the district, and then the district then provides that on the applicant.

Ms. RICHARDSON. What about funding for the snow—this is—we are in the middle of a great recession, and all of the region was bled dry by having to clear the snow. What about that funding, sir?

Mr. GARRATT. Again, if they have a declaration, as soon as they make the request—

Ms. NORTON. You are able to give me in March any date with respect to funding for the first declaration in December?

Mr. GARRATT. Funding is available for—

Ms. NORTON. For the District? For—Heights County? For Montgomery County? For the States and the District of Columbia for the December snowstorm, have you any target date for when funding will be available to jurisdictions?

Mr. GARRATT. Ms. Norton, funding was available the day that those disasters were declared.

Ms. NORTON. So the jurisdictions have received funding?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, ma'am. Not necessarily. Funding is available—

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Garratt, I wish you wouldn't play word games with me. I want to know when these various jurisdictions will receive funding for the snow they picked up with money they do not have.

Mr. GARRATT. They will review funding whenever they submit a project worksheet requesting that funding—

Ms. NORTON. For the jurisdictions, if they have not done so—they have not done so—would you—

Madam Chairwoman, could I ask that Mr. Garratt submit to the Chairwoman the status of the jurisdictions as to what they have not yet done and what FEMA is to do rather than to go around in circles any further on this question?

Ms. RICHARDSON. Without objection.

Ms. NORTON. I would like that submitted within 2 weeks.

I would like to know the role of the region when it comes to your so-called reserve or temporary workers. Is it true that these workers do not have any health care?

Mr. GARRATT. It is true that disaster assistance employees, which is one former reservist, does not have health care. A cadre of on-call reserve employees or core employees do have access to health care.

Ms. NORTON. Do you believe those workers would be covered by the present health care bill that is going through the Congress? Do you believe there should be any group of workers who do work for the Federal Government who should not have access to health care?

Mr. GARRATT. I personally believe that, whenever an individual is under Federal employ, that they should have access to health care during that period of employment.

Ms. NORTON. So these—where do these temporary workers come from?

Mr. GARRATT. They could be retired school teachers. They could be retired military—

Ms. NORTON. Are you aware of whether, perhaps, they are receiving health care from some other source?

Mr. GARRATT. Some of them are.

Ms. NORTON. Don't you think it is the obligation of the agency to know that they are receiving health care from some other source or whether they are simply without any health care?

Mr. GARRATT. Well, given the fact that we cannot provide disaster assistance employees health care right now, knowing whether they have access to health care or not is relatively—

Ms. NORTON. Beside the point.

Mr. Garratt, health care is this President's signature issue. I wish you would go back to Administrator Fugate and indicate that, in light of his own President's priority on health care, the agency needs to do one of two things; either make certain that these employees have health care from some other source, or devise a way to make sure the Federal Government does not have, in its employ, people who don't have health care while it is preaching to the rest of the country that everybody ought to have health care.

Thank you very much, Madam Chairwoman.

Ms. RICHARDSON. The gentlelady's time is expired.

The Chairwoman recognizes the gentlelady from Texas, Ms. Jackson Lee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chairwoman, let me—Chairwoman, let me thank you, first of all, for your courtesies of extending the opportunity to participate in this hearing as I am not a Member of this subcommittee but a Member of the full committee. Also, let me congratulate you on your leadership of this committee and the courtesies of the Ranking Member as well.

Coming from the Gulf region, I have lived with FEMA as third cousins, if you will. We have gone through, in recent years, Storm Allison. Some of you may remember that if you are seasoned FEMA-ites. That was one of the costliest climate or weather conditions. It was not a hurricane. Then, of course, Hurricane Katrina, Rita, and Hurricane Ike that has hit our community.

Just several points that I would like to make and then have a comment on it. I would like to join my colleague, Congressman Olson, to insist and hope that FEMA will remain in the Galveston region. Before the Congressman was elected, we worked collectively together on these issues, and I continue to look forward to working with him.

