

# THE CENTER FOR NATIONAL POLICY

## **“DISASTERS AND RESILIENCE: PERSPECTIVES FROM FEMA DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR TIMOTHY MANNING”**

**FEATURED SPEAKER:**

**TIMOTHY MANNING  
DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR, FEMA**

**12:30 PM – 1:30 PM  
FRIDAY, APRIL 23, 2010**

**TRANSCRIPT PROVIDED BY  
DC TRANSCRIPTION – [WWW.DCTMR.COM](http://WWW.DCTMR.COM)**

MR. STEPHEN FLYNN: Good afternoon everyone. I'm delighted to be here today with the deputy administrator for FEMA, Mr. Tim Manning, who is joining us. I'm glad we've found our way to food and all the rest of it here. We've got to get the program going.

Let me – a few words of introduction, for anybody who's new to the Center for National Policy, I've just become president at the beginning of January 1<sup>st</sup>. The center is involved with three key things that we think is very, very important for this town and the broader nation. One is we're a pretty good convener of expertise. We try to act that expertise all around the country.

We're bit of an ideas generator and we're focusing yet around the concepts of resilience and how to deal with daily develop a next generation infrastructure for our society. And the other things we're really dedicated to is a civil – emphasis on civil dialogue about real problems that confront this country. And we think one of the really richest areas for us to come together as a nation is around the challenge of preparing for the things we can't always prevent, which is Mother Nature getting angry or things breaking down from time to time that we like. And so we're really excited today to have Tim Manning come over here and meet with us to talk a little bit about what's happened with FEMA.

So a bit of background on Tim. He is the deputy administrator for protection and national preparedness at FEMA. And he's been here for almost, coming up, in the one year in a row's rate. Before this, he had a normal life. He was not in Washington. He was in New Mexico as the head of Emergency Management and Homeland Security newly created under his time, where he worked for Governor Bill Richardson, standing up that office. Prior to that, he'd been involved with as a chief Emergency Operations Bureau in New Mexico.

His background is – (inaudible) – is in geology, where he has a degree from Eastern Illinois University. He's a graduate of the Executive Leaders Program at the Center for Homeland Defense and Security of the Naval Postgraduate School.

And we're really delighted to have you here today, sir, to talk a little bit about how you guys are wrestling with one of the most difficult missions, which is getting this country prepared for dealing with disasters.

Maybe we get it started here by, as we're looking to the – I'm staying right now – in fact Secretary Napolitano is over in your headquarters, getting spun up on hurricane season, which will be on us on the 1<sup>st</sup> of June. So I guess on the new side of things here, how are we looking for hurricanes – I'm sure you have your crystal ball and in terms of what's the forecast out there and where is FEMA at in preparing for that?

MR. TIMOTHY MANNING: Great. Well, first, let me thank you for having me here today and having FEMA here. It's a great honor and pleasure to be here at the Center for National Policy and I thank you all for taking some time off for the conversation.

NOAA will issue their hurricane forecast on May 20<sup>th</sup>. So we don't have the official government forecast. But what we do know now is that the Atlantic is warm, is abnormally warm and that's usually the biggest indicator for an active hurricane season. It's really tied about ocean warmth.

The El Nino signal that really – (inaudible) – this winter here in D.C. is weakening, so we don't expect much shear over the Atlantic and the high altitudes, which would mitigate against tropical storm formation. So it's probably going to be a fairly active season we'd expect.

But I think it's important to recognize, at least when we're talking about hurricane season, is that the activity of the season, how busy it is, is less important than what that means. And 1995 was a good example, a very active season, a lot of hurricanes, but only two came ashore, Opal and Erin were the only two that actually made landfall.

Another – but on the other hand of that spectrum, Hurricane Andrew was a very quiet season, fewer, much fewer than normal storms, but the one that hit was a bad one.

So it's not really about how active the season is or how many storms there are. It's about what hits where. And what we're doing at FEMA, the approach that we take – Craig Fugate, our administrator, and I both came from this job at the state. Governor Napolitano was – Secretary Napolitano – I worked for so long with here as a governor of Arizona, I slip sometimes – Secretary Napolitano was the governor of Arizona and having dealt with a whole panoply of disasters over the years, we recognize that in hurricane season hurricanes are one of those things that hit a big white slot, a very – unfortunately, for the most part we see them coming. So we'll have a couple of days notice, but they are just one disaster. Our job is to be ready all the time. And hurricane season begins in June, really kind of gets kicking in. And Craig is a big college football fan. He really says, "it's not hurricane season until you're in the playoffs." (Laughter.) But it's always earthquake season.

We've had just tragic earthquakes over the last few months. Volcanoes go at any time. And if there is the always – the ever present danger of another terrorist attack. So it's our responsibility – it's coming on us to be prepared all the time for any eventuality.

That's what we really focus on.

MR. FLYNN: That's great. And in fact, I know one – there was too much debate during the presidential election about these issues, but the extent to which there was a discussion about – then candidate Obama was talking much about a more all-hazards

approach to dealing with the Homeland Security mission. And that's become obviously a priority of his in setting up the administration.

How are you seeing that play out? Obviously all-hazards has always been a FEMA focus because you had to prepare for the very worst, like – (inaudible) – war down to the hurricanes and floods and so forth that afflict us. But how are you seeing the president talking about the Homeland Security mission being all-hazard impacting on the way in which people are approaching the Homeland Security mission?

MR. MANNING: Well, that's a good question. All-hazard – the old – the traditional doctrinal approach to emergency management has been one of preparing for all hazards and that was really the catch phrase, "all hazards emergency management." And what that really meant was a maximization of resources, a realization that where the majority of the work, the preparedness and response work, happens is at the community level. It's not at the federal level. The federal government's job is mainly to step in and assist governors in assisting their local communities in a response. And when you get to the community level, the largest of the communities, in cities like New York and Los Angeles, notwithstanding those resources just aren't there to do the level of detail planning required for each particular eventuality.

What we also know is that there is so much variation in any particular hazard that that doesn't really bring a lot of value to the table sometimes. I think a good example is in the pandemic flu preparedness work that we've done over the past couple of years. It was really predicated on avian influenza and then influenza virus migrating from Asia, in East Asia.

