

STATEMENT

OF

THE HONORABLE TIMOTHY W. MANNING  
DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR, NATIONAL PREPAREDNESS  
FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

BEFORE  
THE

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY  
SUBCOMMITTEE  
ON  
EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS, PREPAREDNESS  
AND  
RESPONSE

“PREPAREDNESS:  
WHAT HAS \$29 BILLION IN HOMELAND SECURITY GRANTS  
BOUGHT AND HOW DO WE KNOW?”

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
WASHINGTON, D.C.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 27, 2009

Chairman Cuellar, Ranking Member Rogers, members of the Subcommittee, I am Timothy Manning, and I serve as Deputy Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). On behalf of Administrator Fugate, it is a privilege to appear before you today to discuss our ability to identify and measure the benefits that have accrued from nearly a decade of homeland security spending.

Mr. Chairman, since Fiscal Year 2002, the Department of Homeland Security's (DHS) homeland security grant programs have provided more than \$27 billion to state, local, tribal, and territorial jurisdictions across the nation. These funds are a direct investment in enhancing the nation's capability to prepare for, protect against and respond to a full range of natural and man-made hazards. Given the size of this investment, it is critical for us as stewards of federal dollars, to be able to identify, measure and assess what these dollars have bought and what the investment has returned. At the end of the day, we need to answer some very fundamental questions. The most fundamental of these is simply, "What have we bought?" Once we are able to answer this basic question, we should then be able to ask the more important one that logically follows, "Are we better prepared?"

The Post Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006 (PKEMRA) requires the implementation of a national, comprehensive system to assess emergency management efforts. PKEMRA states that preparedness must be expressed in terms of measurable capabilities that are aligned with definable inputs (e.g., people, training, and equipment) and the ability to perform specific tasks. Section 649 of PKEMRA requires the FEMA Administrator to "establish a comprehensive system to assess, on an ongoing basis, the nation's prevention capabilities and overall preparedness, including operational readiness." The law also requires annual federal and state preparedness reports, including the results of a comprehensive and strategic assessment of capabilities and resources at all levels of government.

Intuitively, we could answer the question "Are we better prepared?" with a "yes." We could validly point to the amount and type of equipment that has been purchased, the physical security improvements that have been made, and the planning and training improvements that have occurred, and conclude that we are better prepared. Our national, state, local, tribal and territorial efforts have certainly increased our interagency planning across the spectrum of preparedness. This is in itself an achievement that greatly improves our ability to act decisively in a crisis.

However, intuitive conclusions are not good enough. DHS and FEMA are committed to answering questions of preparedness with a greater degree of accuracy.

This is not to say that this is an easy task. "Are we prepared?" and "Are we *better* prepared?" are questions that we have wrestled with throughout the history of these grant programs. In the end, the answer to these questions will be found in rigorous analysis and the development of precise metrics which will enable us to connect dollars spent to results achieved and ultimately to improvements in preparedness.

There are several efforts currently underway to measure our preparedness by identifying gaps in our preparedness and response capability and attempting to measure improvements supported by our multi-billion dollar national investments.

## “Cost-to-Capabilities” (C2C)

One existing approach which has been underway for the last 18 months, and which we continue to evaluate, assess and improve, is the “Cost-to-Capabilities” (C2C) initiative developed by FEMA’s Grant Programs Directorate (GPD).

C2C resulted from GPD’s need to better inform itself as well as its stakeholders about the impact of grant dollars on both state and national preparedness. Beginning in early 2008, GPD took an extensive look at what has been done to date with preparedness grant dollars and, from that, developed the C2C Initiative. C2C was designed as a multi-year effort to develop, test, and implement a method to better enable local, state, tribal, and federal levels of governments to strategically manage the portfolio of homeland security grant programs and optimize the impact of those grant dollars on preparedness efforts.

C2C’s objective is to identify the information and develop the tools needed to effectively manage GPD’s homeland security and preparedness grant programs. With the tools and measurements generated by the C2C initiative, we hope that grantees will be able to maximize their local preparedness investment strategies and align their grant dollars with the nation’s homeland security priorities. The tools and measurements could lead to changes in the nation’s homeland security strategy, translating into a clear prioritization of capabilities-based investments that all levels of government can use. C2C tools are meant to inform grantees’ use of inherently finite grant funding and better measure how grants increase the capability of states and local communities to respond to all-hazards.

In its initial phase, C2C conducted a look back and a look forward to determine the best measures of capability gained through the application of grant dollars that supported the National Strategy on Homeland Security, the National Preparedness Guidelines and should support individual state homeland security strategy and priorities. The “look back” confirmed that GPD and its predecessor offices at the Department had never asked grantees to measure outcomes from grant dollars. Therefore, existing data tells us very little about our return on investment or our level of preparedness. GPD developed an Accomplishments Report; Summary of Initial Findings (Fy03-07), in May of this year. This report identifies the uses and accomplishments of over \$10 billion in Homeland Security grant funding. With the Committee’s permission, I would like to enter this report into the hearing record.