Mr. Russell, I would commend to you and your staff to reach out to North Galveston. I am familiar with them because they are working with churches in my Congressional district. I would ask you specifically to contact a Reverend Berkeley on the conditions in North Galveston. This has been brought to my attention by churches in my Congressional district.

One of the concerns I have is this whole question of the relationship—and it is a statutory relationship—between the State and the Federal Government once an emergency declaration is declared.

Mr. Garratt, I would like your commentary. The point that is of concern is I, too, respect the State Government and local governments, but there is much confusion when there is an emergency declaration because, whenever you have to talk to FEMA, they always have to say they have to talk to people who are in the emergency.

My question to you is: What review is FEMA looking at to make sure that it is much more effective in an emergency situation than this back-and-forth calling? If you are FEMA and FEMA says it has to call local. Local is under siege.

I think Hurricane Katrina was an example. The State of Louisiana was under siege. The city was under siege. You couldn't get FEMA to act because they were talking to local officials.

Is there any review on how FEMA behaves during an emergency? Was kind of take-charge posture that you are in?

Mr. GARRATT. Fundamentally, FEMA's responsibility under the Stafford Act is, once the Governor requests an emergency or disaster and the President makes such a declaration, we are in a support role. We are supporting the State and supporting the locals in responding to that disaster. We use the incident-command system as the unified model that we all operate under to provide that support.

So generally, we are operating hand-in-hand. So typically, we are providing support through the State to the locals. However, under PKEMRA, we were given the authority in those unique situations where we had to act unilaterally to do so.

So the Federal Government, as a result of Hurricane Katrina—

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Under what?

Mr. GARRATT [continuing]. Now has that authority.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Under what did you say?

Mr. GARRATT. We have the authority to provide assistance directly to locals even those such assistance has not been requested by the State.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Okay. You said under something. I didn't—

Mr. GARRATT. Under the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Okay. Let me just quickly say that I am officially asking for there to be a review even beyond that as the relationship with the Stafford Act. I believe I have asked this over and over again, and I just believe that that is antiquated.

Let me just quickly go to the question of hires and would emphasize that, in this time, I believe it is important to hire diversity out of the community, people who are in need and to expand the concept and to focus on local contractors.

Let me quickly go to Mr. Russell. Let me thank you for coming down with Administrator Fugate. I think it was a constructive meeting.

Would you please answer the question and concern I had about deferred maintenance where a lot of the properties in Houston were not being taken care of because the excuse was there was an issue of deferred maintenance that I guess these were already

homes that had trouble and you are leaving a lot of seniors in the gap? Are you reviewing and can you review with me numbers of these properties that have not been fixed and denied because of the utilization of deferred maintenance?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, ma'am. You know, when we were down there, one of the things that I set out to do was to make sure we give everything a fresh look; to look at things again to make sure that we did not overlook anything. I think that is being done even as we speak now.

The Stafford Act allows people to be on the road to recovery. I think that, as we are doing in Houston area, we are trying to use as much latitude and flexibility as possible to make sure that we have the right outcome.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Russell, would you then provide to this committee a status report so that I could get a copy? Would you be in touch with my office so that I can get an update as to what reassessment you are making? What areas and what places can look to, possibly resources that they did not have before, because we are still living in very poor conditions. If you travel, as you know, you will see a lot of blue roofs for Hurricane Ike because people have not been able to improve their conditions.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, ma'am. I will do that.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the Chairwoman, and I yield back.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Thank you.

The Chairwoman has one question, and then we will kind of wrap up for the day.

Mr. Garratt, as you may know, my district is home to a very large Samoan population. I actually have a very diverse district; largest amount of Cambodians outside of Cambodia; largest amount of Samoans outside of Samoa. In particular, I have an interest in our support to American Samoa and the Pacific Islands.

Particularly, after the earthquake and the tsunami, I personally traveled to American Samoa. When asked by NAPA what are the biggest challenges affecting the least prepared State in your region, a respondent, in reference to a territory, said "distance, time, funding, trained personnel, and visibility."