When H1N1 popped up in North America, it was a novel virus really originating here, much of the detailed work we did was not as usable as it could have been had we taken a broader approach. The all-hazard preparedness is a way to think about that.

Where it gets or it can get difficult or it can get tricky is that there are obviously very specific things that are required for some specific hazards. There is those large percentages, that 50 to 60 percent of the work that you need to do to prepare for a hurricane is also the same you need to do in response to an earthquake or an accident or a terrorist attack. But there are those – the balance of things are very different.

The response, the capability, the equipment, the training you need to respond to a nuclear, a ND, a nuclear detonation is different than the response, the capability, the training, the equipment you need to respond to a radiological accident.

So we have to keep that in mind. So while we can focus a great deal of our efforts on those few things that have value across the whole spectrum of accidents, the normal daily public safety to natural disasters or intentional terrorist attacks, we cannot lose sight of those things that are specific to the individual hazards or a particular attack tactic. There are large numbers of things that we need to individually focus on as well.

But if I may, I think that another important piece to this, though, it's not just been an all-hazard preparedness in the way that we've been doing it for a long time. That there is a – there can sometimes be a tendency to say that all-hazard emergency management is simply a back to the future, a slide back to the way we had done in the 1990s. But that loses sight of what we've learned. And the recent shift towards thinking of things in the terms of resilience is really another way to think of all-hazard emergency management, where it's less about what are the discrete preparedness things we need to do to be able to respond to this set of disasters, but what are those things that we can do in our communities that offer second and third order effects. They get us where we want to be. How do we work on building and zoning, building codes and zoning in our communities so that our communities are less vulnerable to disasters? How can we work with our social programs in our communities so that our communities are less vulnerable to events?

I think the best disaster response is the one we don't actually have to mount. And we need to think of things, not just in the prevention of a disaster through physical mitigation, like levees and stronger bridges, but through societal programs, where we actually work with the community we're concerned with.

MR. FLYNN: In terms of the community, one of the challenges I've clearly seen as I've worked this issue for a long time, is something I'm calling the asymmetry of interests. essentially, the federal government really is focused legitimately on low probability and high consequence events, where it will be drawn on for you to play coordinate role or resource support role. Communities, on the other hand, are basically – they're day to day – (inaudible) – chronic risk that they have to deal. Chronic, that's a problem. And one of the – (inaudible) – I couldn't see in the last administration was an effort to focus heavily around, “we want you to be prepared for counterterrorism contingencies and we'll provide resources for that mission,” is in many cases, state and local level, they had to draw resources away from their day to day stuff in order to be supportive of this federal effort to get them energized around that risk area. And so as you think – from a broader gender of resilience, so getting these communities to embrace the social or the physical elements of mitigation of being able to withstand and recover. How do you deal with providing leadership for that, when a lot of times – that come from that level as well, the state and local level – is there another federal requirement being pushed on me to – (inaudible) – resources away at a time where we're in pain and agony already when – (inaudible) – about budgets and so forth. How do you advance this work giving that ongoing friction?

MR. MANNING: Yes, an ever increasing set of requirements placed on state and local governments does lead towards a tendency to not want to cooperate, especially in a time where state and local budgets are under more and more pressure. Our revenues are going down or increasingly diminishing.

I think the – the work that's been done in that regard in developing essentially a new field of Homeland Security and all of the attendant pieces of that, developing critical infrastructure protection programs and bringing counterterrorism programs, intelligence

programs, things, information sharing programs that never existed at the state and local level until one particular day when we needed it, we recognized we needed it. It's a difficult proposition and we've spent about the last nine, 10 years working at that.

I think we, like anything, need to recognize and admit to ourselves that the first attempt to the solution isn't always necessarily the right solution. In some cases it is. We found it is the case. In other cases, we need to try things slightly different, work on the margins, or change things completely.

One of the ways, I think, we can work with this is that in times of ever increasing pressure on available resources of state and local government, is to accept the fact, recognize the fact that they're pretty good at identifying what they need for their day to day. So it's a popular choice there. If a community feels it needs a particular capability, it will happen. It will develop it for itself. And so that takes care of a large chunk of what needs to be done. Things like law enforcement, we probably don't need to spend a lot of time through the lens of disaster, preparedness, Homeland Security programs to determine what's the level, what's the officer per capita requirement for traditional law enforcement for the communities around the country. That's something that's been debated for many, many years and will be debated for great many more. And it happens at every level.

What we need to do is focus on those things that are not. So we have had – there's a thing called HIRA, hazard identification and risk assessment, that is a way that most communities do a lot of the mitigation planning, basis for a lot of the disaster planning in the past, where you examine what are the hazards that face my community and how do they impact my community, what are the results and what do I need to be able to do to deal with the interface between that hazard and my community.

Well, that's where they're going to develop their capability and not – there's very few cities, with the exception of, again, probably New York and maybe a couple of others that are going to actually actively feel like there is a nuclear terrorism threat to their community. We know there is, but it may not be recognized at the city level in most communities. So we can – we need to work at that level. We need to work to set the requirements that are truly the strategic and operation level requirements across the country and allow communities to identify and develop capabilities around the risks faced by their communities, recognizing the heterogeneity of risks, of threat, of hazard around the country.

The full spectrum of capability required in, for example, Kansas City is going to be slightly different than what you would see in Miami or Sacramento. So building a process where each community can identify what their hazards are, what their risks are, build a capability against that, and then work with the state and federal government on those – on that level of capability for say WMD attacks or bio attacks, for nuclear terrorism that aren't right at the forefront maybe of concern in communities across the country. And of course also recognize the very specific nature of threat and terrorism and how it varies from places like New York to San Francisco or Saint Louis or Fargo. There

are differences and I think we need to be sophisticated enough in the way we develop these programs to recognize and embrace these differences.

MR. FLYNN: The construct, as I understand the White House is formulating around these resilience is the capacity to better withstand, to rapidly recover and adapt to these ongoing hazards that we face. Secretary Napolitano just Monday was out at Oklahoma City at the 15<sup>th</sup> anniversary of that tragic event and one of the things she spoke about was the need to make – the importance of resilience and making preparedness a part of our culture. Unfortunately the data on our culture of being prepared is not very encouraging. We have lots of efforts to try to get this message out, but each year it seems that when you look at population, as the level of preparedness, whether it's a ready kit or just being able to have a plan to cope with these contingencies, those numbers seem to be going down.

