

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 2004

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met at 10:20 a.m., in room SD-124, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Thad Cochran, (chairman) presiding.
Present: Senators Cochran, Specter, Byrd, and Murray.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS
AND RESPONSES

STATEMENT OF MICHAEL D. BROWN, UNDER SECRETARY, EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE DIRECTORATE

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR ARLEN SPECTER

Senator SPECTER [presiding]. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

I was attending a Judiciary Committee executive session upstairs where we are trying to move forward on the confirmation of many judges, when I heard that this hearing lacked a Republican. It should not be too hard to find a Republican in the Senate complex on a Thursday morning. And then I received a summons from Senator Byrd. Now, a summons from Senator Byrd is not quite like a subpoena.

But it is close. And you know what happens when you do not respond to a subpoena. There is a bench warrant, and that could be very serious. So, I left the Judiciary Committee exec room to convene this hearing. I am going to have to return shortly.

Today this subcommittee will continue the review of the fiscal year 2005 budget request for the Department of Homeland Security. We are pleased to welcome the Under Secretary of the Emergency Preparedness and Response Directorate, Mr. Mike Brown. We will review this year's budget request and work with you, Mr. Brown.

PREPARED STATEMENT

Homeland security is obviously a top priority for this country, reflected in the President's budget request for an increase of 9.7 percent, whereas the discretionary funding got only a half of 1 percent, defense some 7 percent.

Without objection, the full statement, which had been prepared for Senator Cochran will be included in the record, and we now turn to your testimony.

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR THAD COCHRAN

The hearing will come to order.

Today we continue our review of the fiscal year 2005 budget request for the Department of Homeland Security.

I am pleased to welcome to this hearing the Under Secretary of the Emergency Preparedness and Response Directorate, Mike Brown.

Our Committee will work hard to provide the funds this Directorate needs to carry out its responsibilities and perform its mission successfully.

We thank you for submitting a copy of your statement in advance of this hearing. It will be made a part of the record, and we invite you to make any comments you think would be helpful to the committee's understanding of the budget request.

Now, I will yield to Senator Byrd and other Senators who may wish to make opening statements.

Senator SPECTER. Excuse me. The custom is to call on the ranking member, the ranking member of the full committee, former President Pro Tempore, chairman of the full committee, and so many titles. If I went through them, you would not have any time left, Mr. Brown.

Senator Byrd.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD

Senator BYRD. Thank you. America has done some great things. It put a man on the moon, brought him back to earth safely again, but it has never been able to produce a truly good loudspeaker system.

I appreciate your kind remarks about me. Plato thanked the gods for having been born a man, for having been born a Greek, and for having lived in the age of Socrates. I thank the gods for permitting me to live in the same age and serve at the same time in the United States Senate with a chairman and also a Pennsylvania Senator on this committee who presided over this committee with such dignity and skill. I thank Senator Specter for his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, the Senator from Pennsylvania had turned to me for a statement. May I proceed?

Senator COCHRAN [presiding]. Please.

Senator BYRD. Welcome, Mr. Brown. No relation to Jimmy Brown, the newsboy of this town, but a good man nevertheless.

In April of last year, when you testified before this subcommittee, I asked you how Congress could be sure that the agencies merged into the new Department of Homeland Security with specific missions unrelated to homeland security, such as preventing and responding to natural disasters, would have the resources to accomplish their missions. In your response, you assured the committee that FEMA would continue—and I quote—“to protect our Nation’s institutions from all types of hazards through a comprehensive, risk-based, all-hazards approach.”

ALL-HAZARDS EMERGENCY PLANNING

In your written testimony today, you stress a continued commitment to all-hazards emergency planning, but frankly, as I see it,

the President's policies ignore that commitment. I will repeat that again. As I see it, the President's policies ignore that commitment.

States and local communities look to FEMA to provide the resources and expertise that they need to meet a wide range of challenges. Today, possibly more than ever before, our States and local communities have to be ready to cope with disasters such as floods, earthquakes, chemical incidents, disease in our food supply, and other public health emergencies. Given the events of 9/11, States and communities must also prepare for preventing or responding to terrorist attack. And this is why a focus on all-hazards preparedness is so important.

However, rather than embrace the all-hazards approach to emergency planning, the President's budget undermines it. Rather than develop the capacity to respond to a terrorist attack within the framework of all-hazards planning, the President's budget, in essence, mandates that State and local governments give priority to anti-terrorism programs at the expense of other potential disasters.

TRANSFER OF SEVERAL ALL-HAZARDS PROGRAMS FROM FEMA INTO A NEW OFFICE OF STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT COORDINATION AND PREPAREDNESS

The Administration proposes to transfer several all-hazards programs out of FEMA and into a new Office of State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness. That office's mandate, as laid out in the Homeland Security Act, is to help State and local governments effectively combat terrorism.

Under the consolidation proposal announced by the Secretary on January 26, 2004, and under the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2005, emergency management performance grants, community emergency response team grants, and the metropolitan medical response system will all be shifted into this newly expanded office. And yet, this new office does not have the expertise or the regional staff experienced in all-hazards planning. FEMA has that expertise.

Yesterday I joined with Representative Martin Sabo, the ranking member of the House Appropriations Homeland Security Subcommittee, in sending a letter to Secretary Ridge urging him not to proceed with the reorganization of the emergency management performance grants and community emergency response team programs, along with several Transportation Security Administration programs.

PROPOSED CUTS TO FIRE GRANTS FUNDING

Furthermore, the administration proposes to cut funding for fire grants by \$246 million and emergency management performance grants by \$9 million and, at the same time, mandate that States give priority to terrorism preparedness. This is a squeeze play that States cannot afford.

I will give you a rhetorical question at this point. Where do these policies leave a small town fire department in West Virginia or Mississippi, or other rural States, that needs to purchase breathing apparatus or equipment to deal with a chemical spill? We have one of the largest chemical complexes in this country, in the Western

Hemisphere as a matter of fact, in the Kanawha Valley. So this comes home to us in West Virginia.

PROPOSAL TO LIMIT THE AMOUNT OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT
FUNDS THAT CAN BE SPENT ON SALARIES

The President also proposes to limit the amount of emergency management funds that can be spent on salaries. This provision would drive a stake through the heart of State and local all-hazards planning efforts.

TERRORIST ATTACK CONCERNS

I am as concerned as anyone about the possibility of future terrorist attacks, but I am also greatly concerned that preparing for such an attack will come at the expense of preparing for other types of disasters if this administration's budget proposal is enacted.

There are elements in the budget request that are praiseworthy. The Administration is again requesting \$200 million for the flood map modernization initiative. This initiative is so important to flood-prone States such as West Virginia. I am also pleased to see an adequate and timely budget request for the disaster relief fund. Last year we came very close to running out of money in the disaster relief fund and nobody—not even OMB it seems—wants to go through that again this year.

Also, the Administration's budget recognizes the importance of pre-disaster and post-disaster mitigation funds. Post-disaster mitigation funds help communities pay for mitigation activities right after a disaster occurs, when communities have the will and the momentum to complete such projects. I hope we can do even more post-disaster mitigation in the future.

West Virginia endured four Federally declared disasters last year. No State is more grateful for, and no State is more in need of, FEMA's programs and expertise than West Virginia. And I want to compliment you on the excellent work that you and your staff have done. You have not failed us in West Virginia where we are very keenly aware of and live often with disasters that are not manmade.

So, I look forward to hearing your testimony, Mr. Under Secretary, and to working with you to preserve FEMA's all-hazards planning programs.

And I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your patience and kindness.

Mr. BROWN. Thank you, Senator.

Senator COCHRAN. Thank you, Senator Byrd.

Senator Murray.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR PATTY MURRAY

Senator MURRAY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you so much. I join my colleagues in welcoming you here today. You have a tremendous task before you and I thank you for your service.

FIRST RESPONDER FUNDING

My colleague, Senator Byrd, discussed the more visible issues regarding first responder funding. I too am very concerned about the proposal to shift the homeland security grants into the Office of Domestic Preparedness. Streamlining these programs is a key element to ensure our local communities get the needed resources in a timely manner, but the programs that are traditionally supported by TSA and FEMA I do not believe should be forced to compete with our first responders for funding.

I am also really concerned that the President's budget request cuts State grants for first responders by \$990 million. It cuts training for first responders by \$103 million and eliminates the COPS program. That is almost \$2 billion in cuts for first responders nationwide at a time when our State and local budgets just do not have the capacity to absorb those additional costs. So, I am very concerned about that. I am confident that Congress will prevent this administration from decimating those essential first responder programs and I want my colleagues to know that I will work with them to restore that.

I do have a number of questions for you and I will wait for my time. But thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for this hearing.

Senator COCHRAN. Thank you, Senator.

Mr. Brown, we have a copy of your statement which we appreciate very much your submitting to the committee in advance of the hearing. It will be made a part of the record in full. We encourage you to make whatever comments you would like to make in support of the budget request that will be helpful to our understanding of the request. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF MICHAEL D. BROWN

Mr. BROWN. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and Senator Byrd, thank you for your kind comments, and Senator Murray, you also.

My name is Michael Brown. I am the Under Secretary for Emergency Preparedness and Response of the Department of Homeland Security. I am, indeed, honored to appear before you today to talk about FEMA's accomplishments over the past year since we became a part of the Department of Homeland Security. But more importantly, I want to highlight some of our priorities for fiscal year 2004 and discuss why support of the President's budget request for 2005 is critical to ensure that FEMA can continue to fulfill its traditional mission.

FEMA has undergone changes since becoming a part of Homeland Security, both externally and internally, but we have not changed our focus. As part of the Homeland Security Department, FEMA has continued the tradition of responding to help disaster victims and those in need wherever disaster or emergencies strike.

On March 1, FEMA will celebrate its first full year as a part of the Department of Homeland Security. We are proud to be part of this historic effort and are more committed than ever to do our duty as defenders of the homeland. We believe that the Federal-wide consolidation of all-hazards preparedness, mitigation, re-

sponse, and recovery programs brings real benefit to the American public.

FISCAL YEAR 2003 ACCOMPLISHMENTS

In fiscal year 2003, FEMA responded to 62 major disasters and 19 emergencies, covering 35 States, 4 U.S. territories, and the District of Columbia. These disasters included the record number of tornadoes in the Midwest, the unfortunate loss of the Space Shuttle Columbia, Hurricane Isabel, and the absolutely devastating wildfires in California. In fiscal year 2003, FEMA obligated nearly \$2.9 billion in fiscal year 2003 disaster funds to aid people, victims and communities that were overwhelmed by these disasters.

FISCAL YEAR 2004 PLANS

In fiscal year 2004, FEMA is focusing on our five major program areas: mitigation, preparedness, response, recovery, and national security.

Our mitigation efforts center on modernizing our Nation's flood maps, providing pre-disaster mitigation grants and enhancing the national flood insurance program.

In the Preparedness Division, we will support the Department's efforts to put into place a national incident management system that will help improve coordination of disaster response at all levels, and we will also publish mutual aid system development, credentialing, and equipment interoperability standards.

In 2004, our response capabilities continue to grow as we field enhanced response teams and resources, improve our response times, put into place plans for catastrophic events, and improve our training. For those impacted by disasters, FEMA continues to provide appropriate and effective disaster recovery assistance.

Finally, we are ensuring that the FEMA national security program has adequately staffed, trained, equipped, and exercised the continuity of operations and the continuity of Government programs.

FISCAL YEAR 2005 BUDGET REQUEST

Looking ahead to fiscal year 2005, the President's budget request is critical to ensuring that FEMA can continue to fulfill its traditional mission. The President's budget again requests \$150 million for the pre-disaster mitigation program to help minimize the devastation caused by natural disasters.

The budget also requests \$200 million to continue the replacement and modernization of the Nation's flood insurance rate maps, and includes \$7 million in new budget authority for the development and implementation of the national incident management system as part of the national response plan. These two initiatives will ensure that all levels of government across the Nation are prepared to work together efficiently and effectively employing a single national approach to domestic incident management.

The President's budget request includes \$8 million in new budget authority for four incident management teams to act as the core field level response management teams for major disasters, emergencies, and acts of terrorism.

The President's budget also provides \$2.9 billion for disaster relief, a level consistent with the average non-terrorist disaster costs over the past 5 years.

I can assure you, Senators, that President Bush appreciates the importance of recovery. I had the distinct honor of joining the President in touring Missouri last spring after the devastating tornadoes struck Pierce City, Missouri. It was absolutely a downpour. The President gets out of the car, and goes over to visit with a couple who were standing in front of their damaged storefront. This couple also had damages to their home, but using FEMA's temporary housing, our immediate needs assistance, their insurance, and SBA home and business loans, this couple is now recovering. The President recognizes the importance of this type of all-hazards planning, as evidenced by his \$2.1 billion request for the disaster relief fund.

OFFICE OF NATIONAL SECURITY COORDINATION

In fiscal year 2005, FEMA's Office of National Security Coordination will also continue to carry out its mandated mission to provide executive agent leadership, to ensure continuity of national operations in response to all-hazards emergencies in order to guarantee the survival of an enduring constitutional government.

In summary, during the last year, FEMA has continued to carry out its traditional mission. Successful implementation of the new initiatives and the ongoing activities I have discussed today will improve our national system of mitigating against, preparing for, responding to, and recovering from disasters and emergencies caused by all hazards.

PREPARED STATEMENT

In closing, on a personal note, I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, Senator Byrd, Senator Murray, for the absolute wonderful support that you have given FEMA over the past years. I would be happy to answer any questions that you might have at this time. [The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MICHAEL D. BROWN

Introduction

Good morning Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee. I am Michael Brown, Under Secretary for the Emergency Preparedness and Response Directorate (EP&R) of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), which includes the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

I am honored to appear before you today to talk about FEMA's accomplishments of this past year since it has become part of the Department of Homeland Security. More importantly I want to highlight our priorities for fiscal year 2004 and why support of the President's Budget request for fiscal year 2005 is critical to insure that FEMA can continue to fulfill its traditional role of preparing for, mitigating against, responding to, and recovering from disasters and emergencies caused by all hazards.

FEMA has undergone significant changes since becoming part of DHS—both external and internal—but it has not changed its focus. As part of DHS, FEMA continues its tradition of responding to help disaster victims and those in need whenever disasters or emergencies strike.

Transition into the Department of Homeland Security

On March 1st, FEMA will celebrate its first full year as part of the Department of Homeland Security. We are proud to be part of this historic effort and are more committed than ever to our duty as defenders of the Homeland. We made significant

strides in our first year as a component of the Department, and we continue to see the advantage of and realize benefits from being part of a larger organization. We believe that the Federal-wide consolidation of all-hazards preparedness, mitigation, response, and recovery programs brings real benefit to the American public.

Since March 1st of last year, FEMA has worked to merge disaster-related public health programs from the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) into a comprehensive and unified national response capability. These programs include the National Disaster Medical System (NDMS), which is designed to provide a single, integrated, national medical response capability to augment the Nation's emergency medical response capability when needed for major disasters and Federally declared emergencies. Another important public health-related program, the Strategic National Stockpile (SNS), maintains large quantities of essential medical items that can be provided for the emergency health security of the United States in the event of a bioterrorist attack or other public health emergency and to support State and local communities during emergencies.

FEMA also successfully merged a multiplicity of other disaster response teams and assets from different departments and agencies to create a unified national response capability within the Department of Homeland Security. Among these teams and assets, now merged within FEMA's Response Division, are the:

- National Disaster Medical System,
- Domestic Emergency Support Team, and
- Strategic National Stockpile

FEMA has also been given operational control of the Nuclear Incident Response Team in certain circumstances, including the event of an actual or threatened terrorist attack.

As we settle into DHS, we continue to leverage the extensive experience and capabilities of the Department's other components. For example, in responding to Hurricane Isabel, we received aerial imaging and aviation support from our friends at Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) and the U.S. Coast Guard. We are partnering with the Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection Directorate to improve our damage prediction and resource placement decisions and to take advantage of their critical infrastructure resources and expertise. We look forward to continuing and increasing such cooperation in the future.