What steps are you taking to ensure that the Pacific Islands are receiving the training, funding, and attention that they need to properly prepare for and respond to a disaster?

Mr. GARRATT. I can assure you that our Region 9 administrator, Ms. Nancy Ward, who is one of our premier regional administrators—she was, in fact, the acting FEMA administrator during the interval between the old and the new administrations—is extremely familiar with American Samoa and the challenges that face getting assistance to them as well as what they need to improve their posture.

She is using the response to the recent events in American Samoa as an opportunity to reach out to and, in fact, conduct the sorts of training and engagements that we believe, as an agency and as the Samoans believe, will help improve their posture and their preparedness for future disasters.

So I think if you talk with the leadership in American Samoa, what you will see is that there is and has been increased engage-

ment there to address and identify weaknesses or shortfalls in capability, and we are working with them to address those.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Well, with all due respect, Mr. Garratt, it was well publicized on one of the channels that, for example, this—our Government, we had invested money, for example, for a warning system that had never been deployed.

I can tell you that I did go there and I did talk to people. There were no sirens. There were no warnings. When the disaster occurred and the tsunami subsequently approached, I believe probably about 10 to 15 minutes, there were no police on the street to provide direction. There were not first responders out there to help people, seniors and children, who were the greatest amount of people who died in that incident because those systems were not in place.

So I do hope that we will learn from it, but I wouldn't go so far as to say that things are necessarily working well.

Finally, I would like to build upon Ms. Jackson Lee's comments that I think we really do need to reevaluate the policy under the Stafford Act of who FEMA takes direction from if, in the event a disaster occurs. When I went to American Samoa and had an opportunity to participate in some of the FEMA meetings, it is quite clear that it is the Governor's discretion to determine what happens next.

My only question to you would be: What happens if the Governor does not make the right decision? The Governor may be in power, but he or she does not necessarily make the right decisions. If they don't, what do you do then?

Do we just let the boat sink because that person has the authority? Or do we have a Plan B in place to make another decision?

Specifically, I would say that American Samoa owes this Government money for previous incidents and so, therefore, the Governor didn't rely upon some help that should have been provided because he was afraid of adding to the additional bill. We should never put residents and people at the whim of those kinds of decisions.

So just giving you forewarning, that is an area I am going to be working at, and I think we do really need to seriously evaluate, if an emergency happens, what happens if you don't necessarily agree with that Governor's decision, what do we do in that case?

Do you agree?

Mr. GARRATT. I agree that it is an issue that is worthy of continued discussion, Madam Chairwoman.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Thank you.

I want to thank the witnesses for their valuable testimony and the Members for their questions. The Members of the subcommittee may have additional questions for the witnesses, and we ask that you respond, preferably, within 2 weeks in writing to those questions.

I would just like to summarize that Mr. Rogers mentioned a concern of transparency and also turnaround time in terms of declarations.

Mr. Thompson talked about the staffing for disability coordinators, implementing the 5-year human capital strategy which, Mr. Garratt, you promised to get us a timeline and actually get it done.

Also, the status of FEMA employees, those that are retired, former civilians and so on. Mr. Olson talked about Galveston, Texas, regarding the work force staying there.

Mr. Russell, you made a commitment to that. He also mentioned the building rights for disaster-prone areas.

Mr. Pascrell talked about choosing local contractors in regards to some of this regional work that is being done. Mr. Cao talked about workers having a positive work environment in Louisiana and the ability to complete their projects.

He mentioned evaluation of FEMA's response to some of the claims and whether they are being done fairly and efficiently. Finally, he mentioned that the regional offices—what decisions that they would be able to make in regards to food, for example, that the cost would be reasonable and would not be wasteful.

Ms. Norton talked about the current emergency that—here in the district—we experienced the first Presidential, she believes, declaration made and asked for a recap in terms of the current worksheets that have been submitted, have not been submitted, and where you are in the response, Mr. Garratt.

She also talked about the temporary disaster workers, what is the process in place if they qualify for benefits and if that is something that can be changed.