How's, like is FEMA advancing, this effort of building this culture for preparedness and how are you overcoming I guess some of what seems to be the challenges that are keeping us from doing what we should be doing, which is becoming better prepared for these contingencies?

MR. MANNING: Yes, the numbers are very concerning and frankly kind of frightening I think. We did a survey last year as part of our community preparedness programs, where we found the same numbers we've seen for a great number of years. So what we've been doing, we've been trying to engage the public for about 50 years in roughly the same way, all through the civil defense era, the Cold War, and to traditional emergency management now. And it's really about PSAs and talking to the public about – some variation on have a plan, get involved. It's really been about the same message and engaging the same way. And we've always seen the response engagement of the public in about 50 percent, hasn't really moved. Slides a little bit here and there.

But what's most concerning is that when you actually deconstruct that number and you ask, "have you actually done this, have you done this, have you done this," the things that we mean when we say "are you prepared," the number's actually in the 30s. It's actually about 37 or 40 percent.

Most people, as like 67 percent of respondents, say that they plan on relying on government, that they won't take any actions and they plan on relying on government in the first couple of days.

It's very concerning. And we're just discussing that the best response is the one we don't have to mount. What we need to do is build our communities, build our societies to a point where they are prepared. But I think, like we're trying to do across the whole spectrum of homeland security preparedness, we have to recognize our communities and we have to plan for the community, not just plan for easy. So we have – we say preparedness means this. Maybe we need to be a little bit more sophisticated than that. Maybe what we need to say is these are the things you can do to be prepared. But work at a more – work through our actual communities.

We have a program that we're working through our community preparedness division, individual community preparedness division, where we're working with the Los Angeles Fire Department right now, recognizing that firefighters, they're both the responders that we're going to account on in a response, but they're also members of their community and often leaders of their community. They're seen by their neighbors as knowing what to do. They're good role models.

So we're working through the Fire Department itself to build the preparedness of the individual, firefighters and their families, not just building the capability of the Fire Department to respond, but building resilience within the actual fire department by ensuring that the members, the firefighters themselves and their families don't become – aren't affected by a disaster, are strongest survivors of an emergency.

As we can get into the community and find individuals that can lead the community in those efforts, we could have an approach to the human side of more resilient communities. The Citizen Corps program that we've been working in FEMA for a number of years through DHS and the Community Emergency Response Teams, the CERT teams, that came out of some of the higher – some of the large cities where we provide training to individuals within the community on what to do if there's an emergency, how to help your neighbors, things like how – just simple things like how do you use a fire extinguisher, how do you turn the gas off on your house, things that prevent an earthquake from becoming a conflagration. That's the kind of thing – most people don't know that kind of thing. Everybody's got a fire extinguisher in their house, but very few have ever actually pulled the pin and turned it on. If you actually had a fire, would you know how to handle it?

So those kind of – that kind of getting into the community and providing resources and training is critical.

On the same token, working with the private sector, with business, the Private Sector Preparedness Program, PS-Prep that we run, Title 9 of the Post-Katrina act that we run out of FEMA is important in that regard, providing most companies will be the business sense and doing business continuity. But we need to rely on our businesses for again twofold, both to be able to be part of the response and to get their employees to the businesses be able to withstand the emergency on the first place.

Administrator Fugate tells – well, it's a great story to illustrate the point, but it's really a horrible example of how things really build sometimes, where – he was in a mission in Florida, giving out ice, handing out ice as a disaster response in the parking lot of an open grocery store. Those are – that's not the right approach to building community resilience and effective disaster response. You really need to focus on those things that aren't being provided by the community itself.

MR. FLYNN: On that private sector theme, the data seems pretty overwhelming. (Inaudible) – I had out there trying to push this is a lot of times when you talk about

preparedness and dealing with disasters is you're asking people to – it's a bit like trying to sell insurance, which is not something that people really want to – “get me some of that kind of thing.” You have to talk about bad things happening. They don't want to hear. You have to talk to them about being adults and recognizing your mortality if it's life insurance or flood if it's flood insurance, whatever it is that you're trying to hock. And people tend to really buy this stuff after something really bad has happened, when they're actually – odds may have gone down that they need it.

So we have this difficulty also. But there turns out to be, it seems, a lot of – on the private sector side – that the things that it takes to provide business continuity, whether it's on supply chains or maintaining your workforce through various disruptors, that these things actually are very positive and constructive for the company, even if nothing bad happens. So and balancing this out, on the one hand we know like numbers, I think it said, 30 percent of small businesses go belly out if they're hit by a disaster and it takes up to a month to recover. A lot of this because they can't get access to credit to rebuild. And that's obviously a heart attack for a community. That can really, really damage a community.

So there is a private sector incentive for getting communities to balance back quickly, but sometimes I hear from the private sector it's little tricky working with public sector on some of this stuff. Again, you may be competing with them because they're giving away – you're giving away ice. When you're trying to sell it to keep the employees employed, to get the community back. And so how are we doing? There're a lot of rhetoric on private-public cooperation as we go around. There's still obviously some sticky wickets associated with making it really happen. So where is some of the successes that you're seeing and where do we need to go to really mature that relationship?

MR. MANNING: Yes, that really is one of those programs, one of those areas where it's easy to talk about and extremely difficult to implement and show return. FEMA's had a – and DHS has had a lot of work in this regard through our private sector offices, engagement in various areas. Mr. Fugate spends a lot of time and has been doing a lot of good work with a lot of tech companies on our new Web 2.0 initiatives, where we're trying to integrate – instead of trying and get government fashion duplicate the efforts and the advancements of the private sector by hiring a bunch of government workers to do it, we're working with the private sector to develop those.