Fiscal Year 2003 Accomplishments

In fiscal year 2003, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) obligated nearly \$2.9 billion in disaster funds to aid people and communities overwhelmed by disasters, including floods, ice and winter storms, wildfires, tornadoes, hurricanes, typhoons, and tropical storms. In addition, FEMA obligated \$6.8 billion to fund projects associated with the September 11 response. Overall, FEMA responded to 62 major disasters and 19 emergencies in 35 States, 4 U.S. Territories and the District of Columbia. These events included the record Midwest tornadoes, Super Typhoon Pongsona and Hurricanes Claudette and Isabel. The 19 emergencies declared in 2003 included the loss of the Space Shuttle Columbia, the President's Day snowstorm, and the Northeast power outages.

While the California fires in October left an indelible mark in our memories, the Nation's fire season in 2003 was not as busy, with exceptions, in Montana and Arizona. But in the areas impacted, the fires were devastating and severe. In fiscal year 2003, FEMA approved assistance for 34 fires in 11 States, compared with 83 fires in 19 States in fiscal year 2002.

In fiscal year 2003, Congress supported the President's efforts to promote disaster mitigation, through the creation and funding of two important initiatives: the Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grant Program and the Flood Map Modernization Program. Great strides have been made in both of these areas in the last year. These two programs will ultimately result in the reduced loss of life and property throughout our Nation.

FEMA's Preparedness Division awarded more than \$160 million in Emergency Management Performance Grants to the States to maintain and improve the national emergency management system. To date, the United States Fire Administration has awarded over \$650 million in grants to fire departments across the Nation as part of the Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program. Both of these programs are now requested in the Office for Domestic Preparedness (ODP) portion of the Department's budget for fiscal year 2005 and we are working very closely with ODP on transferring these programs. FEMA also provided a total of 17 interoperable communications equipment grants for \$79.57 million, and the Emergency Management Institute, the National Fire Academy (NFA) and the Noble Training Center together trained more than 290,000 fire and emergency management and response personnel nationwide.

In our response to Hurricane Isabel, last September, we demonstrated a more forward-leaning and proactive response posture and made every effort to improve communication, coordination and timely delivery of critical disaster supplies. FEMA increased the frequency of daily video teleconferences with the impacted States and meteorological and river forecasting centers, jointly planned response actions with the States, pre-positioned materials, and opened multiple staging areas and mobilization centers in anticipation of response needs. These and other changes we have made allow us to continue to improve Federal disaster response efforts. We will continue to take advantage of the lessons learned and best practices from Isabel and other disasters, and apply them in our programs to change the impact of future events.

Also during fiscal year 2003, FEMA launched the Continuity of Operations Readiness Reporting System, a single automated system that allows Federal Executive Branch departments and agencies to report the state of their Continuity of Operations capabilities and readiness. The System has been tested and will be fielded this year. In addition to technology upgrades and improvements, FEMA's Office of National Security Coordination maintained a 24/7 operational readiness capability in support of National Security programs, including the initial planning and coordination for an interagency Continuity of Operations exercise, Exercise Forward Challenge 2004, to take place later this year.

Fiscal Year 2004 Priorities

In fiscal year 2004, FEMA is focusing on its five major program areas: Mitigation, Preparedness, Response, Recovery, and National Security.

Our Mitigation efforts center on modernizing our Nation's flood maps, providing Pre-Disaster Mitigation (PDM) grants, and enhancing the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). For Map Modernization over 300 mapping projects, valued at approximately \$85 million, were launched nationwide in fiscal year 2003 and we are working with State and local representatives to identify projects for fiscal year 2004. The PDM grants will again provide stable funding to assist State and local governments to reduce risks. The number of NFIP policies will be increased by 5 percent.

Our Preparedness Division will support the Department's efforts to put into place a National Incident Management System (NIMS) that will help improve coordination of disaster response at all levels. In addition, we will publish Mutual Aid System Development, Credentialing and Equipment Interoperability Standards. Our support for training and exercises continues to enhance the Nation's emergency management capabilities and increasing fire preparedness remains a central mission.

In 2004, our Response capabilities continue to grow. We will field enhanced response teams and resources, improve our response times, put plans into place for catastrophic events, and improve our training. We will continue to consolidate and integrate all of our different disaster response programs, teams, and assets; design new approaches; and implement new efficiencies that will result in a more unified, integrated, and comprehensive approach to all-hazards disaster response. We want to elevate our operational response capabilities to a whole new level of proficiency, one that will further the principles of the National Response Plan (NRP) and the National Incident Management System (NIMS) to better serve the American people.

For those impacted by disasters, FEMA continues to provide appropriate and effective disaster recovery assistance. Simultaneously, we continue to focus on re-designing our Public Assistance Program and developing a catastrophic incident housing recovery strategy. These efforts will enhance our current capabilities and better position us to recover from a catastrophic event.

Finally, we are ensuring that the FEMA National Security Program has adequately staffed, trained, equipped, and exercised Continuity of Operations (COOP) and Continuity of Government (COG) programs to guarantee the survival of Enduring Constitutional Government.

Fiscal Year 2005 Budget Highlights

The President's fiscal year 2005 Budget for FEMA:

- Assumes a \$2.9 billion spending level for disaster relief—a level consistent with the average non-terrorist disaster costs over the past 5 years. This includes more than \$2.1 billion in new disaster funds, as well as funds expected to remain available from prior years. This is over \$300 million more than the fiscal year 2004 appropriation.
- Continues implementation of Project BioShield, which encourages the development and purchase of necessary medical countermeasures against weapons of mass destruction. Through an advance appropriation, \$2.5 billion is made avail-

able beginning in fiscal year 2005. These funds will be obligated through fiscal year 2008.

- Includes \$20 million in new budget authority for planning and exercises associated with improving medical surge capabilities.
- Includes \$8 million in new budget authority for four Incident Management Teams (IMTs) to act as the core, field-level response teams for major disasters, emergencies, and acts of terrorism.
- Includes \$7 million in new budget authority for development and implementation of the National Incident Management System (NIMS), specially designed to provide a basic framework of organization, terminology, resource identification and typing; training and credentialing; and communications protocols to deal effectively with incidents of all sizes and complexities involving Federal, State, and local governments, Tribal Nations, and citizens.
- Continues the President's Pre-Disaster Mitigation program, which helps to minimize the devastation caused by natural disasters through a competitive grant process that supports well-designed mitigation projects. In fiscal year 2005, we will initiate post-disaster evaluations to begin documenting losses avoided and assessing program impact.
- Continues the replacement and modernization of the Nation's Flood Insurance Rate Maps.
- Transfers the Strategic National Stockpile to DHHS. As a result of the transfer, \$400 million is moved to DHHS to maintain the stockpile and strengthen its future capacity with new and needed medical products as soon as they become available.
- Transfers the Emergency Food and Shelter Program to the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Mitigation

FEMA's mitigation programs are an essential part of the Department of Homeland Security's charge to protect the lives and property of Americans from the effects of disasters. Mitigation programs provide us the opportunity not only to develop plans to reduce risks, but more importantly, to implement those plans before disaster strikes.

In previous years, Congress supported the President's efforts to promote disaster mitigation by creating and funding two initiatives:

- Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grants, and
- Flood Map Modernization.

The intent of the Pre-Disaster Mitigation Grants is to provide a consistent source of funding to State, local, and Tribal governments for pre-disaster mitigation planning and projects that primarily address natural hazards. The plans and projects funded by this program reduce overall risks to the populations and structures, while reducing reliance on funds from Federal disaster declarations. The competitive nature of the Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program encourages communities to assess their risks, to evaluate their vulnerabilities, and to implement mitigation activities before a disaster strikes. This budget proposes support for both pre-disaster and post-disaster mitigation assistance.

The Flood Map Modernization Program provides the capability to broaden the scope of risk management. This enables more expansive use of the geospatial base data needed to develop the flood maps. Communities, lenders, insurance agents, and others use the maps and the flood data approximately 20 million times a year to make critical decisions on land development, community redevelopment, insurance coverage, and insurance premiums. As flood hazard data is updated, the current flood map inventory is being changed from a paper map system to a digital one. New technology will enhance the usefulness and availability of flood data to all customers. The new system also supports the development and distribution of geospatial data of all hazards, both natural and man-made.

The fiscal year 2005 budget will continue to update flood maps nationwide and increase State and local capability to manage flood hazard data. By the end of fiscal year 2005, digital GIS flood hazard data covering 50 percent of our Nation's population will be available online.

The National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) has a significant impact on reducing and indemnifying this Nation's flood losses. Prior to the creation of the NFIP, floodplain management as a practice was not well established, and only a few states and several hundred communities actually regulated floodplain development. Flood insurance was not generally available. We are working diligently to refine and expand our all-hazards risk communication strategy to meet the goal of a 5 percent increase in NFIP policy ownership. This increase in insurance policy ownership will

reduce reliance on the Disaster Relief Fund and will foster individual economic stability.

Preparedness

FEMA's Preparedness Division helps ensure our Nation is prepared to respond to emergencies and disasters of all kinds. The Preparedness Division is responsible for Federal, State, local, and community emergency preparedness programs; assessments and exercises; grants administration; the Radiological Emergency Preparedness Program and the Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program. The U.S. Fire Administration works to prevent fire deaths and damage to property, and carries out its mission through leadership, advocacy, coordination, and support. The training programs offered at the National Fire Academy and the Emergency Management Institute promote the professional development of command level firefighters, emergency managers, and emergency responders, and are an important aspect of the U.S. Fire Administration's duties.

The Noble Training Center, located at Ft. McClellan, Alabama, is a new addition to FEMA. Transferred from DHHS in fiscal year 2003, the Noble Training Center is the only hospital facility in the United States devoted entirely to medical training for Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD). In fiscal year 2005, Noble will continue to train medical personnel for State and local hospitals, emergency medical services, and the National Disaster Medical System.

In fiscal year 2005, FEMA's Preparedness Division will work with other components of the Department to develop the National Incident Management System (NIMS) and the National Response Plan (NRP). These initiatives will ensure that all levels of government, across the Nation, work together efficiently and effectively, employing a single national approach to domestic incident management.

FEMA's Preparedness Division will continue to provide the States with technical assistance in their all-hazards planning. To avoid duplicative planning, our efforts will be closely coordinated with those of the Office for Domestic Preparedness to update State terrorism preparedness plans.

As part of our effort to prepare our citizens for all disasters, the Division will oversee the Community Emergency Response Teams, or CERT. This program, begun as a civilian training program by the Los Angeles Fire Department, has become a nationwide effort to train citizens in first aid and basic firefighting and emergency response techniques. CERT-trained citizens are able to provide those basic emergency services that would otherwise occupy the first responders. FEMA provides train-the-trainer programs to allow as many citizens as possible to receive this training across the country. The CERT program has grown from 170 teams in 28 States and Territories in March of 2002 to over 900 teams in 51 States and Territories.

Response

FEMA's Response Division is responsible for integrating national emergency response teams, systems and assets into a comprehensive and fully coordinated, national capability that supports States and communities in responding to all types of disasters, including acts of terrorism. This is accomplished by arranging the necessary and appropriate national assets, establishing a consolidated national incident response system, and effectively coordinating strategic resources in full partnership with Federal, State, local, and tribal governments, the private sector, volunteers, and citizen partners.

The fiscal year 2005 Response Division budget proposes to:

- Create four Incident Management Teams (IMTs) and formulate plans for full implementation in fiscal year 2006; the IMT is a highly responsive and flexible response team that will be able to quickly establish a strong Federal leadership capability in any disaster environment or high threat situation, including acts of terrorism involving the use of WMD;
- Continue all-hazards catastrophic disaster response planning for one additional U.S. city, based on the pilot disaster planning template developed for New Orleans, Louisiana. The template will be used in the future as a basis for all-hazards catastrophic planning for other high risk areas of the country; and
- Continue efforts to develop the capability to provide intermediate emergency housing aimed at meeting the needs of large numbers of disaster victims displaced from their homes as a result of large scale and catastrophic disasters

FEMA's Response Division will also continue to implement measures to reduce response times for its teams and delivery of disaster supplies.

Additional funding requested in fiscal year 2005 implements the National Incident Management System—NIMS. FEMA's goal for 2005 is to focus on the readiness of Federal response teams and the integration of Federal capabilities with that

of State and local jurisdictions. We will conduct outreach to our Federal response partners and State and local counterparts to ensure connectivity and synchronization of response capabilities under NIMS, and will conduct NIMS and Incident Command System (ICS) training for Federal response teams. These activities will ensure we have the baseline skills for all teams to operate under NIMS and be fully integrated into the NIMS/ICS doctrine.

As highlighted previously, the President's fiscal year 2005 budget proposes an initiative to develop FEMA's medical surge capability. Under this initiative, FEMA will evaluate supplemental capabilities for both a fixed and mobile facility to demonstrate the utility of using alternate facilities to support medical surge activities, as well as the utility of having a surge capacity that can be mobilized, transported, and made operational within set timelines. The second part of this initiative is to implement the concept through two pilot projects.

Recovery

FEMA's Recovery Division leads and coordinates the timely delivery of Federal disaster assistance to individuals and communities.

In fiscal year 2005, the Recovery Division will continue to provide assistance to individuals for temporary housing, damaged personal property, crisis counseling, disaster unemployment, and disaster legal services. FEMA responded to over 2.5 million calls last year, from people seeking to register for disaster assistance and to have their questions answered. The Recovery Division processed more than half a million individual disaster applications.

The Individual Assistance Programs that meet victims' most basic needs provide assistance for housing, personal property losses, and medical and funeral expenses. In each disaster we ask our customers, the disaster victims, what they think of the service we provided to them. I am pleased to tell you that we consistently earn very high marks from our customers when they are surveyed. In fiscal year 2005 we will continue to invest in technology that ensures we continue to meet our customers' expectations.

FEMA's Public Assistance Program, which accounts for the bulk of recovery expenditures out of the Disaster Relief Fund, is the primary means for community recovery. State and local governments and certain non-profit organizations can be reimbursed to repair facilities to their pre-disaster condition, as well as for costs associated with debris removal and emergency protective measures. FEMA is focusing on redesigning the Public Assistance Program to be more efficient and better prepared to meet the needs of a catastrophic or terrorist event by moving toward a web-based, user friendly, estimated based program, communities will be able to recover faster. In order to better prepare for the transition to a redesigned program, FEMA is establishing a methodology for estimating the total cost of large projects versus determining final costs after work is complete. Implementing the Public Assistance Program using cost estimates will allow State and local governments to better budget for recovery, improve our estimates of disaster expenditures, and reduce administrative costs and closeout timelines. In addition, we are working on proposed revisions to the Public Assistance Insurance Rule, which was last revised in 1991. The Stafford Act requires applicants for Public Assistance grants to "obtain and maintain" insurance on a damaged facility as a condition of receiving assistance. In the past, there have been concerns about this rule imposing a pre-disaster insurance requirement for all hazards. The proposed rule will not require insurance before disaster strikes, except for flood insurance in identified flood hazard areas, as required by the Stafford Act. The purpose of the rule is to simply clarify issues not adequately addressed in the current rule, such as eligible deductibles.

The Fire Management Assistance Grant Program is another key resource for States and local governments to mitigate, manage, and control forest or grassland fires to prevent damages that may otherwise result in a major disaster declaration.

I assure you that President Bush appreciates the importance of Recovery. I had the honor of joining the President in touring Missouri last spring after the devastating tornadoes struck Pierce City. Even though it was pouring rain during our visit, the President got out of his car to go over and talk to a couple who were standing in front of their damaged store front. They also had damages to their home. Using FEMA's temporary housing, immediate needs assistance, their insurance, and SBA home and business loans, this couple is recovering.