Finally, Ms. Jackson Lee talked about—she built upon Mr. Olson's comments of continuing support with Hurricane Ike for you, Mr. Russell.

Review of FEMA's take-charge policy which what I was just talking to you, Mr. Garratt, about, the considering of local hires and contractors and keeping diversity in mind. Finally, what reassessment we would make.

I think that summarizes it all. We look forward for future hearings. Thank you very much for all of your participation.

Hearing no further business, the hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:37 a.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

APPENDIX

QUESTIONS FROM CHAIRWOMAN LAURA RICHARDSON FOR DAVID GARRATT AND TONY RUSSELL

Question 1. In response to questioning, you indicated that Administrator Fugate has asked the Regional Administrators to identify additional authorities that would make the Regions more effective. What is the FEMA Headquarters' timetable for receiving, reviewing, and acting upon the suggestions of additional authorities provided by the Regional Administrators?

Answer. On July 21, 2009, Administrator Fugate issued a memorandum acting on the recommendations of the Regional Administrators to delegate several new authorities to the Regions. FEMA acted proactively and quickly to delegate the authorities to be executed in the Regions. Ten authorities have been delegated to date with several executed immediately upon the issuance of the memorandum. Others are under review. Subsequently, Administrator Fugate empowered the Regional Administrators at a recent joint meeting to continuously identify additional authorities that they believe will help them more effectively implement their mission. Since this is an open-ended invitation, there is no specific "time table." FEMA's Office of Regional Operations will, as a matter of routine, solicit and convey such new authority requests directly to the administrator as they are received.

Question 2. In response to questioning, you stated that the Deputy Administrator has committed to reallocating to the Regions 25 percent of existing FEMA headquarters vacancies. How many Headquarters vacancies does FEMA currently have, and what will be the process and timeline for making 25 percent of those positions available to the Regions?

Answer. FEMA's vacancies change on a near daily basis, as employees separate, retire, or on-board. We will commence reallocating vacancies to the Regions once a senior-level workgroup has completed its review and recommendation, which they intend to complete within 60 days. While the initial identification of these positions will be concluded prior to hurricane season, recruitment and hiring will take longer, and depend on various geographic factors.

Question 3. Please provide the current number of filled and vacant permanent full-time positions named below per FEMA Region. For each position, please describe their role and responsibilities in managing and implementing FEMA's preparedness and grants programs.

- Federal Preparedness Coordinator
- Deputy Federal Preparedness Coordinator
- Preparedness Analysis & Planning Officer
- Grant Management Specialists
- Training and Exercise Specialists
- Continuity Programs Manager
- Community Preparedness Officer

Answer. Please see the accompanying attachment for the total number of filled and vacant permanent full-time positions for the job titles named above, by FEMA Region.

Below are the role and responsibilities by job title named above for the preparedness and grants programs:

FEDERAL PREPAREDNESS COORDINATOR FPC'S

The Regional-National Preparedness Concept of Operations (2008), outlines the Federal Preparedness Coordinator (FPC) responsibilities for implementing the National Preparedness System, including three primary roles:

- Meeting regional and National needs, including providing support for all-hazards preparedness (e.g., strategy development, hazard identification and risk assessment, and planning) at the State and local level, in accordance with the National Preparedness Guidelines. FPCs also assist in exercise coordination and

review (i.e., planning, design, execution, and evaluation) and facilitate the spectrum of homeland security-related information sharing among regional stakeholders (e.g., Fusion Centers, Joint-Terrorism Task Forces, Emergency Operation Centers). They also support efforts to assess regional risk and level of preparedness in coordination with the National Preparedness Directorate (NPD) and regional stakeholders (e.g., monitoring NIMS compliance and implementation of National preparedness initiatives);