And that's in the preparedness side. And that's in tool development, capability development, but it's building the relationships prior to an event, where it's really critical, so that we have – so that we've spent time – for example, a supply chain as an example. Handing out ice in the parking lot of an open grocery store. Well, that grocery store being able to be open is the – (inaudible) – piece of that. So if our plans, if the plans that we've developed they're done in a vacuum, we may have security plans, we may have the security element of that plan where in order to access the disaster site, you have to clear through with a set of credentials that are, it turns out, ore only issued to government employees, but it doesn't help anybody. So if you can't get the workers back to the

grocery store, if you can't get the grocery store back open, you can't get the commodities back into the community. So the community is –

MR. FLYNN: As the government often wants to buy –

MR. MANNING: – exactly, exactly, exactly. Well, we'll go in and we'll outbid the supply chain into the community. And we go and – the grocery stores are open, but they can't no longer give their commodities because we're paying twice the price, 200 miles away, and then giving it out for free. We have to be much better in our plan in that regard.

So those are lessons we've learned. Those are lessons that Craig and I have learned, having unfortunately learned the hard way, that we're bringing to our – the way we engage communities. We're planning – we're taking a whole of community approach. You guys are the whole of government approach to national security. We're trying to take a whole of community approach to disaster and homeland security preparedness to planning for whatever it is we may be faced.

So that – because the private sector is going to be the solution to the majority of the needs of the community. The community recovery is another way to look at that. A community is not going to be recovered, long term, short term recovery until the tax base is back. It's not unlike what we see in a lot of foreign development assistance. The more that a community is propped up on federal or state disaster systems and the community in lieu of rebuilding the complexity of the community – the infrastructure, the public-private sector – it's only going to succeed so long as there is those external dollars flowing in. And unfortunately we've seen that in the way recovery programs have worked in the past.

We have communities that were built – rebuilt without that attempt. And the infrastructure, the economy never came back. The tax base never came back. That's not the key to help the communities, to resilient communities. We need to build things so that that doesn't happen.

So that's both the PS-Prep program, where we can build strong private sector components of community so they can bounce back quickly. We focus our – if we were to focus our recovery programs on getting the infrastructure, the business infrastructure back and focus our efforts on recognizing and acknowledging the community members themselves are the respondents, that it's not just about sit back and wait for government to come in and do it for you. The communities need to help – communities do help themselves and we need to build our programs in such a way that we support that.

We can't look at disaster response, response to terrorist attacks, we can't look at these things the way we would think of – I guess the best way to describe it is they don't scale from where we used to. We think of response as when you call 911 and the Fire Department and the Police Department. Your house is on fire, you call the Fire Department and you stand out on the street and wait for them to come. And we'll go into

your house and put out the fire. And then you've got to go back and then rebuild your house. We shouldn't take that same approach at this level because it doesn't scale. It's not a scalable event.

If there is a disaster in your community, the community is responding. The community is helping their neighbors. The community is helping alleviate the disaster. They're the ones throwing the sandbags on the waters rising. Government comes in and supports them in that because we are not – we will never be that national level Fire Department to come in and just do it all. That doesn't really help the communities.

MR. FLYNN: A final question for me before I open it up to our audience. We, of course, as Americans, are not alone in facing disasters. I would take the quick run on the earthquake record here just in the last few months – Haiti obviously, Chile, Mexico, China, and ripple effects from there. The fact is that other countries also have the skill sets. And I think of earthquakes, Japan clearly leads the way – (inaudible) – civil defense, the Swiss are probably getting that down better than about everybody in terms of counterterrorism, resilience, response, recovery, the Israelis and the Brits are pretty solid in that. How will we sort of can structure it here to deal with the fact that – (inaudible) – are global, problems that we as global – (inaudible) – have to face, but that we share lessons and draw lessons from those who have relevant expertise?

MR. MANNING: Well, that's a very important point too. We do a pretty good job in the U.S. of sharing experiences across the states, within U.S. The experiences – there's a – emergency management and homeland security is a pretty tight community and pretty good at sharing experiences from California to New York and from Florida to Washington – Seattle, not Washington. And we have just as much to learn internationally. We absolutely do. And we don't – we have not traditionally done a very good job of that. There's many efforts underway to embrace that.

Interestingly, there's a large amount of work happening and international mutual aid at the state level, both on the Southern and on the Northern border, especially on the Northern border. There are existing interstate – international interstate compacts that have been developed, both providing experience and lessons learned and best practices, good practices, and responding.

MR. FLYNN: One of my favorite stories is the customs station, border crossing – (inaudible) – the first responders are the Canadians from the Quebec who helped the federal facility deal with hazardous or anything else happening there.

MR. MANNING: Great, great. I had an experience, where there was a particularly large storm in Northern Mexico that was overtopping a reservoir or that potential dam failure in Mexico, in Juarez that was going El Paso, Texas, and Southern New Mexico. It actually wasn't even raining in the U.S., but it required international cooperation and experience. And Juarez and Chihuahua, the State of Chihuahua didn't have the level – didn't have the experience that we had. And so that led to a lot of interaction and cooperation and building experience and programs back and forth.

We also have in FEMA, through our international affairs division, actually a quite robust network of relationships around the world. We've just completed an exercise with the Swedish government and the EU, looking at some global phenomena that actually isn't talked about a lot, but geomagnetic storms and solar storms, where there – it's one of those high impact, high magnitude, low probability events where really will dismantle the communications infrastructure across all of the U.S. and Europe.

So bringing the experiences that we have to bear to the problem and that we learned from Swedish government, from the EU, really good approaches that we haven't thought of or tried before and things that we can learn.

We do the same thing in many countries throughout the globe. And you mentioned the Japanese. They have experience in Japan and throughout Asia, in Taiwan, where – in tsunamis and earthquakes that we just don't have. And they've learned lessons. And I spent some time in Taipei last spring. And some of the programs that they've built to resilient communities is really impressive. Parks in their community – there are parks, but they're actually built under the disaster plans. So if there's an earthquake, the community is trained, it's taught and knows that when buildings start shaking, go to the park. Stuff as supplies, support is focused on these resilience parks within the community. And that's the way they can get into their communities in a very high density – population density environment. Great, great things there.

MR. FLYNN: Excellent, well thank you very much from my side of things. And we have a great audience folks here. So who'd like to begin with some questions here for – yes – and please introduce yourself and tells us from where you're from.