The massive California Wildfires of 2003 scorched over 750,000 acres and claimed 24 lives. During the response to the wildfires, the President and Secretary Ridge wanted me to be intimately involved in the coordination efforts between the Federal agencies doing work there. Through the formation of a pair of interagency bodies, the Washington-based California Fires Coordination Group and the field-level Multi-Agency Support Group, FEMA's Recovery Division was instrumental in assuring

that each of our Federal partners was coming to the table with comprehensive plans that were complementary to each other, that minimized the sort of bureaucratic “stove piping” that results in duplication of efforts, and that continued to focus on the needs identified by the State and local communities as priorities. Our shared success is the natural result of FEMA’s commitment to “all-hazards” emergency management, and a focus on a scaled approach to meet the challenges of any kind of incident, from the floods, fires, and storms that happen all too often, to the catastrophic scenarios that we prepare for, but hope will never come to pass.

We take our mission to help communities and citizens recover very seriously. My goal is to continue to do the work we do now better and faster, and to build on our current recovery capabilities to be better prepared to face a catastrophic natural or terrorist event.

National Security

In fiscal year 2005, FEMA’s Office of National Security Coordination will continue to carry out its mandated mission to provide Executive Agent leadership to ensure continuity of national operations in response to all-hazard emergencies in order to guarantee the survival of an enduring constitutional government. Funding in fiscal year 2005 will be used to ensure that all Federal Executive Branch departments and agencies attain and maintain a fully operational Continuity of Operations (COOP) capability. FEMA will provide assistance to Federal departments and agencies to help them attain and maintain fully operational contingency capabilities. FEMA will develop and implement a test, training, and exercise program that culminates in a complete exercise of the Continuity of Government (COG) program. In addition, we will provide technical support and guidance to our interagency, regional, State and local stakeholders across the Nation.

Conclusion

During the last year, FEMA has been busy but we continue to carry out our mission to prepare for, mitigate against, respond to, and recover from disasters and emergencies caused by all-hazards. The key to our continued improvement will be to take the lessons learned from previous disasters and incorporate them into our preparedness, planning, and procedures, so that we do an even better job of responding next time. We evaluate the lessons learned from each disaster and make plans to incorporate the new approaches and remedy problems. Hurricane Isabel provided such an opportunity, and it validated our priority to reduce disaster response times and improve our capability to gather information and effectively and efficiently manage the Federal Government’s response to Presidentially-declared disasters.

Successful implementation of the new initiatives and the on-going activities I have discussed today will improve our national system of mitigating against, preparing for, responding to, recovering from disasters and emergencies caused by all hazards.

In closing, I want to thank the Members of the Subcommittee for their past support of FEMA and I appreciate the opportunity to testify before you today. I would now be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

STRATEGIC NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Senator COCHRAN. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Some of the questions that we have relate to the proposals to make transfers of authority and responsibility within the executive branch, some from the new Department of Homeland Security to the Department of Health and Human Services. I observed in Senator Byrd’s statement concerns about that, and I was going to ask about that as well.

One of the transfers that I notice includes a transfer of the Strategic National Stockpile to the Department of Health and Human Services. Why is this a priority of the administration? Do you think that would be an appropriate thing to do and would enable us to do a better job of defending against attacks or terrorist attacks in this area?

Mr. BROWN. Senator, the beauty of transferring the stockpile back to HHS is that it truly aligns the budget requirements and the operations requirements in one Department. The important

thing to note is that FEMA does not lose its ability to deploy the stockpile in times of emergency. Under the national response plan, we will still be able to deploy the stockpile and utilize it as necessary to aid victims. So, what we have done is actually realign operations and budget within one Department.

DISASTER RELIEF FUND

Senator COCHRAN. There is also a question about whether some of the funding requests are sufficient to enable you to carry out your mission and to fulfill your responsibilities under the law. In particular, we notice that in the President's budget for disaster relief there is a request for \$2.1 billion, but also included is a transfer of \$7 million to preparedness, mitigation, response, and recovery for the urban search and rescue teams.

Is this an indication that you really need more money for disaster relief than is reflected in the budget request?

Mr. BROWN. No, Senator, it is not. In fact, I would say in response to Senator Byrd's comments earlier about last year's episode with the disaster relief fund, that President Bush absolutely recognizes the importance of the DRF being fully funded, and in this case by requesting \$2.15 billion, we are going to be able to do that.

I will tell you that we learned some lessons in FEMA last year because of that experience with the DRF. I am very pleased to say that our cash management systems have gotten much better. Our recoveries have gotten much better, and so this \$2.15 billion, combined with the carryover we are going to have from good cash management, and from the recoveries that we are going to make in the current DRF funding, will be fully funded in the DRF this year. I think that is a reflection of the President's understanding that this pool of money needs to be available so that FEMA can do its job without worrying if there is enough money or putting some programs on hold. It is a recognition of the importance of that fund.

Senator COCHRAN. Well, I am impressed with the job that the Department has done in such a short period of time, reorganizing itself under the new Department's management structure, but including some agencies like FEMA, which is I suppose one of the principal responsibilities of this directorate which you chair, and to do so in a way that did not diminish in any respect the capacity of the Government to respond to natural disasters and the traditional role that FEMA has played. So, I congratulate you on the management function that you are providing and the responsibilities that you are carrying out in that regard.

We are going to work hard to be sure that we appropriate the money that you need and that our communities need when they are confronted with natural disasters. In my part of the country, we have been besieged with hurricanes, floods, tornadoes, and many other natural disasters, and FEMA has been right there and has helped lead the way, working with local officials and volunteers who come to respond to those situations. We know how important your work is and we appreciate the fact that you are dedicating yourself to help run this agency so people who do need help in these situations get it.

Mr. BROWN. Senator, I very much appreciate those comments.

FIRE GRANT PROGRAM

Senator COCHRAN. Senator Byrd.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Under Secretary, in my opening statement, I had a question which I said was rhetorical for that purpose. Where do these policies leave a small town fire department, let's say in Sophia, West Virginia, that needs to purchase breathing apparatus or needs equipment to deal with a chemical spill? Let us say we are talking about a town in Kanawha County on the river near the great complex of chemical industries that have been located there and have served the country so well through the years. Where does the policy leave a small town fire department that needs to purchase breathing apparatus or equipment to deal with a chemical spill?

Mr. BROWN. Senator, I would tell you that I think the fire grant program is one of the best programs in the Federal Government. It is incredibly efficient, organized, and directly affects and helps needs like those you are identifying. In addition to that, it has a peer review process that will take fire departments from West Virginia, Mississippi, Washington, or wherever they are from, and the peers themselves, the fire departments, look at where the need is the greatest and give us advice about where those dollars should go.

I will tell you that the President's request this year for \$500 million in fire grants is the same amount that the President requested last year. He recognizes the importance of first responders. He also recognizes the importance of this program.

We are doing absolutely everything to ensure that the fire grant program is not deteriorated in any way by its movement to ODP. We are providing detailees. We are providing programmatic support. We are doing everything to make sure that program stays intact. Congress recognized that last year and said, as this transfer takes place, the U.S. Fire Administration should remain a vital part of the grant program, and indeed they are. FEMA is doing everything to support ODP to keep this program operating the exact same way it always has so that it does help fire departments like you describe.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Brown, if it is one of the best programs, a statement with which I agree, why is the President proposing to cut it by 33 percent?

Mr. BROWN. Well, the President's request is the exact same as he made last year, and Congress added an extra \$249 million to it last year. The President is reiterating his same request from last year.

Senator BYRD. But he is cutting the program by 33 percent. Why is he doing that?

Mr. BROWN. His request is the same request he made last year.

Senator BYRD. I understand that. You said that already. But on what basis? Why is he doing that?

Mr. BROWN. The President's overall request for first responders is actually an increase. There was \$8 billion last year for first responders, and that is increasing by about \$900 million this year. So, overall for first responders, there is actually an increase.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE GRANTS

Senator BYRD. Do I have time for one more question on this round?

Senator COCHRAN. Yes.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Secretary, first, you are proposing to cut emergency management performance grants by \$9 million. Second, you are proposing to target those reduced emergency management dollars to terrorism activities, in essence, mandating that States put terrorism projects at the top of their priority list or risk losing funding. Finally, you are proposing to hinder the States' flexibility by capping at 25 percent the amount of each grant that can be spent on salaries.

West Virginia spends more than half of its EMPG funds on salaries. I understand that nationwide State and local governments use over 50 percent of their grant funds for the salaries that pay for emergency planning professionals. In West Virginia, EMPG is an essential source of funds to help State emergency managers reduce the threat of floods, assist flood victims, and to prepare for potential chemical spills. The all-hazards approach to emergency management is a critical tool for State officials.

Earlier this week, I received a letter from Stephen Kappa, Kappa, the Director of the Office of Emergency Services in West Virginia. Perhaps you know him, do you?

Mr. BROWN. Yes sir, I do.

Senator BYRD. In his letter, Director Kappa concluded that the President's proposals for emergency management would have—and I quote here—"a devastating impact on emergency preparedness at the State and local levels." He, Mr. Kappa, concluded that—quote, again—"West Virginia and other States must balance our preparedness efforts to appropriately integrate terrorism, not to the detriment or exclusion of the existing national emergency response system that supports day-to-day public safety needs." That is the end of that excerpt from Mr. Kappa's letter to me.

Today if FEMA focuses too myopically on terrorist threats, it could jeopardize the all-hazards approach to emergency management that has been built up over the past 25 years, and we will be in danger of repeating past mistakes.

I am very disappointed with the President's emergency management proposal. Please explain, if you will, to a couple of Senators, who have been here quite some time from flood-prone States, such as West Virginia and Mississippi, why these proposals make sense.

Mr. BROWN. Senator, let me first state that I understand the concern that has been expressed by you and others about this change on the cap. I recognize that concern. In addition to that, the reason that FEMA has always been successful under James Lee Witt's leadership, under Joe Albaugh's leadership, has been that we have always understood that it is the ability of our State and local partners to do their job that helps make us successful. We must continue our relationships with the State and local agencies to understand what their capacities are, what their abilities are, what they have, and what they can and cannot do. One way that we will do that is through the EMPG. By changing the cap, it increases necessarily the amount of money that is now available for training and

exercises at the State and local government. The administration believes that personnel costs are truly a shared cost and the State and locals should share some of the costs of that personnel, with this change, we are increasing the amount of money that we can now use to exercise and train those personnel to make them even more robust in the future.

Senator BYRD. Is that the answer to my question?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. That is all on this round, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

Senator COCHRAN. Senator Murray.

CUTS TO EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE GRANTS

Senator MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much.

I want to follow up on the question that Senator Byrd asked because I am also hearing from everyone in my State they are deeply concerned about this cap and obviously the cuts to the EMPG program. It is really the backbone for many of our communities in responding to all types of hazards. Senator Byrd mentioned floods. Certainly earthquakes and all the other disasters that people have to prepare for are also included. They have added to this now, obviously, terrorism. I am very concerned because EMPG really is the lifeblood for many of the emergency programs in my State and across the country.

A good example is Kitsap County. It has several military bases, a population of about 240,000, and about one-fifth of the emergency management budget comes from EMPG funding. That county uses its funding to support their office operations and to provide public education to help prepare the cities and residents in that county for all types of hazards. But not every community in my State is like that, and for those communities, EMPG funding is not some kind of enhancement. It is actually not unusual to see almost 80 percent of the Federal EMPG allocation used to hire dedicated emergency management professionals, which is really important.

So, when we see these recommended limitations, many of the communities in my State and probably across the country tell us they are going to have to terminate their emergency management program. That would place our entire emergency management response system in jeopardy. So, I share Senator Byrd's concern and I think we need to understand that the cap in particular will dramatically impact many of our counties to where they are not doing this, and that is, I do not think, the direction your agency wants to go.

So, if you want to respond, I am happy to listen.

Mr. BROWN. In response, Senator, I would just say again that I understand those concerns greatly. I want to emphasize that we believe that a robust State and local system is necessary for FEMA to be able to succeed because, remember, FEMA only steps in when it is beyond the capabilities of State and local governments to respond to a disaster, whether it is natural or manmade. With the change in this cap, we will now use those additional resources to train the people at the State and local level to exercise them more at the State and local level than we have in the past.

Senator MURRAY. But if there is nobody there to train, we are going to be——

Mr. BROWN. We would ask the States to see if they cannot find money to keep those people in place, because I do not want to lose those people either. I want to keep them there and train them and exercise them.

Senator MURRAY. Well, remember, our States and our local communities are suffering from a very difficult budget crisis right now.

Mr. BROWN. I understand.

Senator MURRAY. And if we just count on them coming up with the money, they are going to turn to us and talk about Federal mandates and complain to us, and it will be back on our shoulders when there is a response that cannot be taken care of.

Mr. BROWN. I understand that, Senator.

Senator MURRAY. So, Senator Byrd, I want to work with you on that concern because I share it.

Senator BYRD. Thank you. You have heard the company line.

PUTTING THE STRATEGIC NATIONAL STOCKPILE BACK UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Senator MURRAY. The chairman mentioned the issue of the Strategic National Stockpile being put back under the Department of Health and Human Services. I think it is a positive change. I think it will help streamline the Federal decision-making in time of a crisis, but I am concerned that with this change, the Department of Homeland Security will no longer be connected to the public health community and our Nation's doctors and nurses are our first responders, particularly in time of a biological attack. They are the ones we need to sound the alarm, and we need to make sure that the immunologists and the virologists and the State public health officials are part of that coordinated effort to manage and respond to a crisis if it involves bioterrorism. So, I am concerned about that and want to know from you how we are going to engage our public health professionals and keep them part of this loop.

Mr. BROWN. Oh, absolutely. In fact, I hope I can alleviate those concerns because, while the stockpile does transfer back to HHS, it is only the budget and operations. We would still deploy the stockpile. We would still handle the logistics of the stockpile.

NATIONAL DISASTER MEDICAL SYSTEM

In addition to that, we still have the National Disaster Medical System within FEMA, which we are looking at and assessing. I think we have a very good relationship with NDMS. I think they are very proud to be a part of FEMA now. We are really trying to invigorate that system to make it part of the first responder community. So I think those concerns that you have, while they are certainly legitimate concerns, we are addressing those. I think we are on the right track to incorporate NDMS fully into our response system.

Senator MURRAY. Well, thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I do have a few other questions, but I know we have a vote in a few minutes. I would like to submit them, if I can, in particular involving Hammer Training Facility and our ability to

train some of our local responders that I would like to get a response back from you.

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Senator COCHRAN. Thank you.

BIOSHIELD

Mr. Secretary, let me ask you about the budget request as it relates to the BioShield initiative. The request asks for a substantial increase in funding from \$885 million for this fiscal year to the level of \$2.5 billion for fiscal year 2005. What is the justification for that substantial increase?

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman, that will fully fund the BioShield program, as the President announced in the State of the Union a couple of years ago. That will enable us to create, as I said last year, this venture capital fund, if you want to call it that, so that we are ready to create a market for any kind of antibiotics or other medicines that we need to respond to a bioterror threat. There currently is no way to encourage the pharmaceutical companies or the drug companies to venture into these areas and create things for which there is no market other than the fact that we have intelligence that may tell us that there is a specific threat, a specific pathogen that terrorists are trying to use. This will enable us to create that market and produce those antibodies for that particular kind of attack.

Senator COCHRAN. There is a failure by the Congress to pass legislation that authorizes the BioShield program. Does this lack of legal authority impair in any way the administration's efforts to help protect our national security from a threat that this program seeks to address?

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman, we are going to use the excellent language that you put in the appropriations, and use that as authorization to move forward, because we think our mandate from you and from the Congress is to use this money, and to use it for these kinds of threats. So that is what we will do.

Senator COCHRAN. To what extent are your funds going to be expended in this year and for what specific purposes?

Mr. BROWN. We currently are looking at some additional anthrax vaccines and some additional kinds of antibiotics that we need to develop.

Senator COCHRAN. The President's budget proposes in this area to make some transfers, transfer the Strategic National Stockpile from Homeland Security to the Department of Health and Human Services. But it does not suggest that BioShield should be transferred. Why is it more appropriate for the stockpile to be managed by HHS and BioShield to be managed by the Department of Homeland Security?