- Managing the preparedness program and building capabilities, including the provision of plans, guidance, and courses of action based on risk and capability assessments to all levels of government, non-governmental organizations, the private sector, and citizen partners across all DHS mission areas. This also includes coordinating the regional implementation of all FEMA grant and technical assistance, training, exercises, planning, and community preparedness programs. FPCs must be aware of available resources and capabilities, current operations, possible threats and vulnerabilities, and facilitating and/or coordinating training opportunities for internal and external regional stakeholders.
- Building a regional network, including strengthening partnerships vertically within FEMA and DHS and horizontally across all Federal, State, and local jurisdictions, as well as with non-governmental organizations, the private sector, and citizen partners. FPCs provide liaison and coordination efforts within the regional preparedness community (e.g., DHS field elements, State, local, and Tribal governments, NGOs, community groups), serving as the principal advisor to regional stakeholders on National preparedness initiatives and programs and supporting Federal interagency prevention and protection initiatives through preparedness programs under his authority (e.g., Protective Security Advisors, law enforcement, intelligence community).

The FPCs report to the Regional Administrator, but receive their primary mission direction from NPD, the Grant Programs Directorate (GPD), and National Continuity Programs (NCP). As FEMA continues to devolve authority to its regions, the FPCs will continue to work with the Regional Administrators and will continue to focus on building relationships and providing support to its partners on protection and National preparedness.

DEPUTY FEDERAL PREPAREDNESS COORDINATOR

The Deputy Federal Preparedness Coordinator directly supports the FPC to achieve the many objectives FEMA National Preparedness is responsible for, as well as, managing the implementation of the Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Grant, Community Preparedness, and Continuity of Operations Programs.

PREPAREDNESS ANALYSIS & PLANNING OFFICER PAPO/PA'S

Regional Office preparedness personnel include Preparedness Analysis and Planning Officers (one per region), or Preparedness Analysts for short, at the GS-13/14 grade level to support the FPC fulfill its broad National preparedness responsibilities. They serve as the critical link between the operational planning and administrative activities at the Regional Office with the preparedness initiatives at the National Preparedness Directorate through performance of the following:

- Collecting and analyzing operational and preparedness capabilities, as well as risk factors specific to the Region;
- Monitoring and evaluating regional capabilities and progress of work in relationship to regional and National preparedness policies and goals;
- Identifying requirements and performing preparedness program management or maintaining awareness alongside other Region, Agency, and Department components, State, local, and Tribal governments, public safety agencies, critical infrastructure and key resource sectors, and citizen partners across the region to meet such requirements; and
- Developing annual and multi-year regional preparedness strategies and influencing the application of grant and technical assistance, training, exercises, operational planning, and assessment activities to achieve such strategies.

GRANT MANAGEMENT SPECIALISTS—GMS'S

The regions also perform grants management activities, which are supported by Grants Management Specialists (GMSs), who perform the basic management functions for all FEMA grants administered in the regions. To support these functions, the GMSs develop, deliver, and maintain a variety of support activities related to the business administration of grants and cooperative agreements, in accordance with policies set forth by GPD. They are responsible for four key management functions:

- Financial monitoring (on-site and desk review) for all grant programs, including legacy FEMA and preparedness grants;
- Audit resolution activities for all grant programs, including legacy FEMA and preparedness grants;
- Cash-on-hand analyses for legacy preparedness grant programs; and
- Close-out activities for legacy preparedness grant programs.

As FEMA continues to build its grant management capabilities in the regions, the GMSs will work even more closely with the National Preparedness Division, chiefly the FPC, to ensure that the financial and programmatic aspects of grants management are more closely integrated and to provide more comprehensive technical assistance to deliver analysis and guidance that focuses on both preparedness policies and financial compliance.

TRAINING AND EXERCISE SPECIALISTS

The Training and Exercise Specialists are responsible for administration, outreach, coordination, and operating efficiency of training and exercise program initiatives. This position is responsible for determining needs, performing gap analysis, marketing available curriculum with State, local, and Tribal partners, coordinating training between and among venues within the Region, assisting in student and instructor recruitment, and providing technical assistance regarding training and exercises. Monitors State, local, and Tribal policies, coordinates training and exercises, and assists with risk analysis, development, and management and other local activities that need to be coordinated with the Federal sector.