Q: Steven Trevino, the Project for National Security Reform. I'm working on a resilience model. But resilient America is a bold – (inaudible) – theme for this administration and of course for the American public. In last years, – (inaudible) – presidential study directive number one, three directorates were stood up as you fully know, one of those being one of our favorites, Resilience Policy Directorate. They have Richard Reed and Kamoie, Darrell Darnell are all leading. Then we got Rand Beers and his evolution over at NPPD. And I'm curious what the dance is now between FEMA, in terms of being a resilience advocate, not only in the critical infrastructure resilience, but the societal and community resilience which you've spoken about. How do you see that dance sort of emerging and maturing between what you're doing, what Rand Beers is doing – he's working on the societal resilience and struggling a little bit with it – and what's going on at RPD? How do you see that kind of nexus coming together?

MR. MANNING: Well, we have – obviously Rand, Rand Beers' directorate and FEMA and NPPD are all sister directorates within DHS and we have close coordination across the department working towards common goals. We have now with the finalization of the publication of the QHSR, the Quadrennial Homeland Security Review, outlines the five mission areas across the Homeland Security enterprise and are working towards those mission areas and the common goal of a safe, secure, resilient America.

The partnership that we have now also with the NSC and the results of the – the outcomes of – (inaudible) – with combining the National Security Staff and the Homeland Security staff into one. I've seen great benefits from that as well. Where there had been bifurcation between essentially a home game and an away game at the NSC and the HSC, topics crossing back and forth constantly. I think we see – take terrorism for an example, any particular threat, any particular threat stream, any particular organization, it's just as likely that they may undertake operation overseas as in the U.S. and it's often that you don't know whether it's – where it's happening until it happens or until somebody gets on an airplane.

There's too much danger involved in separating a home game and an away game when you're talking about coordination and preparedness and capability development. So there has been a great development, this combining of the HSC and NSC into one national security staff with directorates around, the particular mission areas.

I think we have a great opportunity working across NSS and Richard – (inaudible) – and all of the other directorates in the NSS – I still slip sometimes, and Rand's activities and NPPD and of course across the whole Homeland Security enterprise.

MR. FLYNN: You're becoming a real Washington guy.

(Cross talk.)

MR. MANNING: – National Security Council, the Homeland Security Council, and National Security Staff.

MR. FLYNN: There we are.

MR. MANNING: Yes, yes. So there's – yes, I think there's great opportunities and every day I'm excited to come to work, we all are, to be able to implement some of these reforms and really pull the international national security arena, the domestic homeland security arena, and the traditional emergency management disaster response, preparedness activities, all into one large endeavor to protect the American people. It's a great opportunity.

MR. FLYNN: That's great. Right back here.

Q: Thank you. My name is Glenn Pomeroy. I am the CEO of an organization in California called the California Earthquake Authority. That's on the subject to earthquakes. The CEA was created – (inaudible) – earthquake back in the '90s, as a public-private enterprise to try to help make earthquake insurance affordable and available throughout the state. The California's home two third initial earthquake risk and the USGS says it's 99 percent probability for 6.7 or greater in the next 30 years, so it's coming. And yet in terms of resiliency and preparedness, only one in 10 homes are

insured for earthquake risk. And so the CEA is trying to deal with that. And FYI and then a quick question.

There's some legislation pending in Congress that would give a tool to entities like the CEA or some organizations in Florida and Louisiana that are dealing with hurricane risk. State created entities that are helping people and insurance needs – (inaudible) – some legislation that would give it to these organizations. That would be really game changing. For instance, CEA we'd be able – people are buying the – there're so few insured because the policy costs too much and the deductible's too high. And we understand that. This legislation would allow us to reduce our rates by at least a third and lower deductibles at least by half and that without putting pressure on the federal government. I think the CBO's score is going to be – (inaudible) – almost nothing. So it's a win-win proposition and it's inviting several different bills moving to Congress. We're very excited about it.

And my question is, in terms of financial preparedness for an earthquake or other natural disasters, where in FEMA – I would love engage FEMA in this dialogue and see if they – FEMA would have an interest in sort of tracking – (inaudible) – issue, where does something like that reside in your organization?

MR. MANNING: Actually that's – that particular question is very easy. That sits in the Mitigation Directorate, sits in the same – it's the program that runs both – well, mitigation grants to lessen the vulnerability of communities and also the National Flood Insurance Program. And that's – so currently – if you – we can talk afterwards and I'd be happy to put you in touch with whoever is over there and we can talk a little bit more about it.

MR. FLYNN: (Inaudible) – right now I think the general consensus is that we're actually with things like the flood insurance almost creating incentive for people to take risk. That is insurance basically is relatively the opposite of the problem – (inaudible) – is low premium for people to put very exposed real estate and so forth.

I think broadly the role of insurance – because no one – clearly as in this case here, it gets the risk spread out, not just federal dollars would come in to fix this thing, but also as you can leverage the insurance to get people to behave desirably. So how central is this insurance issue for the – (inaudible) – resilience and adaptation that we need going forward. Is that something you spend a lot of time on or is it –

MR. MANNING: It's something we as an agency spend a lot of time on. It sits actually with the other deputy. So he spends a lot of his time on that and I do as well to a certain degree. But it's how all aspects, all facets of life intersect, is really at the core of what we're trying to do in both community, societal resilience, building stronger communities.

The National Flood Insurance Program was created after a series of floods where the private sector insurance companies felt that the risk was too high. And there were no

insurance options anymore. So that the Congress decided that the federal government needed to step in and created that program.

I think one of the biggest – any analysis you look at, communities, the victims of disasters, community victims of disasters, they always disproportionately affect the poor, the disadvantaged. Communities that are most vulnerable to disasters tend to be those with lower property values. So there are all kinds of correlates there. And there're certainly very valid arguments that things like the NFIP, the National Flood Insurance Program, can encourage development and growth in high risk areas that may not be the best decision, just for a public policy decision.

On the other hand, how do you build programs? We do need programs, be they – ideally private sector, but some program to protect those most vulnerable and most at risk from disasters and events.

MR. FLYNN: Okay, over here, yes.