Mr. BROWN. Primarily because in BioShield, the resources that will be used in it are going to be based upon the threats that the Department of Homeland Security, the Central Intelligence Agency, and others develop through their intel gathering processes. So, as we understand and determine what those threats are, that BioShield money will be there for us to use to respond to those specific threats. Now, we will still work with the CDC, with HHS, and others in the development of those drugs and pharmaceuticals, but be-

cause we have the threat information, we believe that program should remain within DHS.

Senator COCHRAN. To your knowledge, is there an assessment being done by the administration on our vulnerabilities to biological attacks, and if so, who is doing the assessments?

Mr. BROWN. There is an assessment that is being carried forth, primarily by the Department of Homeland Security. Since September 11th, everything has changed in the Federal Government. And when I say that DHS is leading it, you can rest assured that we do not do anything without incorporating all of our Federal partners. We talk to HHS. We talk to CDC. We talk to anyone who may be involved to make sure that we get the right kind of information and that we get the right kind of response.

Senator COCHRAN. I assume that your directorate has had some involvement in the recent events that have been in the news and with those that we are also familiar with here in Congress, the ricin incident here in this building, and the anthrax events of the recent past. To what extent is the Department actively involved in these episodes? What do you do? What did you do in connection with those events?

Mr. BROWN. Everything from information-sharing among the Departments to the Capitol Police. We were in constant contact with them, for example, during the State of the Union or any other national security special event such as that. We deploy the National Disaster Medical System. You probably did not have a chance to see it during the State of the Union, but we had incredible teams all around these buildings, all within the Capitol, ready to respond to any type of event. So with FEMA and the Department of Homeland Security still being seen as the first responder on behalf of the Federal Government, we have an intimate involvement in all of those activities.

Senator COCHRAN. Thank you very much for your efforts to protect our security.

Mr. BROWN. Thank you, Senator.

Senator COCHRAN. Senator Byrd.

Senator BYRD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, one of the best with whom I have ever served. I am talking about you.

Senator COCHRAN. I understand. You are embarrassing me.

PRE-DISASTER MITIGATION

Senator BYRD. Mr. Secretary, in fiscal years 2003 and 2004, Congress appropriated \$150 million for a new pre-disaster mitigation fund. \$150 million was a compromise with the Administration which proposed to spend \$300 million on pre-disaster mitigation and to eliminate any funds for post-disaster mitigation.

This year, the administration requests \$150 million for pre-disaster mitigation, and requests that 7.5 percent of the amount a State receives for a disaster from FEMA be provided for post-disaster mitigation.

I am pleased that the Administration recognizes the importance of post-disaster mitigation. In West Virginia, the \$5.6 million received from this program will be used to acquire and demolish repetitive lost properties in the flood plain and relocate residents. To date, none of the non-planning pre-disaster funds from either 2003

or 2004 have been made available to States. West Virginia wants to spend the money on moving people out of the flood plain before another disaster strikes. It is unacceptable that this money is stuck at FEMA.

When can States expect to have pre-disaster mitigation funds in hand?

Mr. BROWN. Senator, we have received well over 400 applications for that money. 140 grants have been awarded for planning and for specific mitigation projects. To date, \$49 million has been obligated. \$15 million of that was for planning and \$34 million for actual projects. \$70 million will go out on a rolling basis before the end of the calendar year. So, we have received those 400 applications, and we have already obligated 49. We have also awarded 140 grants. That money will start going out the door. I want to get those people out of those repetitive places just as badly as you do, sir.

Senator BYRD. I am not so sure about that. Be careful what you say.

Mr. BROWN. Sir, we will get those funds out. It is a process of requesting 400 applications, getting the planning for those applications done, and the grant money out for those planning grants. And we will continue to get those monies out on a rolling basis.

Senator BYRD. The 2003 money was appropriated 12 months ago. I simply do not understand why it has taken so long to get the money out the door.

Until fiscal year 2003, States received an additional 15 percent in disaster relief funds for post-disaster mitigation projects. Earlier this week, I received a letter from a host of emergency management groups, including the International Association of Emergency Managers, the American Public Works Association, and the Association of State Flood Plain Managers, urging Congress to restore the hazard mitigation grant program formula to 15 percent from its current level of 7.5 percent.

What is your opinion of this proposal?

Mr. BROWN. Senator, I am for anything that we can do to mitigate disasters, pre-disaster or post-disaster. To the extent that we can get money out the door to help folks, we are going to do that.

Senator BYRD. What is your opinion of this proposal?

Mr. BROWN. We will certainly take it under consideration and look at it, Senator.

Senator BYRD. You are going to take it into consideration and look at it?

Mr. BROWN. We certainly will.

Senator BYRD. Well, I am going to call you in a few days and see how long you have been looking at it. Okay?

Mr. BROWN. Excellent.

PROPOSED CUTS TO FIRE GRANTS FUNDING

Senator BYRD. I have just one more question, Mr. Chairman, and I may have others for the record.

In December 2002, FEMA issued a report entitled, "A Needs Assessment of the U.S. Fire Service". That report found that half of all fire engines being used by our fire departments were over 15 years old. It found that 57,000 fire fighters lacked personal protec-

tive equipment, and that 41 percent of fire department personnel involved in wildland fire fighting lacked formal training in those duties.

Last year you could not approve over \$1.7 billion of applications because of a lack of funds.

Given the serious deficiencies in basic fire fighting equipment and skills that you found, do you think that the administration's proposal to cut fire grant funding by 33 percent and to focus fire grants on terrorism-related activities will undermine the ability of our local fire fighters to respond to emergencies in their communities?

Mr. BROWN. No, sir, it will not because we will continue to make certain that under the fire grant program whatever monies we have available go to the highest critical needs, so that we start solving the worst needs that we have in the country first. We will keep the program in place that way and make certain that the money goes where it should go.

Senator BYRD. Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

NATIONAL INCIDENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Senator COCHRAN. Thank you, Senator Byrd, very much for your assistance with the work of this committee. I appreciate it.

Mr. Secretary, the budget request includes an increase of \$7 million for a national incident management system to support the President's national strategy for homeland security. This incident management system is proposed to be a single coordinating system to bring together the Federal, State, and local governments, tribal Nations, and citizens during emergencies, disasters, or other catastrophic incidents.

How will the national incident management system differ from other systems that are designed to deal with all-hazard events within the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the Emergency Preparedness and Response Directorate?

Mr. BROWN. Senator, one of the problems we have now is that while we have a fairly good, unified command system around the country—first responders generally understand unified command and command and control systems—what we lack is a unified national incident management system with a common language by which we can all exercise and train to that common language. This \$7 million will enable us to do that. So, when we bring in teams from anywhere in the country or mutual aid teams are helping other teams, they will walk into that situation with a common language, a common training. They will have exercised under a common system so that everyone will be on the same page, so to speak, when they are responding to any kind of disaster.

ADDITIONAL COMMITTEE QUESTIONS

Senator COCHRAN. Mr. Secretary, we appreciate very much your cooperation with our committee, your making available your statement to us, and the opportunity to visit with you to talk about the budget request in advance of the hearing.

Senators may submit written questions, as you know. We hope that you will be able to respond to them within a reasonable time.

[The following questions were not asked at the hearing, but were submitted to the Department for response subsequent to the hearing:]

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR THAD COCHRAN

BIOSHIELD

Question. Without Congressional approval of BioShield, who has the authority to sign contracts related to the obligation of BioShield funds?

Answer. The fiscal year 2004 Homeland Security Appropriations Act provided \$890 million to be spent for development of biodefense countermeasures for the current fiscal year. The Department of Homeland Security (DHS), the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), the Homeland Security Council, and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) recognize the importance of expeditious progress in developing much-needed countermeasures while following Congressional intent. In that vein, DHS and HHS have sought to ensure that the development of the interagency agreement for next-generation anthrax vaccine is in line with the proposed BioShield legislation. Until such time as the BioShield Act is passed, a FEMA contracting officer has the authority to sign interagency agreements with HHS, which, in turn, will execute contracts with manufacturers.

ANTHRAX VACCINE

Question. Is the procurement of an anthrax vaccine conducted through the Strategic National Stockpile or BioShield? Is this the responsibility of the Department of Homeland Security or the Department of Health and Human Services?

Answer. Anthrax vaccine (recombinant Protective Antigen, or rPA) procurement will be funded by the Biodefense Countermeasures appropriation included in the fiscal year 2004 DHS appropriation, but will be acquired for exclusive placement in the Strategic National Stockpile (SNS). The SNS discretionary appropriation is used to purchase items for which there is a significant commercial market. The BioShield program was specifically constructed to spur development of countermeasures for which no commercial market existed, as is the case with rPA, for inclusion in the Stockpile.

DHS is responsible for assessing current and emerging threats against the United States. The Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) Medical Countermeasures subcommittee, an interagency group co-chaired by DHS, HHS, and the Department of Defense, has developed countermeasures information of interest to officials who will make the BioShield procurement decisions. The WMD subcommittee commissioned an end-to-end analysis of medical countermeasures to Category "A" biological agents (anthrax, smallpox, plague, botulinum toxin, tularemia, Ebola and other hemorrhagic fever viruses). Working groups developed initial requirements for four high-priority bioweapon (BW) countermeasures for which there is high need and a reasonable expectation that products will be available in the near term, with rPA development topping the list.

The DHS Secretary enters into an interagency agreement with the HHS Secretary, whose department is responsible for providing medical, scientific, acquisition, technical, and procurement expertise, and is to establish technical requirements, identify suppliers, negotiate and evaluate proposals, enter into contracts, assess contractor performance, and perform administrative services. HHS also must ensure all the necessary steps have been taken for the licensing of the finished product.

Additionally, DHS is in the process of finalizing an interagency agreement with the Army for the acquisition of Anthrax Vaccine Adsorbed (AVA). This agreement will be funded from the Public Health Programs (SNS) appropriations account.

Question. When will the Department of Homeland Security or the Department of Health and Human Services procure the doses for which it has identified a requirement? What is that requirement? How many doses over what period of time will be necessary to meet it?

Answer. DHS and HHS are now finalizing an interagency agreement to purchase recombinant Protective Antigen (rPA) vaccine to protect 25 million persons. The government will consider later purchase of additional anthrax vaccine contingent on new vaccination delivery system technology and other cost-saving factors such as reduced dose requirements. A three-dose schedule is currently being evaluated, which would require a total purchase of 75 million doses. This initial agreement for fiscal year 2004 is for \$134 million. Projections for obtaining the entire 75 million-dose requirement cover 5 years. Additionally, DHS is now finalizing an interagency agreement with the Department of the Army for up to 5 million doses of AVA.

Question. Are we filling at least part of that requirement with an FDA-approved product currently available?

Answer. The Stockpile currently maintains a small amount of the only FDA-licensed pre-exposure vaccine against anthrax (Anthrax Vaccine Adsorbed, or AVA). Currently, it has limited production capacity, and rectifying that problem would be very expensive and take several years to accomplish. AVA is not currently licensed for children or for the elderly. However, in order to ensure that some type of anthrax vaccine is available until the development and procurement of rPA, DHS and HHS have signed an interagency agreement for the purchase of AVA through the Department of the Army. This agreement will provide approximately 2 million doses in fiscal year 2004, 1.5 million doses in fiscal year 2005, and 1.5 million doses in fiscal year 2006.

STRATEGIC NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Question. The proposal to transfer the Strategic National Stockpile from the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) back to the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) in fiscal year 2005 requires legislative action by the authorizing committee. Has such legislation been submitted by DHS, and if so, what action has been taken by the authorizing committee?

Answer. Language to effectuate the transfer of SNS from DHS to HHS has been added to S. 15, the Project Bioshield Act of 2003.

Question. How has the fiscal year 2004 transfer from HHS to DHS, and the proposed fiscal year 2005 transfer from DHS to HHS, affected the daily operations, personnel, and activities of the program? Have we crippled the program in any way by continuing to shuffle it between departments? How are decisions being made at this time in regard to the Stockpile?

Answer. The daily operations of the Stockpile have not been affected in any significant manner. Personnel and normal operations are nearly unchanged since the transfer from HHS to DHS and decisions are being made much as they always have been made at the Stockpile. The motivation to return the program to HHS is due to the desire to create a single command structure for the program, and to streamline operations once again. HHS will, however, have the obligation to deploy the stockpile when so requested by the Secretary of DHS. As such, the potential response needs of the DHS mission will not be compromised in any manner.

METROPOLITAN MEDICAL RESPONSE SYSTEM

Question. What is the direct impact of the elimination of funding within Emergency Preparedness and Response in fiscal year 2005 for the Metropolitan Medical Response System?

Answer. The funds that Congress has appropriated for the Metropolitan Medical Response System (MMRS) over the last several years have been used to establish certain capabilities, to get the program up to its baseline, and to facilitate transfer of the program to the localities for continuation, once the baseline is established. We will reach the baseline this fiscal year (2004), and therefore no additional funding is being requested.

Secretary Ridge has proposed a reorganization (a letter was sent to Members of Congress on January 26, 2004), wherein the MMRS program for fiscal year 2004 will be transferred to a newly established Office of State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness. Under this arrangement, FEMA would have no further role in the MMRS program for fiscal year 2004, and there will be no Federal program in fiscal year 2005.

We cannot precisely estimate the number of local jurisdictions that would continue the MMRS program without Federal resources support. We are fairly certain that a large number of them, as an element of prudent preparedness and operational necessity, will attempt to maintain MMRS-type mass casualty integrated response preparedness and seek to use Federal funds from other programs to support eligible portions of MMRS-type capabilities.

Question. Are the program activities of the Metropolitan Medical Response System being met within any other areas of the President's budget?

Answer. There are other Federal programs, which provide more narrowly focused, but related, support. These include the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention-Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) Bioterrorism Preparedness Grants and the HRSA Hospital Grants; the Office for Domestic Preparedness (ODP) Training and Exercise Programs and Equipment Grants; and ODP Urban Area Security Initiative funding to the designated States, which will then work with counties and cities to form regions that will work together through mutual aid agree-

ments, interoperable communications, statewide intelligence centers, and community and citizen participation.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE GRANTS

Question. What will happen to the all-hazards preparedness, mitigation, response, and recovery activities of the Emergency Management Performance Grants if the primary focus for all grant programs within the Office for Domestic Preparedness is required to be homeland security activities?

Answer. Effective State and local all-hazards planning capabilities are critical to the success of FEMA in responding to disasters, but at this time, the Administration feels strongly that resources be focused toward building local governments' homeland security capabilities.

Question. If a 25 percent cap is placed on the amount of grant funding allowed for personnel costs, many county and local emergency management offices may have to close due to the funding shortfall. The emergency management offices are critical to the preparation of the local community prior to disasters, which is the key to ensuring survival of its citizens during a disaster. The 25 percent cap on personnel costs could result in as much as a 60 percent decrease in emergency management staff nation-wide. If this happens, how will it affect FEMA's ability to operate in the field during a disaster? Would the direct costs to FEMA increase if more FEMA personnel were required to travel to the disaster site for assistance due to lack of local emergency management personnel?

Answer. Currently, Emergency Management Performance Grants funds are disproportionately used to pay salaries, which is predominately a State/local responsibility. The cap on personnel costs is intended to ensure that the State and local governments assume more responsibility for their personnel costs. This would allow a greater percentage of grant funds to be utilized by State and local governments for training and exercises, further enhancing readiness capabilities.

PREPAREDNESS, MITIGATION, RESPONSE, AND RECOVERY

Questions. For fiscal year 2004, the Emergency Preparedness and Response Directorate proposed to establish one pilot Incident Management Team to develop the base structures and procedures for the four Incident Management Teams requested in the fiscal year 2005 budget.

Where will the one pilot Incident Management Team be located?

What criteria were used to determine this location?

Where are you in the process of establishing this pilot team?

What is the time-frame for having the pilot team fully operational?