CONTINUITY PROGRAM MANAGER

The National Continuity Programs (NCP) Directorate Regional National Continuity Program Manager solely manages the NCP Directorate's continuity programs at the Regional level. This includes providing continuity policy and program guidance to all Federal, State, territorial, Tribal, and local government jurisdictions in the region, and includes guidance and outreach coordination responsibilities to all Federal, State, territorial, Tribal, and local government elected officials and senior managers in the region. Primary responsibilities include developing the Region's Strategic Continuity 5-Year Plan and Program, developing and fielding, for all supported Government offices, continuity tests, training, exercises, and assessments, and all other related programmatic support to ensure the governments of the regional can continue their mission-essential functions and primary mission-essential functions, under all conductions.

COMMUNITY PREPAREDNESS OFFICER

- Initiates and develops support strategies to build effective State and local Citizen Corps Councils and Programs throughout the Region.
- Interfaces with other FEMA offices, including Grants Program Directorate, and other Federal agencies to integrate Federal resources at the State, Tribal, local level through Citizen Corps Councils.
- Supports partnerships with a broad range of Government, private sector, non-profit, and community-based groups and promote multi-sector participation in planning, preparedness, prevention, mitigation, response, and recovery through Citizen Corps Councils and Programs.
- Analyzes regional activities and provides support to National policy development, implementation, and reporting on community preparedness.

Question 4. In December, Administrator Fugate announced that FEMA headquarters was reorganizing itself to group together similar programs based on the nature of their mission.

Mr. Garratt and Mr. Russell, to what extent did FEMA HQ consult the Regions when it was formulating the new organizational structure?

Mr. Garratt and Mr. Russell, are the Regions planning to reorganize themselves to realign with the new structure at headquarters? If so, when will that reorganization take effect?

Mr. Russell, what has been the impact, if any, of the headquarters reorganization on Region VI?

Answer. The Regions were integrally involved in the FEMA Senior Leadership Team discussions and decisions leading to the FEMA HQ reorganization.

On February 19, 2010, the Administrator issued a memorandum that outlines the new FEMA organizational structure, and which specifically gave Regional Administrators the authority to implement their own reorganizations. Each Region is currently in the process of formalizing their individual organizational structure within a collectively negotiated uniform division structure that will apply across the 10 Re-

gions. In several cases, a few changes to branch structure and personnel are to be implemented and the new organizational alignment will take effect immediately.

To date, there are few significant impacts on the Regions as a result of the headquarters reorganization. Changes include adjustments to the Regional Office Division titles and the co-location of logistics operations within the Response Division. Each Regional Administrator has flexibility to alter their branch structure depending on operational requirements. As a result, some regions have elected to adjust the location of personnel responsible for managing the financial and/or programmatic aspects of grants within either a new Grants Management Division, within the Mission Support Division, or within the National Preparedness Division. This is an on-going process, and as Regions continue to assess their capabilities, FEMA HQ will work with them to ensure they are able to fully achieve FEMA's mission.

QUESTIONS FROM HONORABLE DINA TITUS FOR DAVID GARRATT AND TONY RUSSELL

Question 1. As you know, the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act required that FEMA develop robust regional offices. I have written both Administrator Fugate and Region Nine Director Armes to voice my concerns regarding the size of Region Nine and significant differences in needs of the States and territories. Has your office considered creating more regions or changing the alignment?

Answer. At this time, there appears to be no need to alter the geographically organized infrastructure that comprises the ten FEMA Regions and supporting Area Offices. The ten-Region structure was originally based upon Office of Management and Budget Circular A-105 "Standard Federal Regions," and FEMA has since relied upon this consistent framework to coordinate with other Federal departments and agencies to support the States, Tribes, and territories to successfully manage requests, coordinate resources, and maintain information sharing during disasters. If adjustments in support are needed to meet the requirements of the States, Tribes, and territories, FEMA prefers to strengthen the capabilities of the existing Regions—such as through the recent enhancement of Area Offices in Alaska, the Pacific, and the Caribbean.