Q: Yes, Matt Korade with *Congressional Quarterly*. I have a question about the mitigation program. I wanted to ask you about if you could speak a little bit about in terms of building resilience of communities, how important that program is and if it matters at all that the program has not been authorized by Congress? But I think it's appropriated every year, year after year, so –

MR. MANNING: Well, I can speak to the importance of mitigation. I mentioned earlier that I think we all believe – we certainly all at FEMA and emergency management believe the best response is the one that we don't have to mount. So if we can prevent a disaster from happening in the first place, if we can create an environment where it's a bad storm last night, but there's no response needed, then that is ideally the best solution. Prevent damage, prevent death, prevent injury, and that comes through mitigation, be it building code, be it changing and working building codes in a community, planning and zoning, or physical infrastructure changes, both post-disaster in rebuilding the community, or pre-disaster in things like changing the way storm water runs through a community. Those things you do are absolutely critically important.

The difficulty comes and it's very hard to measure. How do you measure the effectiveness of the program when the end result is something never happens? And that's always the trickiest part. It's always been the hardest thing I've had to do mitigation programs, is explain to the elected leadership why it's important to spend this money on this program because I can't really ever prove it was successful if it's successful, classic irony.

There's an anecdote I've heard. It may be a – (inaudible) – I'm not sure. But an example in Seattle, where they did a – there was a school where there was a water tank, an old water tank up in the attic of the school. Everybody was terrified of this. There's a known earthquake hazard in Seattle. That if there were an earthquake, this was an unreinforced tank – that if it were – the earthquake would happen, this thing would come

through the school and during the school that could kill hundreds of students. Well, they eventually, through Hazard Program Mitigation Grants – Hazard Mitigation Grant Program – I've been on the acronyms – (inaudible) – HMGP, which is a mitigation grant program that comes post disaster, were able to spend some money and reinforce, retrofit this building and secure the school. And not too long, after that project was completed, was in this quality earthquake.

And so you can never go back and do the engineer forensics to know for sure that that would have come down, but everybody was pretty sure that is this quality earthquake was a scenario they were fearful of. And it happened exactly the way that that was going to happen, but that tank didn't come down and it didn't hurt anybody. And they were able to have what could arguably be a very successful mitigation program.

MR. FLYNN: We do have, though, a very compelling macro-data, right, which is that Congress funds things at this level and then it pays out at this level, after every incident. And this has been going on for quite a long time here. So bottom line for the taxpayers at the macro level obviously it's not a very good bargain to not invest in mitigation. But obviously project by project, making that case is a little tricky. Yes, right here.

Q: (Inaudible.) I wanted to ask you a little bit about your personal experience coming from the state and how you see FEMA today. Administrator Fugate has said that he would like to take the regions and empower them to actually optimize at that level, rather than have FEMA be centralized and telling regions what to do. Can you talk to how your personal experience coming from the state and now being in FEMA headquarters, what you're doing personally and what the FEMA is doing itself to change that paradigm? Were you actually thinking and going through the governor's process of empowering the regions and letting them work with the communities and the private sector, so that they are more resilient and feeding you back with what is needed for them to be successful?

MR. MANNING: Yes. Yes. Strong regions are critical. And it's easy to say that, but what it really means is that having decision making or the ability to get help from a level of government, from some place nearby that really understands your issues, that's what's important. It's not just about – it's not just about the regions for the sake of the regions because – with 21<sup>st</sup> century communications technology is just as easy for me to talk to somebody in a state capital as it is for somebody in a region. In some cases, it's probably easier. But what's important is that people understand the communities they live in. So when you have regional staff, when you have a strong region that's living in, let's say Region IX in Oakland, California, they really understand the requirements. They understand the nuances. They understand the community, the face of the – the complexion of the community of California, of Arizona because they live there. They're from there. And they're also a little isolated from the tendency we have here to think that we have the solutions to all of that's here. So that's why it's important. That's what's important.

I think what we're – the push we're really taking right now is trying to identify what are those things that are truly national assets, those national programs because everything exists somewhere. There is – everything that we do is in a region. If we would devolve everything into all the regions, you would have 10 FEMAs. And that wouldn't necessarily be effective either.

So we need to be able to maximize our resources, provide the accountability that's expected by the American people, by Congress, by the president for our programs, so that we have consistency in say grant program implementation, so that what you can do with a grant in California is the same in New York. But at the same time, make all of the push, as much as the decision making and the ability to be flexible to solve the requirements of the community out to the regions as possible, especially in the disaster response phase. That's where it's the most critical, where seconds count and an understanding of that community is really required to be able to say, "yes, I get what they're saying. I know these people because I work with them every day. So when they say this to me, I understand what it means." Lots gets lost in translation, between regional – (inaudible).

So there's a lot of – lots of that. I think it's – everyday we're doing more. Everyday, we find more programs that we can push out. I don't know that we'll find out 100 percent of the solutions, but we're certainly trying.

MR. FLYNN: Let me just follow up on a piece of that. I think Americans have a view of FEMA as a large entity. The fact is, in terms of numbers you're small. So tell me how many people are Washington based and how many spread across the regions that make up your agency?

MR. MANNING: That's a really good question. FEMA – if you don't count disaster reservists, those people that we bring on to work a particular disaster, FEMA's – we're somewhere in the neighborhood of about 5,000 employees nationwide, which is – I think that's very small for a federal –

MR. FLYNN: It seems a very small –

MR. MANNING: – exactly, exactly. Most regions are in the hundreds, regional headquarters building.

MR. FLYNN: So your total number of people per region is in the 200 range?

MR. MANNING: Right and it varies widely, depending on the regions and the requirements there. And most of – and the vast majority of those people work disasters in any given time. So say Region VI in Texas, outside Dallas, might have in the neighborhood of a couple of hundred people – I actually don't have the numbers off top of my head, but within Region VI, there may be thousands of people in joint field offices, working disaster response. But again, FEMA's not what we – are often made out to be in the public perception, where we don't write in. And FEMA employees don't throw sandbags. FEMA employees don't fight fire. FEMA exists to support those who do. So

we're supporters, enablers, with very rare exceptions don't do the actual response ourselves.

MR. FLYNN: Yes, very good. Yes, please.

Q: Frank – (inaudible). Mr. Manning, just – I appreciate your perspective on a national program, for example. If we look back to the aftermath of Katrina and we have the trailers and we locate the housing that was bought and there were – (inaudible) – issues on the back end. What has happened to that equipment, if you will, and what are plans for reconstituting that capacity?

MR. MANNING: Well, so the – yes, this is definitely ranging into a program that I don't have oversight of, so I –

MR. FLYNN: You're very happy to –

(Cross talk.)