Answer. The Pilot Incident Management Team (IMT) will be collocated with the Coast Guard facility in Elizabeth City, North Carolina. This location was chosen for the Pilot IMT primarily due to the efficiencies that can be achieved through use of existing Coast Guard facilities, air transportation, and available space. Our goal in fiscal year 2005 is for IMTs to be fully activated within 15 hours of initial disaster notification and to have an average IMT response time for arrival at a disaster site within 22 hours. Our current average response time for all existing response teams is 72 hours for arrival on scene; the response time for the IMTs will help to reduce this overall average to 60 hours by fiscal year 2005. Geographic proximity and transportation support will be crucial to achievement of this goal.

Also, this geographic location is ideal for its close proximity to high-risk areas in the eastern United States. The Pilot IMT is our development phase of this initiative and the timing for its inclusion into our response system coincides perfectly with the onset of the 2004 hurricane season. This location will also afford us the possibility of real-time disaster scenarios in which the IMT can be utilized, exercised, and evaluated for future development of other teams in fiscal year 2005.

We are currently engaged in the acquisition of support equipment and recruitment of personnel, and we plan to have the Pilot IMT at an operational status by September 2004. The development and validation of procedures and operational doctrine will be complete by that time as well. Operational status will be constantly augmented and improved as we continue to exercise the teams and to enhance our procedures and doctrine through remedial actions.

In the future, the IMTs will be referred to as Federal Initial Response Support Teams (FIRST), a name which differentiates them from existing response teams and which follows incident management protocols more closely. This name change is proposed in the draft National Response Plan (NRP) and will be made official when the NRP is finalized.

Questions. The fiscal year 2005 budget requests an increase of \$6.2 million for four Incident Management Teams to act as the core, field-level response teams for

major disasters, emergencies, and acts of terrorism. It is my understanding that this funding will be used to secure half of the personnel needed, secure two locations for housing and deployment of teams, complete studies regarding transportation needs, and develop plans for full implementation of four teams in fiscal year 2006.

Will the \$6.2 million support two Incident Management Teams or four? If \$6.2 million only supports two fully functional teams, will another \$6.2 million be needed in fiscal year 2006 for the other two teams? If not, then what is the anticipated need to complete this initiative?

How will the locations for the Incident Management Teams be chosen?

Do you anticipate expanding beyond four teams after fiscal year 2006?

What is the projected annual funding needed to maintain these teams once they are in place and fully operational?

Answer. At the time the budget was developed, the plan was for two full teams staffed by 10 full-time equivalent (FTE) positions. Current plans are to use the funding requested in the fiscal year 2005 budget to establish four teams with 5 FTEs to provide better coverage across the country. The Pilot Team will be established in fiscal year 2004 and three additional teams will be established in fiscal year 2005. We have chosen locations for the teams that take advantage of existing DHS transportation and support assets without requiring a large team structure. Much of the work for site selection is being done in fiscal year 2004 to be ready for establishment of the teams. Establishment of the teams, however, is not an end stage for readiness.

Locations for the IMTs are being identified based on geographic location as well as collocation with existing Coast Guard assets that will be utilized to support the IMTs in their operations. Elizabeth City, North Carolina, and Sacramento, California, have been chosen as potential sites on the East and West coasts of the United States. This will allow the IMTs to have a quick response across the country, including Alaska and Hawaii, through ground and/or air transportation provided through support from the Coast Guard.

Our goal in fiscal year 2005 is for IMTs to be fully activated within 15 hours of initial disaster notification and to have an average IMT response time for arrival at a disaster site within 22 hours. Our current average response time for all existing response teams is 72 hours for arrival on scene; the response time for the IMTs will help to reduce this overall average to 60 hours by fiscal year 2005. Geographic proximity and transportation support will be crucial to achievement of this goal.

At this point, we are concentrating on the establishment of the four teams planned for fiscal year 2005. It would not be fiscally responsible for us to plan for additional teams until we have thoroughly tested our capability with the four teams. We plan to conduct a thorough review of each team through exercises, credentialing, and after-action remediation before we make a determination on needs for future development. In order to provide support to the IMTs, we are also developing augmentation plans that will seamlessly link our regions and existing team structure to the IMTs.

We anticipate that the \$6.2 million budget will be programmed in outyears to provide maintenance of caches and equipment, exercise support, training, further development, and planning support for the IMTs.

In the future, the IMTs will be referred to as Federal Initial Response Support Teams (FIRST), a name which differentiates them from existing response teams and which follows incident management protocols more closely. This name change is proposed in the draft National Response Plan (NRP) and will be made official when the NRP is finalized.

Questions. The President's budget request includes a \$1.8 million increase for the Mobile Emergency Response System to develop a temporary workforce to assist in the daily operations, deployments and necessary training and exercise programs to ensure that all response teams can provide a 24-hour response time to communities impacted by disasters, emergencies, terrorist events, or weapons of mass destruction incidents.

How is this workforce trained, maintained, and called into action when needed? In general, how will the temporary workforce operate?

How many workers make up the temporary workforce?

What is the projected annual funding requirement to maintain the Mobile Emergency Response System?

Answer. Every effort will be made to hire experienced personnel who are already trained, qualified, and experienced in the desired general skill areas. Once hired, they will be paired with permanent full-time employees for on-the-job-training on specific systems. Their skills will be maintained and kept current in the same manner by which the permanent full-time employees' skills are kept current. As new systems are introduced and current systems are upgraded, they will be provided a

combination of contractor and in-house instruction. They will also be provided training literature and manuals as well as opportunities for continuing on-the-job-training. They will be called into action by using FEMA's Automatic Deployment Database. FEMA developed this system several years ago to rapidly activate and deploy its temporary workforce known as Disaster Assistance Employees, who provide most of the staffing at Disaster Field Offices.

The Mobile Emergency Response System (MERS) temporary workforce will be called into action as training, daily operations, and deployment needs develop. In general, the temporary workforce will be used to reinforce and extend the capabilities of the MERS. When training opportunities occur, they will be activated for the period of the training. When deployments occur, they will be utilized in several important ways. They will report to the home bases to replace deployed permanent full-time employees to sustain ongoing daily operations. They will also deploy with full-time employees to increase and extend the scope of field operations and will deploy in the place of unavailable full-time employees.

The initial goal is to have 50 MERS temporary employees. Although all the temporary employees will be available to assist any of the 5 (MERS) Detachments, the initial goal will provide 10 temporary employees per unit. The final goal is to have 100 MERS temporary employees. This would equate to 20 temporary employees per unit.

Once all hiring activities are completed, the projected annual funding to maintain a 100-person MERS temporary workforce is approximately \$3.2 million.

Questions. An increase of \$5 million is requested to develop one fixed and one mobile module to demonstrate medical surge capacity. An additional \$15 million is requested to develop two pilot projects to evaluate one fixed and one mobile medical surge facility.

How will the locations for the pilot projects be determined?

What follow-on appropriations will be required to support this project?

What is the anticipated timeframe for expanding this project nation-wide?

Answer. Department staff will develop standardized evaluation criteria that will be used to assess potential locations for the pilot projects. It is currently anticipated that a significant number of factors will be incorporated in the evaluation criteria, including: overall population of the jurisdiction; population density in and around the location; hazards and risks prevalent in the location (including natural, technological, and terrorist incidents); existing hospital capacity; strength and organization of existing medical response and public health systems; existing State or local plans for surge capacity; availability of existing Federal and non-Federal facilities with adequate storage space, site access, and proximity to commercial ground and air transportation; proximity to sources of medical equipment and pharmaceutical suppliers; and proximity to FEMA regional offices.

FEMA continues to work with the Administration on the program details and budgetary requirements for future years.

It is anticipated that if the program is funded beginning in fiscal year 2005 without delay, procurement will begin for the two pilot units in fiscal year 2005.

URBAN SEARCH AND RESCUE

Question. Why has the administration requested only \$7 million to support the FEMA urban search and rescue program when the annual preparedness grants of \$150,000 that were previously generated under a \$7 million budget were insufficient to properly maintain and operate these task forces?

Answer. A funding level of \$7 million is requested for Urban Search and Rescue (US&R) for fiscal year 2005. The program will be funded in the Preparedness, Mitigation, Response and Recovery account, rather than from Disaster Relief, where it has historically been funded. Since 2001, FEMA has received more than \$100 million in both regular and supplemental appropriations to upgrade equipment for and to train the US&R teams to perform under a variety of scenarios, including those involving WMD.

Question. Since all 28 teams have been made Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) capable, what is the projected funding level for maintaining that WMD capability in fiscal year 2005?

Answer. The fiscal year 2005 President's Budget requests \$7 million for the US&R program.

Question. Although funding was provided in fiscal years 2003 and 2004 for the purchase of a second equipment cache, is it true that FEMA has not moved forward on this acquisition of equipment and materials for the 28 task forces? If so, why not? What happened to those funds?

Answer. The US&R program is committing funds for the 2nd Equipment Cache initiative. This includes \$22.4 million in fiscal year 2003 funds and \$27.3 million in fiscal year 2004 funds through an interagency agreement with the Defense Logistics Agency, and a subordinate acquisition contractor to assist the US&R program office staff and to allow for the bulk purchase of the myriad tools, supplies, and equipment that will be procured (a full cache has some 6,500 items). An ad hoc Tiger Team made up of US&R logistics specialists from selected US&R task forces has been convened to address the purchase, organization, cache packaging, and other necessary issues for developing the prototype standardized cache that will be duplicated and distributed to the 28 US&R task forces in the system. Initial meetings have already been conducted and subsequent meetings are scheduled.

Furthermore, we are finalizing the lease of necessary warehouse space to allow for the receipt of the ordered items; developing the organization, cache packaging scheme, and mobilization load plan of a standardized cache; and resolving other related issues. Due to the large size and complexity of a full US&R cache, the procurement and development is being addressed in a phased approach by cache function, such as rescue, communications, medical, logistics, etc. To expedite the process, each segment will be forwarded to all task forces as the segment is addressed. We anticipate the warehouse lease being finalized in mid-March. The overall initiative is in progress and on target with identified timelines. We anticipate the task forces will begin receiving initial cache shipments in the latter half of calendar year 2004. Fiscal year 2003 and fiscal year 2004 funding provides for the first- and second-year phases of the overall 3-year acquisition. Funding for the third phase from fiscal year 2005 is indeterminate.

Question. There seem to have been some delays in the progress of enhancement intended by Congress for the urban search and rescue program: a lack of progress in acquiring the second equipment cache for all 28 task forces; delay in the acquisition of ground transportation; development of additional training programs and task force evaluations have not been accomplished. What steps are being taken to rectify the delays and lack of progress?

Answer. The identified aspects of the US&R program are in process and on target. The US&R program is committing funds for the 2nd Equipment Cache initiative. This includes \$22.4 million in fiscal year 2003 funds and \$27.3 million in fiscal year 2004 funds. An ad hoc Tiger Team made up of US&R logistics specialists from selected US&R task forces has been convened to address the purchase, organization, cache packaging, and other necessary issues for developing the prototype standardized cache that will be duplicated and distributed to the 28 US&R task forces in the system. Initial meetings have already been conducted and subsequent meetings are scheduled.

Furthermore, we are finalizing the lease of necessary warehouse space to allow for the receipt of the ordered items; developing the organization, cache packaging scheme, and mobilization load plan of a standardized cache; and resolving other related issues. We anticipate the warehouse lease being finalized in mid-March.

The acquisition of ground transport vehicles, which will allow for movement of the US&R equipment cache, is also on target. In fiscal year 2003 funding, \$11.2 million (\$400,000 per task force for trucks and trailers) and \$3.9 million (\$138,000 per task force for command and support vehicles) is being provided to the 28 task forces for this procurement at the sponsoring agency level.

The US&R program office has received and approved the task forces' acquisition plans for the fiscal year 2003 acquisition. We anticipate that all task forces will have the truck/trailer assets in place by the middle of 2004. Acquisition of command vehicles will follow in the same vein with the awarding of the fiscal year 2004 Preparedness Cooperative Agreements, which are also in process.

US&R training requirements are also in process and on target. Another \$2 million in fiscal year 2003 funds has been committed and eight national US&R specialist-training classes are scheduled and being conducted in calendar year 2004 (including the development of three new classes). For fiscal year 2004, \$1.9 million is being obligated for nine national training classes scheduled during 2005. A comprehensive US&R Task Force Administrative Training Course has been developed and was recently delivered for the sponsoring agency task force program managers and grants managers of the 28 task forces. The US&R Task Force Readiness Evaluation Program is currently under development by US&R program staff and selected task force members. Prototypes for US&R Preparedness Cooperative Agreement reporting, monthly operational readiness reporting (using web-based online access), and onsite peer evaluation/readiness checks are in progress or have been developed. We anticipate the pilot onsite inspections to begin in the mid-to-latter half of calendar year 2004.

EMERGENCY FOOD AND SHELTER PROGRAM

Question. The transfer of the Emergency Food and Shelter Program from the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requires legislative action by the authorizing committee. Has the Department sent a request to the authorizing committee for legislative language to be considered? If not, why? If so, what is the current status of the legislative proposal?

Answer. FEMA is currently working with the appropriate authorizing and appropriations committees on the legislative language to transfer the Emergency Food and Shelter program to the Department of Housing and Urban Development in accordance with the President's fiscal year 2005 budget request.

FLOOD MAP MODERNIZATION

Question. The fiscal year 2005 budget request includes \$200 million for the Flood Map Modernization project. How will this funding be used?

Answer. Fiscal year 2005 funding will be used to continue to implement the Multi-Hazard Flood Map Modernization Program. FEMA's vision for the program entails providing credible flood maps and data for communities nationwide that are more accurate, up-to-date, easier to use, and readily available. FEMA intends to accomplish the following:

- Network the Nation using the latest Internet portal technology to provide access to general flood hazard, risk, and mitigation information, and convert the maps from paper to a digital format. The information will be tailored to the needs of specific partners, stakeholders, and users.
- Leverage the use of Federal, State, and local resources, and transfer ownership and use of flood maps and data to the State and local levels by building and maintaining effective partnerships with State, regional, and community entities in the development of the maps and data
- Use clear data standards to ensure that the modernized flood hazard maps reflect the best available data that suits the risk level for the given area
- Reduce processing time and costs for flood map updates and increase accountability for spending by implementing results-oriented systems and standards that will facilitate the rapid exchange of data between our partners, staff, and contractors
- Communicate widely, effectively, consistently, and continuously to maximize our partners', stakeholders', and users' understanding of flood hazards and the risks the hazards pose to life and property

Primarily, the fiscal year 2005 funding will be used to initiate and complete flood map updates nationwide based on our 5-year Multi-Hazard Implementation Plan (MHIP) for completing the work in fiscal years 2004 through 2008. FEMA will use the MHIP to establish goals and baseline with existing priorities; to document and understand flood map update needs identified by State, regional, and local partners and stakeholders; and to develop prioritization criteria and a sequence for scoping counties and watersheds in the priority areas based on floodplain management, hydrologic, hydraulics, and terrain needs. The MHIP will be reevaluated annually to account for changing needs, natural disasters, and new partnerships; to prioritize changes; and to update mapping priorities, as appropriate.

FEMA will provide a precise accounting of the engineering studies to be performed and the flood maps to be produced once development of the MHIP is completed; will scope the map update projects identified in coordination with State, regional, and local partners and stakeholders; and will contract the required map updates with our contractors and with State, regional, and local participants in our Cooperating Technical Partners (CTP) program.

Question. The final contract for the national flood map modernization project has been continuously delayed over the last several months. Why? When exactly will the contract be finalized?

Answer. The National Service Provider (NSP) contract was awarded on March 11, 2004. FEMA experienced some delays in finalizing the contract with the NSP due to the need to ensure the completeness and accuracy of this performance-based contract. More discussions and negotiations were needed than for a conventional compliance-based contract. The NSP is now on the ground in each of the ten regions as well as in headquarters, performing in accordance with the results-based contract, and on schedule to deliver initial functionality.

Question. Since this is a performance-based contract, have the guidelines been developed for how performance will be measured? What level of funding is available or will be provided for the contract for "independent contractor" monitoring?