FEMA Region IX, headquartered in Oakland, California, serves more than 400,000 square miles that include the States of Nevada, Arizona, California, and Hawaii, the territories of American Samoa and Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the independent nations of the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Republic of the Marshall Islands. Over the past 2 decades, FEMA Region IX has responded to more than 280 U.S. Presidentially-declared disasters that generated nearly \$12.5 billion in Federal assistance. To serve this large area, FEMA Region IX is augmented by separate offices, which have been established in key locations within the Region's area of responsibility. This ensures that every State and territory receives a constant and comprehensive level of support. For example, the Pacific Area Office, located in Honolulu, Hawaii, was created in 1992 to support disaster response and recovery in the Pacific area, and provides FEMA a forward-area presence in the Pacific.

FEMA will continue to monitor and assess the efficacy of the current ten-region structure. However, it has proven to be a successful organizational construct for many years.

Question 2. Following Hurricane Katrina it was painfully obvious that our Nation's emergency response capabilities were severely lacking and unable to provide necessary recovery services. I am supportive of the idea of regional offices, but I want to ensure that these field offices are ready and able to respond to emergencies. What metrics does your office use to evaluate the readiness of field offices?

Answer. Each Regional Office is charged with implementing FEMA's mission pursuant to the "Rules and Tools" outlined by headquarters. As such, the measures and metrics that apply to the Regions are derived from the specific mission and programmatic requirements that are developed by the individual FEMA directorates and offices. For example, the field operational guides, manuals, and doctrine that exist or are under development by the Response and Recovery Directorate outline the expectations of the Regions to implement response and recovery operations. Likewise, the National Continuity Programs, National Preparedness, Grant Programs, and Federal Insurance and Mitigation Directorates also provide programmatic and strategic direction to the Regions for managing National programs. The Office of Policy and Program Analysis also oversees the development of performance measures in order to implement the Secretary and Administrator's strategic priorities, such as those outlined in the Quadrennial Homeland Security Review (QHSR) and the annual Administrator's Intent. Regional Office measures and metrics are reflected within each Regional Administrator's performance plan that is

evaluated and updated each year to assess their implementation of FEMA programs. Finally, additional metrics are established by regulation—notably 44 CFR—which outlines requirements for responsiveness across multiple disaster-related program areas.

	FPC		DFPC		PAPO		GMS	
	FILLED	VA-CANT	FILLED	VA-CANT	FILLED	VA-CANT	FILLED	VA-CANT
Region 1	1	0	1	0	1	0	4	0
Region 2	1	0	1	0	1	0	5	0
Region 3	1	0	1	0	1	0	6	1
Region 4	1	0	1	0	1	0	6	0
Region 5	1	0	1	0	1	0	6	0
Region 6	1	0	1	0	1	0	2	2
Region 7	1	0	1	0	1	0	3	0
Region 8	1	0	1	0	1	0	3	0
Region 9	1	0	0	1	1	0	5	0
Region 10	1	0	1	0	1	0	5	0
Total	10	0	9	1	10	0	45	3

	TES		CPM		CPO	
	FILLED	VACANT	FILLED	VACANT	FILLED	VACANT
Region 1	1	0	1	0	1	0
Region 2	2	0	1	0	2	0
Region 3	2	0	0	0	1	0
Region 4	6	1	1	0	1	0
Region 5	3	0	0	1	0	1
Region 6	4	0	1	0	1	0
Region 7	1	0	0	0	1	0
Region 8	2	0	1	0	1	0
Region 9	2	0	1	0	1	0
Region 10	2	0	0	0	1	0
Total	25	1	6	1	10	1

QUESTION FROM HONORABLE DINA TITUS FOR CHRISTINE GIBBS SPRINGER

Question. As you know well, Las Vegas is unique city. I would argue that private sector integration and preparedness is more important in Las Vegas that almost any other city in the United States. While working on NAPA's report, what did you find regarding the integration between the regional office and the private sector?

Answer. Response was not received at the time of publication.