MR. MANNING: – that program, that's right. FEMA's responsibility – emergency management's responsibility is sheltering and the approach to the temporary housing of displaced survivors, people that have been affected by disaster, there's a lot of different ways you can approach. And we had traditionally done the travel trailers, where we could – there's a large swing in supply and demand. What we recognized post Katrina was that in some of the construction methods, there were some quality concerns. Where – the current plan, there are – we work with the states on particular environmental regulations, requirements within the states. We have currently in process, developing now a long term recovery program that has a different – a number of different ways to think about short term and long term housing. And that might be a really good discussion for a subsequent policy thing, but I'm not the right one to talk to that.

MR. FLYNN: Over here, yes.

Q: Yes, Paula – (inaudible) – I have formerly – (inaudible) – spent two years at – (inaudible) – early '80s actually. I have a website called – (inaudible) – [publicadministration.com](http://publicadministration.com), which has an extensive list of preferences for resources on homeland security and emergency management. And two items there, I think are particularly pertinent to what you've been saying. One is research results of a 2005 study that was done with FEMA funding that determined that for every dollar spent, \$4 were saved for – (inaudible). And then you also have your newer research done on prevention that General Honore mentioned in his book. And I tracked that down and that's also there too where the cost savings are noted there. I think that would be helpful to people depend upon that kind of – (inaudible).

The idea I want to raise is things like project impact, hazard user groups and the newer concept of metacommunities, which all involve public private sector kinds of

partnerships, oriented towards resilience, preparedness, and mitigation. To what extent are you promoting those project impact type programs these days?

MR. MANNING: Well, we're certainly using things like the concepts of the metacommunities to inform a lot of our program development –

MR. FLYNN: Can you explain a little bit what metacommunities are?

MR. MANNING: – yes, I think the idea that you can link together the community itself – it really goes to the core of what I was talking about, where you have these community societal level side of mitigation, where – or preparedness, where you're building stronger communities to help each other, rather than having to rely solely on an external level of government to come in and provide those resources in the disaster response anyway.

The example – a story – something that happened to me this winter, with the big snow storms we had here in Washington this year. Before I moved to Washington, I had lived in the mountains between Santa Fe and Albuquerque in a very rural area, up against the National Forest, a fairly isolated place, a place where people moved because they don't really want to build relationships with their neighbors in many cases. And people – there is a high degree of individualism and self reliance in that part of the world. And it's expected – it's kind of understood that when you move there, you're kind of on your own. People build the ability – things like having a lot of water on there because I'm at the end of a power line, the end of a trunk, so when the power goes out, it's quite a while before the power comes back, and my well doesn't work. So I have zero water, unless I have it stockpiled.

So when I moved here, I moved in a community very unlike that, very high density population, but a community that was fairly old and one that was really the model for a lot of the kind of urban planning ideas, where you have front facing windows and a community that builds relationships among neighbors. I didn't realize this when I moved there. I came from the mountains of New Mexico. But what I found this winter with these storms, when power was knocked out – because we also are at the end of the power line, trunk, that when it goes down – we're the end of the priority list. But that community was the complete opposite. That community is one that because of – I'm not sure why, but because of maybe the transient nature of a lot of defense industry people – it's a lot – it's Northern Virginia and a lot of people that are coming and going into the community work in the Pentagon, maybe it's that. Maybe it's the nature of the housing that everybody – it kind of – it pulls everyone together like that. I'm not sure what it is. But the community was self healing. People that lived there a long time had generators. And they didn't have a generator for their house. They bought a generator twice the size they needed and extra extension cords. So when the power went out, they ran extension cords to their neighbors. And everybody helped each other. And people, they couldn't get out, when they couldn't get to the grocery store, every night there were houses that everybody came with what food they had and fed everybody else.

It was – I hadn't run into that anywhere else. It's sort of a story you don't hear very often. I'm sure that – I know that happens every day across America. We have to identify – I think it's incumbent on us to find out what builds that. How does that happen and further that, not just spend more money and be able to get there quicker? We have to do both of those things.

Q: And that's a great segue into the question that I wanted to ask you. There are –

MR. FLYNN: Could you introduce yourself –

Q: – I'm sorry. I'm Lynne Kidder and I work with BENS, Business Executives for National Security. We have done a lot of work to help facilitate the creation of state and local partnerships between public-private and all sectors of the communities' resilience focused activities.

My question to you is I think all of the leaders in this field and federal agencies and the White House and so on will be quick to admit that every community is unique, that it's impossible to devise a one-size-fits-all, that there – you've just described in your own experience why it works in some communities. The same model will not work in another community. So my question to you is do you see any indication whatsoever that FEMA or other federal agencies will acknowledge that and try to modify their roles somewhat so that they can provide incentives and rewards to communities that do take this on themselves? I think long term, we've all recognized that if it doesn't have local buy in and ownership, if it's not driven locally, then it will not be sustainable.

So what can the federal government do to encourage that and reward that, as opposed to making it more challenging by saying, "we give you federal dollars, you shall use it for this purpose?"

MR. MANNING: Yes, that's right. That's exactly right. I think we've – I have a good example there too of what we've done. All right, so the Citizen Corps Program, the CERT program, those are great programs and there has been great work done. But they're pretty typical federal government program, where it's here is a grant and here is a program. So if you want to apply for it and get money, you can implement this program. But at the same time that we're being largely successful on that program, other ideas have popped out.

And up in Rhode Island, they have a program called STEP, Student Tools for Emergency Preparedness, where they built – is really a grassroots, a locally designed and organized and implemented program, where partnership between the school administration of the elementary schools there, the local weatherman, the FEMA region – another example of where strong regions are good because they were helping the community be able to step in and help without – if we'd stepped in, we probably would have screwed it up. And they build this great program there. That works really well in that community. It gets in the classrooms, in the schools, into the schools there. And

instead of, in a way, we have a tendency – everybody says – recognize that children are a large part of the solution here, that if we can get – affect change in behavior of children, they'll affect their adults. We see it over and over again with seatbelts or smoking. Go back. Every successful program really is about kids.