## GAP Analysis Program

Another major initiative underway to assess FEMA’s preparedness and response capability is FEMA’s Gap Analysis Program (GAP), which focuses on the performance of six distinct phases. These six phases are: (1) Selection of Disaster Scenario, (2) Estimation of Response Requirements, (3) Measurement of Baseline Preparedness, (4) Identification of Gaps, (5) Development and Implementation of strategies, and (6) Evaluation and Application of Lessons Learned. These phases are driven by the Capabilities-Based Preparedness Process outlined in the DHS National Preparedness Guidelines (NPG) and are designed to provide emergency management agencies at all levels of government with greater situational awareness of response

resources and capabilities. Like the NPG, GAP is an all-hazards, risk-based, and capabilities-driven program.

Once data is collected, users can measure any scenario against the GAP data to generate additional response requirements and can apply multiple concurrent scenarios or scenarios in succession. GAP provides its greatest value, in this all-hazards functionality. States are encouraged to reference their Statewide Hazard Mitigation Plan as required by the Stafford Act in the development of a disaster scenario, which helps ensure the selected hazard has been prioritized through a process of hazard identification and risk assessment. GAP provides flexibility to states in the scenario development process to ensure the scenario is useful to states' needs while still giving FEMA and other federal partners a better understanding of potential requests from states. This flexibility has the added benefit of allowing better integration of GAP into existing efforts the states and federal government may already have planned or underway.

In the wake of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, many new federal programs were created to enhance the overall preparedness of our nation by providing state, territory, local, tribal and territorial governments assistance in building and sustaining their capability to effectively prepare for, protect against, respond to, recover from and mitigate natural disasters and terrorist attacks. While these new initiatives have bolstered our nation's level of preparedness, they have also created new federal requirements for state, territory, local, tribal and territorial emergency management and homeland security agencies. FEMA's key partners in emergency management and homeland security report that the existing volume of requests for information is placing a significant strain on their resources.

In 2007, FEMA commissioned the *Analysis of Federal Preparedness Requirements* in order to assess the impact of 41 preparedness programs and 275 preparedness requirements on state emergency management and homeland security agencies. Published in Fiscal Year 2009, the *Analysis of State and Local Officials' Views on Federal Preparedness Requirements* report outlines the views and recommendations from 20 states as well as the New York and Los Angeles Urban Areas and presents 75 recommendations from state and local officials for improving the reporting process for federal requirements. Many of the findings and recommendations focus on the need to reduce the volume of reporting requirements and to develop a more efficient system for collecting data from state emergency management and homeland security agencies.

FEMA has engaged state, local, tribal and territorial government officials as well as representatives from the National Emergency Management Association and committed to seek opportunities to consolidate and reduce duplicative or similar reporting requirements. In March 2009, FEMA's Office of Policy and Program Analysis was tasked by the Acting FEMA Administrator with leading an effort to identify ways to reduce the impact of FEMA's information collection requirements on state, local, tribal, and territorial governments while continuing to provide the information used to assist Federal decision-makers. This initiative engaged FEMA Offices and Directorates as well as officials representing state, local, tribal, and territorial governments.

On July 17, 2009, FEMA Administrator Craig Fugate issued a moratorium on new requests for information that require a response by, or action from, any state, local, tribal, and territorial

government. In addition, Administrator Fugate directed a more thorough review of FEMA's reporting requirements to include an assessment of the agency's needs for information as identified by individual Offices and Directorates and information required by legislation such as the PKEMRA.

This past August, FEMA developed the Reporting Requirements Working Group, consisting of representatives from FEMA Offices and Directorates and officials from state, local, tribal, and territorial governments. The goal of this Working Group is to make the collection of data from state, territorial, local and tribal governments more efficient, transparent, and predictable.

FEMA must better communicate its own information needs and understand the information needs of state, local and tribal governments. To achieve this goal, the working group has begun developing a calendar of all FEMA reporting requirements in order to provide recommendations for consolidating similar requests and identifying ways to better align its processes with the calendars and operating plans of its state, local, tribal, and territorial government partners. In addition, the Working Group will seek ways to enhance communication between FEMA and its partners in emergency management and homeland security agencies throughout the country. Enhancing the communication process will not only reduce duplication of exiting requirements, but it will also help enhance the utility of preparedness data for all levels of government. Finally, the Working Group will provide realistic and measurable recommendations for data collection priorities.

### Conclusion

Continuing to establish a meaningful framework for the measurement of preparedness is a priority at FEMA, and we look forward to working with this Committee and the Congress toward a methodology that will inform future decision making without placing undue burden on our partners in tribal, state, local and territorial government. Thank you Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Rogers and members of the Subcommittee, for the opportunity to testify today. I am happy to answer any questions you may have.