Answer. FEMA has developed guidelines for how performance on the NSP contract will be measured and performance metrics have been closely linked to the strategic goals of DHS and FEMA.

A detailed program management plan that outlines how performance will be measured has been developed. FEMA has negotiated a performance requirement summary with the NSP that describes each specific measurement and its acceptable quality levels. We have established a specific team that will be responsible for monitoring performance measurements and reporting results on a frequent basis.

FEMA has assigned specific responsibilities for monitoring and measuring not only the contract performance, but program performance as well. We are providing the NSP with incentives to effectively manage all mapping activities and build partnerships and capabilities while producing high-quality flood maps using accurate, credible data.

In addition, FEMA is procuring the services of an independent contractor to help monitor the NSP's performance and to verify that program outcomes are truly achieved. The projected funding level for this independent contractor is approximately \$1.2 million for fiscal year 2004.

Question. There is concern about conflict of interest with the company who has won the national contract and how much work they may be doing on the sub-contractor level. Are there guidelines in place to ensure there is no conflict of interest? How will identified conflicts of interest be avoided or mitigated?

Answer. During the source selection process, one of the key issues was identifying mechanisms to avoid conflicts of interest or the appearance of conflict. Each offeror included presentations on means of avoiding such conflicts. The contract has established that the NSP will have an aggressive Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) management program consistent with Federal Acquisition Regulation 9.5.

The NSP, which is a team of experienced contractors led by one primary contractor, has proposed a conflict of interest management approach that will be put into place upon contract award. Under the proposed approach, the prime contractor will not pursue any contracts for engineering studies with our regional offices or with States under our CTP program. The proposed approach also includes a reporting requirement for all other members of the NSP team to disclose all ongoing contracts and pursuit of contracts to the prime contractor for screening to identify potential OCI issues, perceived or actual. The prime contractor will inform our Contracting Officer in writing of any work that could pose a potential OCI so that appropriate measures may be taken to eliminate the OCI.

Question. Without valid data the people at the State and local level won't have confidence in the maps, making them virtually useless. What guidelines are in place for an independent review of the process itself and the new digitized maps to ensure the revised maps have valid data? How will FEMA ensure that the flood hazard "data" has been updated or is current before converting it into new digital maps?

Answer. A fundamental tenet of the Multi-Hazard Flood Map Modernization Program is that State and local involvement in the modernization of the flood maps is essential for program success. State, regional, and local partner involvement is particularly vital for the identification and use of best available, accurate data that are appropriate for the flood risk in the area being mapped. We are maximizing our partners' involvement and contributions in this critical area by establishing clear quality standards; by making appropriate use of Internet technology, automated data collection and processing tools; and through use of independent quality reviews.

FEMA has developed criteria for assuring the quality of flood hazard maps and supporting data. FEMA implemented Digital Flood Insurance Rate Map base map standards in 1998 and Light Detection and Ranging system standards in 2000. Both standards were updated when the consolidated Guidelines and Specifications for Flood Hazard Mapping Partners was published in February 2002.

State, regional, and local review and acceptance of new and existing data will be achieved at key milestones throughout the flood map update process—from the initial identification of flood map update needs as part of the MHIP, to the scoping of the flood map update, to the preparation and adoption of the final maps.

Through our web-based flood hazard data collection and delivery system, we will make component data, such as topographic data, available for use by our mapping partners as it is developed. This will allow for data quality verification at the State, regional, and local levels at numerous points in the flood map update process. These reviews will help to assure that the data reflect a level of analysis and effort commensurate with the flood risk faced by the mapped communities.

In addition to providing access to the data as it is developed, we are assuring quality by providing data collection and processing tools for our partners and contractors to use in performing map update projects. These tools have been designed

with quality checks built in to minimize errors and to assure internal consistency in the collection and processing of the data. To ensure the tools are used properly, we will provide appropriate training and support to the partners and contractors who are using the tools for map update projects.

FEMA is using the latest Internet portal technology to allow State, regional, and local partners to obtain current status information on the progress of a map update. This access will give our partners a more significant role in the management of the program.

Furthermore, FEMA has incorporated a quality standard into the performance measurement system for the program, and plans to establish an independent contract to perform independent verification and validation and to measure the quality of the products produced. The independent contractor also will help monitor the NSP's performance and verify that program outcomes are achieved.

Finally, FEMA is continuing the very effective practice of requiring independent quality reviews as part of the flood map update process. This practice was institutionalized when we published our consolidated Guidelines and Specifications for Flood Hazard Mapping Partners in February 2002. We include the independent quality review requirement in all mapping project-related contract documents developed with our contractors and with participants in the CTP program. These independent reviews help to assure map updates are completed efficiently and are consistent with FEMA standards.

By requiring independent quality reviews throughout the map update process, we are assuring that products resulting from each activity meet FEMA standards before the next activity is started. We also are assuring that the maps and related products and data are internally consistent. These reviews also provide an opportunity for providing task-specific training to partners who may not be completely familiar with FEMA quality standards. The frequent independent quality reviews also eliminate the costly rework that can result when an error is made early in the processing and is not identified before processing continues.

Question. Is the schedule of trying to have completely revised, digitized flood maps for the entire country in 5 years realistic?

Answer. Based on our current schedule, we believe our plan for preparing and distributing updated, digitized flood maps is realistic. However, we will be better prepared to provide a precise accounting of the type of engineering study to be performed in each county when we complete the development of our 5-year implementation plan (MHIP); scope the map update projects identified in coordination with State, regional, and local partners and stakeholders; and contract the required map updates with our contractors and participants in our CTP program.

Question. Is \$200 million a year still an accurate estimate of the cost for this project, not just to convert the old paper maps into digitized maps but to truly revise them with the most accurate flood plain data? Are we sacrificing quality at any level for quantity of maps completed?

Answer. Based on the information we have to date, we believe the funding requested will be adequate to meet our initial program goals. We will validate our original program baseline and provide a precise accounting of when and how the funding will be expended later this year, after we have completed the development of our 5-year implementation plan (MHIP), scoped the map update projects identified; determined the contributions that may be made by State, regional, and local partners through the CTP program; and contracted the required map updates.

One of the primary objectives that our NSP was asked to meet was the creation of credible flood maps for use by partners, stakeholders, and other users. The maps will reflect the best data available and will be appropriate for the level of risk associated with the mapped area.

In addition, we have incorporated a quality standard into our program performance standards to ensure quality of maps produced.

Question. Beyond the 5 years anticipated to complete the project, how much follow-on funding is anticipated in the out-years to maintain the digitized map?

Answer. At the present time, we cannot formulate a precise cost for maintaining the digitized maps. The cost of maintaining the digitized maps will depend on several factors, including the total cost savings realized by eliminating routine production of paper maps (e.g., manual updates, warehousing), and the level of State and local participation in maintaining the new maps that will be realized by expanding our CTP program. We will be able to estimate the maintenance budget for the program after we complete our 5-year implementation plan (MHIP); coordinate with States, regional agencies, and local communities; and assess each State's desired level of program participation as identified in its State Business Plan.

QUESTION SUBMITTED BY SENATOR TED STEVENS

Question. FEMA Region X has denied the use of Stafford Act disaster funds for two airports in Alaska (Northway Airport and Gulkana Airport). The repairs of these airports total \$13,675,693. FEMA claims that it does not have the authority to perform these repairs and claims that the Federal Aviation Administration is authorized to perform these repairs. The FAA disagrees and claims that its agency lacks authority to provide for disaster repairs. Who has the legal responsibility for repairs to disaster damaged runways and airports?

Answer. The appeal from the State of Alaska has been received and is currently under review. We will notify your office once a decision has been reached and the applicant has been informed.

 QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD

Question. What percentage of fiscal year 2003 and fiscal year 2004 EMPG funds are being used to pay salaries nationally? Please provide breakouts by State and include State and local government personnel expenses.

Answer. In an attempt to be as responsive as possible to the questions of the Committee, we have developed the information in the table below. It is a statistical extrapolation based on budget levels for "Personnel" and "Fringe Benefits" submitted by the States on FEMA Form 20-20, "Budget Information—Non-construction Programs." The States are not required to maintain or to submit detailed information on the exact percentages of their personnel costs funded with Emergency Management Performance Grant (EMPG) funds, therefore, we must emphasize that the data and methodology underlying this analysis are of known inadequacy, and the results below may not provide a complete or accurate assessment of the amount of EMPG funds used to pay salaries.

The indications that we are able to derive from this analysis are that the amount of the Federal share of EMPG funds budgeted by the States for salaries and fringe benefits varies greatly, ranging from about 16 percent to about 72 percent. The average of the percentages was about 37 percent. For the Insular Areas, which are not required to share cost, the percentages ranged from about 56 to about 72 and averaged about 67 percent.

Very little data is available for use of pass-through, or subgrant, EMPG funds for salaries and benefits at the local level. What we do have indicates that the number is higher than at the State level, probably averaging 80 percent or more.

Reg./St. Name	EMPG Federal Share	Personnel	Fringe Benefits	Percent of Federal Share for Salaries/Fringe	Estimated Pass-through	Estimated Percent of Pass-through Salaries/Fringe
National Totals	154,885,912	75,144,375	16,416,336	37.40	115,843,873	
Region 1	12,185,673	7,177,474	2,189,927	34.75	7,164,177	
Connecticut	2,407,428	1,477,757	603,221	43.22	1,404,291	
Maine	1,609,597	611,124	291,873	28.05	1,464,192	
Massachusetts	3,457,781	3,062,227	673,690	54.02	1,595,952	
New Hampshire	1,667,748	733,957	237,289	29.12	959,703	
Rhode Island	1,599,677	891,015	285,125	36.76	1,136,623	
Vermont	1,443,442	401,394	98,729	17.32	603,416	
Region 2	15,011,754	4,632,915	1,311,370	45.25	2,742,707	
New Jersey	4,139,084	1,031,739	201,641	29.80	1,672,122	
New York	7,703,460	2,500,000	859,250	43.61	215,085	
Puerto Rico	2,536,400	737,895	156,026	35.24	855,500	
Virgin Islands	632,810	363,281	94,453	72.33		
Region 3	7,329,496	5,003,332	1,383,750	46.67	6,025,436	
Delaware						
District of Columbia	1,501,603	1,793,206	284,000	69.17	410,000	
Maryland						
Pennsylvania						
Virginia	3,889,095	2,306,396	810,356	40.07	3,195,436	
West Virginia	1,938,798	903,730	289,394	30.77	2,420,000	
Region 4	29,591,145	18,954,422	0	33.48	25,329,569	
Alabama	3,823,967	3,696,461		48.33	2,500,000	
Florida	7,233,935	2,617,511		18.09	4,279,886	
Georgia	4,123,419	4,040,060		48.99	3,687,500	
Kentucky	1,809,701	1,309,020		36.17	1,340,853	
Mississippi	2,318,816	1,521,486		32.81	1,936,342	
North Carolina	4,253,671	2,399,006		28.20	5,149,520	
South Carolina	2,669,936	1,320,078		24.72	3,317,468	
Tennessee	3,357,700	2,050,800		30.54	3,118,000	
Region 5	24,931,917	11,509,247	4,558,027	30.80	22,249,984	
Illinois	5,580,907	3,608,501	1,479,486	45.58	2,927,069	
Indiana	3,365,504	1,200,538	497,218	25.22	4,288,816	87
Michigan	4,709,793	2,504,359	1,192,078	39.24	3,034,000	
Minnesota	2,972,911	1,294,766	455,809	29.44	3,547,586	78
Ohio	5,184,208	1,981,083	553,436	24.44	3,852,513	86
Wisconsin	3,118,594	920,000	380,000	20.84	4,600,000	88

Reg./St. Name	EMPG Federal Share	Personnel	Fringe Benefits	Percent of Federal Share for Salaries/Fringe	Estimated Pass-through	Estimated Percent of Pass-through Salaries/Fringe
Region 6	17,990,977	4,333,511	1,184,259	28.34	11,282,574	
Arkansas	2,179,451	1,376,311	415,921	41.12	991,384	41
Louisiana	2,791,271	673,366	121,206	28.47	1,581,860	93
New Mexico	1,862,907	331,978	107,487	23.59	1,244,156	75
Oklahoma	2,415,000	531,156	137,871	27.70	1,764,007	
Texas	8,742,348	1,420,700	401,774	20.85	5,701,167	75
Region 7	6,752,153	4,277,632	1,152,392	38.98	6,945,990	
Iowa	1,600,520	1,094,279	364,760	45.58	5,000	
Kansas	1,511,233	850,063	212,712	35.16	3,230,491	
Missouri	2,295,781	1,712,376	428,095	46.62	1,954,000	
Nebraska	1,344,619	620,914	146,825	28.55	1,756,499	
Region 8	11,212,298	4,176,758	1,244,091	28.98	11,553,304	
Colorado	2,899,310	1,079,936	152,671	21.26	3,949,354	
Montana	1,621,942	693,757	222,002	28.23	2,173,008	
North Dakota	1,524,180	651,240	201,884	27.99	2,137,116	
South Dakota	1,569,201		0.00			
Utah	2,121,554	978,743	431,343	33.23	2,373,456	
Wyoming	1,476,111	773,082	236,191	34.19	920,370	
Region 9	21,734,734	10,460,851	1,968,488	48.28	12,300,869	
Arizona	3,123,049	4,104,686	416,372	72.38	45,308	
California	13,350,374	3,599,274	690,715	16.07	6,735,231	
Hawaii	1,676,149	1,338,168	431,158	52.78	2,022,655	
Nevada	1,992,530	646,106	201,491	21.27	3,036,516	
American Samoa	431,942	243,092	46,176	66.97	10,756	
Guam	589,350	299,847	117,248	70.77	84,365	
CNMI	471,340	202,678	62,628	56.29	366,038	
FSM	50,000			0.00		
RMI	50,000	27,000	2,700	29.70	20,300	
Region 10	8,145,765	4,618,233	1,424,032	42.81	10,249,263	
Alaska	1,173,241	1,223,577	429,905	70.47	693,000	
Idaho	1,501,310	1,090,683	368,881	48.61	1,543,055	63
Oregon	2,205,226	721,252	274,074	22.57	3,415,126	79
Washington	3,265,988	1,582,721	351,172	29.61	4,598,082	

Question. What percentage of fiscal year 2003 and fiscal year 2004 EMPG are being used for homeland security activities nationally? Please provide this information for each State.

Answer. State and local entities have not been required to maintain detailed reports which segregate their program expenditures on a percentage-of-use basis.

That being said, FEMA would contend that very nearly all of the State and local emergency management agencies' resources are being used for all-hazards preparedness activities, including terrorism. The capabilities developed and maintained in such areas as training, exercising, command and control, communications, and even administration are essential for homeland security (as broadly defined) as well as for hurricanes, earthquakes, floods, hazardous materials accidents, plane crashes—any and all mass-casualty situations.

Question. On what equipment, training and exercises were the fiscal year 2003 fire grants spent? What was requested?

Answer. Below is a list of eligible equipment and training under the Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program. Approximately \$440 million to \$460 million was expended in fiscal year 2003 on these kinds of items. These represent 80–85 percent of the activities supported for and applied for under the Fire Operations and Firefighter Safety and Emergency Medical Services (EMS) program areas. The Fire Operations and Firefighter Safety program area is the largest request area in the program, representing 13,888 of the 20,136 applications initially submitted, and nearly \$1.377 billion of the \$2.468 billion (inclusive of non-Federal share) requested. EMS applications totaled 216 for \$14,145,120.