Also we want to get into classrooms, but there's no room in classrooms, no room in the curriculum. So what they had done there was weave it into the curriculum, when they are teaching social studies, when they are teaching geography. It was about map my neighborhood and where am I going to go if – if my house in on fire, where do I meet my family, building the stuff that we need into the curriculum itself. Hugely successful, really well – embraced by the whole community. Students love it. The teachers love it.

Great stories, great feedback in the flooding recently that the kids, the families that were affected by this program had plans in place. They knew what to do. They weren't making up in the middle of the night, when the flood waters were rising.

But now the solution to that is – the tendency might be to take that program and say, “okay, well now we're going to create a national STEP program. And so here's grant money and here's how you shall do it.” But the success for that program was because the local weatherman today is well known by the community and he personally embraced it. He said, “this is great.” And he spent a lot of his own personal money to it and a lot of his own prestige. The teachers believed in it and they wanted to make it succeed. It wasn't something – it wasn't a new program that came down with some materials and said, “okay, here, Ms. Smith, this is how you will teach your children now.” It was they decided to do it.

So it's one of those things – what we need to do is find the successes, embrace them, provide resources because here's a whole community that has had the opportunity to learn the things we need them to learn, has had the opportunity to – there's – what – probably 60 – actually maybe hundreds of families that now have plans, that have discussed this with their children. We've reached this people in a way that doing a PSA never would, never could. We need to be able to have the flexibility. We need to build programs with the flexibility to find those, recognize the potential success, and provide resources to make them succeed. Copy those best practices, make them available to whomever want to do them, but don't force it out as the program.

If we take that program, STEP program, and we say, “here's our work, great success. If you want to use it, we'll give you the tools. We'll give you the resources. How about it?” But in order to succeed you need the buy in of teachers. You need this. You need this. You need this and provide those resources.

Q: Would you be willing to – personally, if you have a wherewithal to devise a program that would be even more flexible than that and say – or provide some kind of incentive to states or communities for demonstrated success or demonstrated effectiveness in terms of public-private collaboration, community wide, without saying, “it shall be – it shall look like this. It shall be called this. It will include this.” Really

give that flexibility to states and localities to embrace that and devise it in – (inaudible) – so that it works for them, perhaps around broad principles that can connect it vertically with the dotted line, as opposed to the solid line.

MR. MANNING: Absolutely. I'll give you another quick example. Iowa, State of Iowa has built public-private partnership in a way that nobody else is doing. And they felt it was successful, but the grant program rules, strictly speaking, didn't support it because it was fairly unique. And they came – if they were to just read the rules or we were to implement them very much to the letter of what we had written, they couldn't have supported what they wanted to do. But they came to us and we recognized the importance of what they're doing, the criticality of it, and the unique nature of the program, specific to the way government's structured, the community works together, how people come together there in Iowa. And we're able to say, "yes, now, you can do that. And here we'll help you do that by – here's how you can – here's how we can interpret the grant regulations, the grant rules to allow you to facilitate that. Absolutely, absolutely.

MR. FLYNN: We're, I'm afraid, down to our last one. Let me get this question right here in the back and then we'll go from here.

Q: I am Bill – (inaudible) –retired from the Defense Department, where I worked on foreign disaster relief and humanitarian assistance. You mentioned an away game and a home game. Last year, there was an example of where your home game was actually away. The tsunami hit Samoa and American Samoa. And DOD had the responsibility to provide relief through with USAID in Samoa. And DHS had to work with American Samoa. And there were some interesting lines of communication there, sometimes potential miscommunication as well. I wonder how many other cases you have like that we have to worry about territory – U.S. territories away from the homeland and to coordinate with the USAID and DOD.

MR. MANNING: Yes, that's a great question. Every disaster in Pacific territories, we deal with that. When we do the domestic preparedness here in the U.S., we work with DOD as a close partner and USNORTHCOM now, but when we're working in the Pacific with the territories, PACOM has a role that NORTHCOM doesn't – PACOM exists in the –

MR. FLYNN: Pacific Command.

MR. MANNING: – Pacific Command, U.S. Pacific Command exists in life in the Pacific in a way that the U.S. Northern Command does not in the U.S., continental U.S. So that's a different relationship. Just the lines, the sea lines of communication in the Pacific territories make things – it's just a different environment. But we've also seen that experience with Haiti recently, where we had urban search and rescue deployment that exceeding anything we've done before. We had – there are a couple of our urban search and rescue teams, the FEMA urban search and rescue teams that are equipped and prepared and have an interdependent relationship with USAID, the U.S. Agency for

International Development. And – but they needed more than those two. This has always been – our kind of cooperating concepts have always been about providing resources to China, to Indonesia. They’ve never really been about Haiti, right on our back step. So we’ve pulled that up very quickly and we provided a lot of support. Just like in the domestic disaster, FEMA is essentially the lead coordinating agency and the rest of the federal government, and the rest of – following to support a governor’s requests to the president – we coordinate that. In that case, we did – USAID held that role and FEMA stepped in as a supporting agency. So we were working in the National Response Coordination Center at FEMA headquarters. We had resources going. We sent a full third of our stockpiled commodities to Haiti in support of AID and the Department of Defense.

We were busy as we were for any domestic disaster through that, but in support of USAID, always in support of USAID and not FEMA. It was a whole of government approach there. And we learned a lot from the way the operations went there. We did a very in-depth after action report on that disaster to help inform how we’re going to do domestic work and how we’ll work with the territories. It was a very successful coordination.

MR. FLYNN: I think that was a great question to finish, in both highlighting the theme that we touched on, which is the divide between the away and home has gotten more blurred and appropriately so, giving that this is a sheer vulnerability we have. But also I liked the stories that you’re sharing. I think while this often is a sobering topic. We’re talking about disasters as we hope that they don’t happen, but what’s for me so rewarding to hear, as you were laying some of these tales, is how much you described communities coming together, the civic value or being prepared for things that we hope might not happen. This is not basically something that worries us that actually as we get this straight, I think it’d be very beneficial for a body politic that right now could use this little bit of coming together and a little less of going apart.

So I want to thank you very much for taking time from your very busy schedule. I’m glad we got to the entire session without a disaster happening. You’ve been scooted away. Thank you for coming by the center and we really wish you best of luck, not just in the hurricane season, but all the other messes that come your way. Thank you.  
(Applause.)

(END)