BASIC FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT

Adapters, Wyes, & Siamese	Portable deluge sets
Foam eductors and foam concentrate	Power saws
Hose—(3½ inches or less)	Ropes, harnesses, carabineers, pulleys, etc.
Hose—Large Diameter (LDH 4 inches or larger)	RIT pack
Hydrant and spanner wrenches	Wildland
Ladders	Other basic equipment
Nozzles	

COMMUNICATIONS

Base station	Pagers
Computer aided dispatch (CAD)	Two-way pagers
Computers	Portable radios
Headsets	Repeaters
Mobile radios	Other communications
Mobile data terminal (MDT)	

EMS

ALS airway equipment	Stethoscopes
BLS airway equipment	Thermometers
Suction	Backboards
Automated external defibrillators (AED)	Cervical collars
Defibrillator/monitor	Splints
Blood pressure cuffs	Vest extrication devices
Pen lights	Other EMS
Pulse oximeters	

EMS/RESCUE

AEDs	Technical rescue equipment
Powered/mechanical extrication tools/equipment	Various supplies
Stretchers, backboards, splints, etc.	Other EMS/rescue

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS (HAZMAT)

Computers	Reference library
Decontamination, clean-up, containment, and packaging equipment	Spark-proof tools
Monitoring and sampling devices	Suppression
	Other Hazmat

INVESTIGATION

Cameras	Monitoring and sampling devices
Lights, portable	Hand tools
Computers	Other investigation

SPECIALIZED

All-terrain vehicles	Fixed generator
Rehab equipment	Washer
Compressors/cascade/fill station (fixed)	Portable/mobile generator
Skid unit	Boats (13 feet in length and under)
Compressors/cascade/fill station (mobile)	Portable pump
Thermal imaging devices	Other specialized

PERSONAL PROTECTIVE EQUIPMENT (PPE) LIST

STRUCTURAL

Helmets	PASS devices
Pants, coats	Accountability systems
Boots	Flashlights
Goggles	Complete set of turnout
Gloves	Hearing protection
Hoods	

RESPIRATORY

Self-contained breathing apparatus (SCBA)—30 minutes with face piece—no extra bottle	SCBA—60 minutes with face piece—no extra bottle
SCBA—30 minutes with face piece—with extra bottle	SCBA—60 minutes with face piece—with extra bottle
SCBA—45 minutes with face piece—no extra bottle	Spare cylinders-30 minutes
SCBA—45 minutes with face piece—with extra bottle	Spare cylinders-45 minutes
	Spare cylinders-60 minutes
	Face pieces
	Respirators
	Air-line units

WILDLAND

Helmets	Jumpsuits/coveralls
Boots	Accountability systems
Goggles	Shelters
Gloves	Canteens
Pants, coats	

WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION (WMD)

SCBA/chemical/biological/radiological/nuclear environment respirators	Chemical/Biological Suits (Must conform to NFPA 1994, 2001 edition)
	Other WMD-related PPE

OTHER PPE

Encapsulated Suits	Proximity and entry suits
Tyvek suits	Wet and dry suits
Splash suits	Infection control
Escape masks	

TRAINING PROGRAM TITLES LIST

Operations (NFPA 472)	RIT Training
Firefighter I, Firefighter II (NFPA 1001)	Confined Space Rescue—Awareness level
Instructor Training (NFPA 1041)	Vehicle Rescue
Driver/Operator (NFPA 1002)	Technical Rescue/Urban Search and Rescue—Awareness level (NFPA 1670/1006)
Officer Training (NFPA 1021)	Technical Rescue/Urban Search and Rescue—Operations level (NFPA 1670/1006)
Basic Wildland Firefighting	
Wildland Firefighter Certification	
Airport Rescue Firefighting (ARFF) (NFPA 1003)	

Technical Rescue/Urban Search and Rescue—Technician level (NFPA 1670/1006)	Mass Casualty Incident Training (MCI)
Hazmat—Technician/Specialist level	NIIMS (Unified Command)
Infection Control (NFPA 1581)	Incident Management Course (IMC)
Medical First Responder Training	Integrated Emergency Management Course (IEMC)
Emergency Medical Technician—Basic (EMT B)	Fire Inspector (NFPA 1031)
Emergency Medical Technician—Intermediate (EMT I)	Fire Investigator (NFPA 1033)
Paramedic Training (EMT-P)	Fire Educator (NFPA 1035)
	Telecommunications/Dispatcher
	Safety Officer

Question. TOPOFF 2 highlighted the fact that a large-scale bioterrorism attack does not qualify as a Major Disaster under the Stafford Act. How did the Emergency declaration differ from the response and resources that a Disaster would have triggered? Is a legislative change to the Stafford Act necessary? Will you request such a change?

Answer. The scenario in TOPOFF 2 did result in an emergency declaration. The Stafford Act provides authority for the President to declare either a major disaster or an emergency, as a situation may warrant. In the case of TOPOFF 2, where the nature of the incident was not one contemplated for major disaster declarations, an emergency declaration was determined to be appropriate. The emergency declaration makes available the same response resources and assistance as would be available for a major disaster. It also makes available assistance for individuals under the Individuals and Households Program. The primary difference in assistance that would be available under a major disaster, but not for an emergency declaration, is assistance for the repair, replacement, and restoration of public facilities that sustain physical damage from the event. This was not a factor in the bioterrorism attack in TOPOFF 2, nor would it be expected to be a factor in such types of events in general. In contrast, should a terrorist event also include fire or explosion, it then would be within the type of event contemplated as a major disaster under the Act; as a practical matter, public assistance would then be available to address physical damages likely to occur in such cases. Accordingly, it is FEMA's position that the types of events that are addressed by major disaster or emergency declarations, respectively, are adequate and appropriate to the types of assistance available under the respective declaration authorities of the Stafford Act.

Question. What is currently contained in the Strategic National Stockpile? How will fiscal year 2004 and proposed fiscal year 2005 funds be spent? How much anthrax vaccine is needed? From where will the Department procure the needed anthrax vaccine, and how long will the process take?

Answer. The Strategic National Stockpile currently contains anthrax exposure treatments, smallpox vaccine, nerve agent treatment, and radiation countermeasures, as well as a limited amount of botulinum antitoxin.

Proposed Stockpile funding for fiscal year 2004 and fiscal year 2005 will be used to sustain its 12-Hour Push Packages and Vendor Managed Inventory, to increase stocks for anthrax antibiotics and vaccine, to purchase smallpox vaccine, and to develop botulinum antitoxin plasma. The Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) Medical Countermeasures subcommittee, an interagency group co-chaired by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), DHS, and the Department of Defense, has recommended the eventual procurement of enough anthrax vaccine to inoculate 25 million people.

HHS will be the procurement agent for the anthrax vaccine and will request proposals for the vaccine development. The time requirement for the actual procurement of the vaccine will be dependent on clinical trials and Food and Drug Administration (FDA) licensure processes.

The Stockpile currently maintains a small amount of the only FDA-licensed pre-exposure vaccine against anthrax (Anthrax Vaccine Adsorbed, or AVA). Currently, it has limited production capacity, and rectifying that problem would be very expensive and take several years to accomplish. AVA is not currently licensed for children or for the elderly. However, in order to ensure that some type of anthrax vaccine is available until the development and procurement of rPA, DHS and HHS have signed an interagency agreement for the purchase of AVA through the Department of the Army. This agreement will provide approximately 2 million doses in fiscal year 2004, 1.5 million doses in fiscal year 2005, and 1.5 million doses in fiscal year 2006.

Question. Please detail how the fiscal year 2004 and fiscal year 2005 proposed funding for Project BioShield will be spent.

Answer. Over the past 10 months, the WMD Medical Countermeasures subcommittee has developed countermeasures information of interest to administration policymakers who will make the BioShield procurement decisions. The WMD subcommittee commissioned an end-to-end analysis of medical countermeasures to Category "A" biological agents (anthrax, smallpox, plague, botulinum toxin, tularemia, Ebola, and other hemorrhagic fever viruses). Working groups developed initial requirements for four high-priority bioweapon countermeasures for which there is high need and a reasonable expectation that products will be available in the near term:

- Next generation anthrax vaccine (recombinant Protective Antigen, rPA)
- Anthrax immune therapy
- Next generation smallpox vaccine (modified vaccinia, MVA or LC16m8)
- Botulinum antitoxin

Question. Provide the status of the Disaster Relief Fund. What are the carryover funds from fiscal year 2004, current balance?

Answer. As of March 10, 2004, the unobligated balance in the Disaster Relief Fund was \$1.813 billion. The fiscal year 2005 budget request includes an estimated carryover of \$453 million from fiscal year 2004 into fiscal year 2005.

Question. What is the justification for requesting \$0 for the Metropolitan Medical Response System? Provide a legislative history of MMRS, including its genesis and original intent. What costs are incurred by EP&R, and what costs are incurred by local governments? What will EP&R's role be in the MMRS if no funds are appropriated in fiscal year 2005? How many cities are expected to continue the program without Federal resources support?

Answer. The funds that Congress has appropriated for the Metropolitan Medical Response System (MMRS) over the last several years have been used to establish certain capabilities, to get the program up to its baseline, and to facilitate transfer of the program to the localities for continuation, once the baseline is established. We will reach the baseline this fiscal year (2004), and therefore no additional funding is being requested. Since 1995, the Federal Government has publicly articulated a necessity to improve planning and response to acts of terrorism involving WMD. The Defense Against Weapons of Mass Destruction Act of 1996, Public Law 104-201, states in Section 1412—Emergency Response Assistance Program, paragraph (h)(2), "Of the amount available for the program pursuant to paragraph (1), \$10,500,000 is available for use by the Secretary of Defense to assist the Secretary of Health and Human Services in the establishment of metropolitan emergency medical response teams (commonly referred to as 'Metropolitan Medical Strike Force Teams') to provide medical services that are necessary or potentially necessary by reason of a use or threatened use of a weapon of mass destruction."

In 1997, HHS initiated the MMRS program to provide support for the development of a response system in the event of a terrorist attack. On March 1, 2003, the MMRS program was transferred to DHS.

DHS is responsible for sponsoring the MMRS program, a system-based approach to mass casualty/surge capacity preparedness and response, developed to enhance existing local first responder, medical, public health, and emergency planning in the event of a terrorist attack. Through contracts administered by FEMA, DHS is responsible for providing funding and technical assistance to plan, develop, equip, and identify training to local governments in 125 identified jurisdictions, based on threat and population.

MMRS program duties have been absorbed as additional duties by existing FEMA staff. Costs to absorb these duties include approximately \$770,000 to fund regional salaries, set at 50 percent of the time for 18 staff members currently administering the program; approximately \$408,000 to fund two staff years at the Noble Training Center and two staff years at headquarters; and an estimated \$350,000 for travel. There are no cost-sharing requirements for local governments.

Secretary Ridge has proposed a reorganization (a letter was sent to Members of Congress on January 26, 2004), wherein the MMRS program for fiscal year 2004 will be transferred to a newly established Office of State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness. Under this arrangement, FEMA would have no further role in the MMRS program for fiscal year 2004, and there will be no Federal program in fiscal year 2005.

We cannot precisely estimate the number of local jurisdictions that would continue the MMRS program without Federal resources support. We are fairly certain that a large number of them, as an element of prudent preparedness and operational necessity, will attempt to maintain MMRS-type mass casualty integrated response preparedness and seek to use Federal funds from other programs to support eligible portions of MMRS-type capabilities.

Question. Provide specific examples of capacity at the Department of Housing and Urban Development that FEMA does not have for operating the Emergency Food and Shelter program.

Answer. The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) is the primary Federal agency responsible for the administration of homeless assistance programs. While FEMA has successfully administered the Emergency Food and Shelter (EFS) program over the years, there are ways that the program could be improved by moving it to HUD. Specifically, the following examples demonstrate the capacity of HUD to operate the program:

- HUD, as mandated by Congress, is currently assessing all homeless assistance programs to determine the need for structural changes to the programs in order to address the President's goal to end homelessness in the next 10 years. The EFS program is the only homeless assistance program not included in this assessment. In order to ensure an integrated approach to assisting persons facing housing emergencies and to meet this goal, it would be more logical for the program to be administered by HUD. FEMA does not have the capacity to perform this requirement.
- HUD is able to link housing and supportive services for chronically homeless persons to other comprehensive services through its numerous other homeless assistance programs and mainstream housing programs. FEMA does not have any other homeless assistance programs.
- HUD has the staffing and financial resources to improve the administration and delivery of the EFS program.
- HUD has the capacity to ensure that homeless assistance/prevention programs are not duplicative, allowing for scarce resources to be utilized more efficiently and effectively. Currently, the EFS program provides funding to the same agencies that HUD programs fund for the same services and individuals. FEMA does not have the capacity to monitor which agencies are duplicating services.
- As FEMA's mission evolves under the Department of Homeland Security, its resources must be focused entirely on natural disasters and catastrophic events, such as the terrorist attacks of 9/11. The EFS program does not fit within the goals and objectives of DHS or of FEMA.

Question. How many staff vacancies do you have in EP&R at this time?

Answer. Vacancies in directly funded programs total 256. This excludes the Disaster Relief Fund and 88 newly funded positions in the Mitigation program for Flood Map Modernization and Pre-disaster Mitigation activities.

Question. Provide the numbers of FTE that have been detailed and transferred out of FEMA since the Department was created. From which offices were the transfers made, and to which offices did FTE go?

Answer. In fiscal year 2003, there were 200 FTE budgeted for FEMA's Office of Inspector General, which transferred in its entirety to the Department. The only transfers of positions that have occurred are those positions associated with the Office of Inspector General; no other FEMA positions have been transferred. FEMA has documented approximately 85 FTE details since March 1, 2003, to various components of the Department.

Question. Provide the number of positions (filled and unfilled) and the Salaries and Expense funds spent within each FEMA office, before February 1, 2003 and currently. Please indicate which positions are in the regional offices and the headquarters offices. Do not include EP&R FTE detailed out of the Directorate.

Answer. The tables below provide the positions and Salaries and Expense in FEMA as of February 1, 2003, and as of February 21, 2004.

FEBRUARY 2003

Organization	Positions			
	Encum- bered	Vacant	TOTAL ¹	S&E
Office of Director	15	4	19	\$968
National Security	27	20	47	905
General Counsel	31	3	34	1,184
Equal Rights	10	0	10	283
Regional Operations	3	0	3	107
Inspector General	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)
External Affairs	52	7	59	1,853
Administration & Resource Planning ³	4	1	5	210
Human Resources	62	2	64	2,103
Financial & Acquisition Management	130	21	151	4,365

FEBRUARY 2003—Continued

Organization	Positions			
	Encum- bered	Vacant	TOTAL ¹	S&E
Facilities Management	64	7	71	7,876
Response & Recovery	327	69	396	12,675
Fed. Insurance & Mitigation	153	27	180	5,607
U.S. Fire Administration	196	7	203	6,272
National Preparedness	74	7	81	2,759
Information Technology	191	17	208	6,867
Subtotal Headquarters	1,339	192	1,531	54,033
Subtotal Regions	771	45	816	25,991
TOTAL	2,110	237	2,347	80,024

¹ In 2003, encumbered total excludes positions funded under Disaster Relief and the Working Capital Fund.

² Inspector General (IG) personnel activity was handled by Bureau of Public Debt. In fiscal year 2004, the entire IG office was transferred to the Department of Homeland Security.

³ Office abolished in 2003.

FEBRUARY 2004

Organization	Positions			
	Encum- bered	Vacant	TOTAL ¹	S&E
Office of the Under Secretary	22	4	26	\$1,022
National Security	38	12	50	1,579
General Counsel	32	3	35	1,221
Equal Rights	9	1	10	275
Regional Operations	3	1	4	106
External Affairs	40	14	54	1,643
Human Resources	55	10	65	1,711
Financial & Acquisition Management	140	16	156	4,504
Facilities Management	60	8	68	8,009
Recovery	73	7	80	2,939
Mitigation	148	32	180	5,662
Preparedness	249	38	287	8,006
Response	314	51	365	13,582
Information Technology	174	22	196	7,013
Subtotal Headquarters	1,357	219	1,576	57,272
Subtotal Regions	770	37	807	25,966
TOTAL	2,127	256	2,383	83,238

¹ In 2004, encumbered total excludes positions funded under Disaster Relief, National Disaster Medical System, and the Working Capital Fund.

Question. Also please provide the number of Senior Executive Service positions which FEMA had on Feb. 1, 2003 and the number it has now. Please include the filled and vacant, indicate political and career and the division or department. If a position has been moved, indicate where it was located before and to where it has been transferred.

Answer. The tables that follow provide the number of Senior Executive Service (SES) positions in FEMA. FEMA has a set number of SES slots that the Under Secretary can use for any SES position. Each time an SES position becomes vacant, the slot returns to the Under Secretary's "SES pool" and the Under Secretary can reallocate it to another FEMA organization based on a determination of the most critical SES need. As the charts indicate, from February 2003 to March 2004, some SES positions were realigned to best support new mission critical responsibilities.

There was no net change in the number of FEMA's allocated SES slots between February 2003 and March 2004. In February 2003, FEMA's allocation was 54 permanent slots and one term allocation for a total of 55 slots.

As a result of FEMA's transition into DHS, 2 slots were transferred (the only 2 SES slots transferred outside of FEMA) to the DHS Office of the Inspector General (OIG). Although OIG originally had three incumbents, one had retired. However, DHS provided 2 slots from its overall allocation to FEMA for 2 positions in the Office of the Under Secretary.

The term appointee in the Information Technology Services Division, identified in the February 2003 order, resigned and the one slot was lost. However, again as a result of transitional activities, one slot was transferred to FEMA from the Department of Health and Human Services as an encumbered position. Therefore, FEMA's allocation was then and is now 55 slots.

FEBRUARY 2003 FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

Organization	Encumbered Career	Encumbered Non-Career	Encumbered Term	Vacant	Total
Office of the Director	2	1		1	4
Office of National Security Coordination				1	1
Office of the General Counsel				2	2
External Affairs Division		1		2	3
Administration & Resource Planning Division		1			1
Human Resources Division		1			1
Finance & Acquisition Management Division	2				2
Facilities Management & Services Division	2				2
Mt. Weather Emergency Operations Division	1	1			2
Response & Recovery Directorate	5	1		2	8
Federal Insurance & Mitigation Directorate	6				6
U.S. Fire Administration	2	1			3
Office of National Preparedness	1		1		2
Office of the Inspector General ¹	3				3
Information Technology Services Division	5	1	1		7
Region 1		1			1
Region 2				1	1
Region 3				1	1
Region 4	1				1
Region 5		1			1
Region 6		1			1
Region 7		1			1
Region 8		1			1
Region 9		1			1
Region 10		1			1
Total	30	4 ¹⁵	2	8	3 ⁵⁷

¹ Determination order of February 2003 did not include OIG SES members since they received personnel services from the Bureau of Public Debt.

² Two additional vacancies were listed on determination order (which were subsequently canceled).

³ SES slots allocation (maximum number that could be filled) was 55.

⁴ Ceiling of 19 non-career (political).

MARCH 10, 2004 DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY (FEMA)

Organization	Encumbered Career	Encumbered Non-Career	Encumbered Term	Vacant	Total
Office of the Under Secretary—Emergency Preparedness & Response	3	2		2	7
Office of National Security Coordination		1			1
Office of the General Counsel				1	1
Office of External Affairs Coordination				1	1
Human Resources Division				1	1
Finance & Acquisition Management Division	2			1	3
Facilities Management & Services Division	1			1	2
Mt. Weather Operations	2	1			3
Response Division	3		1	2	6
Recovery Division	2	1		2	5
Mitigation Division	4			2	6
Preparedness Division	2	1		1	4

MARCH 10, 2004 DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY (FEMA)—Continued

Organization	Encum- bered Ca- reer	Encum- bered Non- Career	Encum- bered Term	Vacant	Total
Information Technology Division	5				5
Region 1				1	1
Region 2			6	1	1
Region 3				1	1
Region 4	1				1
Region 5		1			1
Region 6		1			1
Region 7		1			1
Region 8		1			1
Region 9		1			1
Region 10		1			1
Total	25	¹ 12	1	17	55

¹ Ceiling of 19 non-career available for fill.

Question. Please describe how the amounts of CAP-SSSE funds provided to each State are determined. Describe the States' responsibilities and how they've changed, if at all, in recent years. As income associated with the Federal policy fee has increased, have funds provided by FEMA to the States increased proportionally?

Answer. The purpose of the Community Assistance Program—State Support Services Element (CAP-SSSE) is to provide, through a State grant mechanism, a means to ensure that communities participating in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) are achieving the flood loss reduction objectives of the NFIP. CAP-SSSE is intended to accomplish this by funding States to provide technical assistance to NFIP communities and to evaluate community performance in implementing NFIP floodplain management activities with the goal of building community and State floodplain management expertise and capability. Using CAP-SSSE funding, States now provide a significant portion of the technical assistance to NFIP communities. Without this State support, FEMA regions would not have enough staff to implement the program. CAP-SSSE capitalizes on partnering with the staff of State agencies to provide this assistance.

CAP-SSSE grant fund allocations to States are determined by the FEMA regional offices. In general, States are provided a baseline funding amount to develop basic floodplain management capabilities to assist the FEMA regions in providing technical assistance to communities. After the baseline amount is established, other factors such as the number of participating communities in the State, population growth rate, and number of NFIP insurance policies, as well as each State's capability to provide assistance and overall technical support needs, are considered in determining the final allocations. All States participate in the program and receive funds in varying amounts. FEMA regional offices and the designated State agency negotiate a CAP-SSSE agreement that specifies activities and products to be completed by a State in return for CAP-SSSE funds. There is a 25 percent non-Federal match for all States receiving CAP-SSSE funds. In some cases, a State's ability to provide the required funding match may affect funding levels.

In recent years, States' responsibilities have been changing in order to support nationwide map modernization implementation. Specifically, States have been more involved in map modernization planning activities to assist in implementing this important initiative. Finally, CAP-SSSE grant funds are not directly linked to Federal policy fee income. However, total CAP-SSSE funds have increased by 40 percent over the past 2 years to assist States in their floodplain management activities and in meeting the challenges of map modernization.

Question. When will DHS release 2004 CAP-SSSE funds to the FEMA Regions for distribution to the states?

Answer. Fiscal year 2004 CAP-SSSE funds were released to the FEMA regions in November 2003. Many States have already received their fiscal year 2004 CAP-SSSE funding allocation. Some of the FEMA regions are still negotiating with the States regarding the content of the State Work Plans. Once the State Work Plans are finalized and approved, the remaining funds will be awarded.

Question. Are all of the Federal Personnel paid with funds collected from the Federal Policy fee working directly on National Flood Insurance Program projects?

Answer. Yes. Each year we carefully monitor the program assignments paid from the National Flood Insurance Fund to ensure that those Federal employees are performing NFIP work.

Question. Describe how DHS and HUD are working together to assure that HUD regulations address installation of manufactured homes specifically in flood hazard areas.

Answer. On December 27, 2000, the Manufactured Housing Improvement Act (MHIA) became law (Public Law No. 106-569) and for the first time established a requirement that HUD develop national model manufactured home installation standards. DHS has participated in this development process by submitting to the non-Federal consensus committee, established by the MHIA, proposed flood disaster-resistant provisions, consistent with NFIP, which would apply to manufactured homes sited in flood hazard areas. On December 18, 2003, the consensus committee approved DHS' proposed provisions and included them in the final recommended national model manufactured home installation standards submitted to the HUD Secretary. In accordance with the law, the HUD Secretary has 1 year (December 18, 2004) in which to act on these recommended standards.

Question. Will DHS coordinate with HUD to include in existing Federal regulations (24 CFR Part 3282.303(c)), a requirement that State administrative agency plans must require licensed installers and/or dealers to determine whether a proposed manufactured housing site is located in a FEMA identified flood hazard area before installation?

Answer. Changes to 24 CFR Part 3282.303(c) are not anticipated by HUD. Rather, under the MHIA, State installation programs for their licensed installers and/or dealers must include standards that meet or exceed the protection provided by the national model manufactured home installation standards that are currently being developed by HUD. A key provision of the model standards reads, "Prior to the initial installation of a manufactured home, it shall be determined whether the home site lies wholly or partly within a special flood hazard area." In this way, States will be fulfilling 3282.303(c) in assuring that homes are properly installed in their States.

Question. Will DHS coordinate with HUD to require manufacturers installation manuals to specifically state whether model installation designs are intended for use in flood hazard areas?

Answer. Under the MHIA, manufacturers shall provide with each home designs and instructions for the installation of the manufactured home that have been approved by a design approval primary inspection agency (DAPIA). Once the national model installation standards have been established, DAPIAs may not issue approvals unless the designs and instructions for installation provide equal or greater protection than the protection provided under the national model standards. A key provision in the new national model installation standards is that manufactured homes located wholly or partly within flood hazard areas shall be installed using methods and practices that minimize damage in accordance with the flood damage reduction requirements contained in the NFIP regulations. Specific to foundation systems used in the manufacturers' instructions, the standards also require that, in flood hazard areas, the piers, anchoring, and support systems shall be capable of resisting loads associated with design flood and wind events.

Question. What priority are you giving to preparing new floodplain delineations to replace or refine approximated flood hazard areas, rather than simply converting them to a digital format? How much of the fiscal year 2005 request for flood map modernization will be spent on preparing new floodplain delineations? On digitization of existing paper maps?

Answer. FEMA's current priority is working with States and local governments to identify those communities at greatest risk and to provide updated geospatial data. The long-term performance goal for the Multi-Hazard Flood Map Modernization Program is for the U.S. population to have up-to-date digital flood hazard data and maps for flood-prone areas. FEMA is developing flood data and producing maps for communities that reflect the level of analysis and effort commensurate with the flood risk faced by each community. Part of the mapping process involves a needs assessment during which FEMA works with the local community to determine mapping needs and to assess whether existing local data are sufficiently accurate to meet local needs and NFIP criteria. All assessments will be coordinated with States, regional agencies, and local communities.

During the next 6 months, FEMA will be working with national, State, and local partners and stakeholders to assemble an integrated 5-year implementation plan for the Multi-Hazard Flood Map Modernization Program. We will use the plan to establish goals and baseline with existing priorities; to document and understand flood map update needs identified by State, regional, and local partners and stakeholders; and to develop prioritization criteria and a sequence for scoping counties and watersheds in the priority areas based on floodplain management, hydrologic, hydraulic,

and terrain needs. The plan that will be developed is the MHIP for fiscal years 2004–2008.

FEMA will provide a precise accounting of the new engineering studies and flood-plain boundary delineations once we complete the development of the MHIP; will scope the map update projects identified in coordination with State, regional, and local partners and stakeholders; will determine the contributions that may be made by State, regional, and local partners through the Cooperating Technical Partners (CTP) program; and will contract the required map updates with our contractors and with participants in our CTP program.

FEMA plans to update the flood maps based on the level of flood risk associated with an area and the accuracy of the existing data for that area. For some areas, there may not be a need to perform a new engineering study because the flood hazards and related risk are accurately portrayed on the flood map and are appropriate for the area. For example, for recently mapped areas, we will use the accurate available data to create a digital map.

Our modernization effort is predicated on using the best available data and clear data standards. To that end, it is not our intention to convert inaccurate flood maps to a digital format.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR PATRICK J. LEAHY

Question. I have noted that the Emergency Preparedness and Response Directorate, which includes the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), has slowly shifted its emphasis from all-hazards to terrorism. The President's budget request includes legislative language that would give "priority to homeland security activities." The intent of FEMA, however, was to insure broad-based, all-hazards approaches to State and local preparedness and response efforts. This shift is cause for great concern.

I strongly believe that a reliable emergency infrastructure—adequately resourced at the Federal, State and local levels—must build upon the all-hazards emergency management approach and address the needs of the entire emergency system, including, but not limited to: law enforcement, fire, emergency medical services, public health, the 911 communications system and emergency management. Currently, a greater focus on terrorism has increased the role of emergency managers and the immediate needs of all responders to ensure adequate preparedness. Meanwhile, natural hazards continue to be the pervasive disaster that occurs regularly. In 2003, for example, there were 56 major disaster declarations, 19 emergency declarations and 46 fire suppression authorizations—none of which were terrorist-related.

Mr. Brown, would you agree that natural disaster preparedness must not suffer as a result of homeland security efforts, but rather should be viewed as the most frequent opportunity to validate domestic preparedness efforts and to also build best practices? If not, please explain why you think our emergency response system must be focused on terrorism rather than all-hazards and how that benefits us.

Answer. Although the Department of Homeland Security is focused on terrorism and protecting the homeland, the President, Secretary Ridge, and I are committed to an all-hazards approach of preparedness, response, and recovery from all events, including natural disasters. Recent efforts to improve response to and recovery from a terrorism event do not diminish FEMA's commitment to dealing with the destruction of a natural disaster—just the opposite. FEMA has enjoyed a long history of focusing on all hazards, and I believe that being part of DHS has strengthened that approach. As you mention, FEMA has successfully continued to respond to and recover from a multitude of natural disasters in the past year. At the same time, these efforts do provide us with opportunities to better prepare not only for terrorism events, but also for catastrophic events, whether they be natural or caused by terrorism.

Question. The President's fiscal year 2005 budget request for the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) proposes changes to the Emergency Management Performance Grants (EMPG) Program that would severely impact State and local emergency management. In the fiscal year 2003 Consolidated Appropriations law (Public Law 108–7), Congress called the EMPG Program "the backbone of the Nation's emergency management system." In fiscal year 2004, Congress increased EMPG funding to \$179 million, directed that EMPG would remain in the Emergency Preparedness and Response Directorate where the focus is an all-hazards approach to emergency management, and ordered the continuation of funding personnel expenses.

I was surprised to read, therefore, that the President's fiscal year 2005 request cuts EMPG funding by \$9 million and also proposes a 25 percent cap on the use

of funds to support personnel salaries. Since the functions of emergency management are almost 100 percent personnel driven (i.e., planning, coordinating, exercise design, public education, and hazards at the State and local levels and would result in losses of 70 percent of their emergency management staff response to and recovery from actual incidents), this provision would have a devastating effect on emergency management agencies nationwide. The cap would eliminate current personnel responsible for planning for and responding to all

Mr. Brown, now is the time when we should be building the capacity of our Nation's emergency management agencies. Why, then, is this Administration seeking to weaken it?

Answer. The EMPG personnel cap is intended to ensure that State and local governments assume responsibility for their personnel costs. Effective State and local emergency management capability is not the primary responsibility of the Federal Government, rather, it is a shared responsibility. In exchange for absorbing some of these personnel costs, DHS will increase the amount of funding that goes to the State and local governments for training and exercises. If the State and local governments can reprioritize some of their monies to keep their personnel intact, then DHS will spend the funding freed up by that on training and exercises to make sure they are still capable of doing what DHS needs them to do. DHS feels that by imposing the personnel cap, the Department will be able to do more to build the capabilities of the States rather than weaken them.

Question. I am very concerned about the state of the floodmap modernization program. I saw in your budget submission that almost \$40 million of fiscal year 2004 funds would be distributed this year. However, my home State of Vermont has received no funds thus far, and it appears that several of the state's grants requests have been acted upon very slowly if at all.

You are asking for another \$293 million this year for the program, yet I am beginning to question whether the benefits of this program are really flowing to the communities that need to update their maps, and I wonder whether the program is taking too broad an approach to be useful at the local level.

Mr. Brown, can you please tell me specifically what this program is going to do for my home State of Vermont. Is FEMA going to stick to a verbal commitment made to the State to support its Fluvial Hazards Risk Assessment Initiative through Map Modernization funding opportunities? What is the status of Vermont's grant applications for other programs that will help prepare for flooding, such as the Pre-Disaster Mitigation program? Answer. FEMA's Mitigation Division administers two major programs that involve extensive coordination and planning with State and local officials—the Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program (PDM) and the Multi-Hazard Flood Map Modernization Program.

FEMA's PDM fiscal year 2003 funds will be awarded on a competitive basis with a national priority on funding mitigation projects that address National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) repetitive flood loss properties. The national evaluation of fiscal year 2003 PDM competitive grant applications submitted by the October 6th application deadline was completed on November 21, 2003. All projects funded under the PDM program must be cost-effective, consistent with environmental laws and regulations, and contribute to a long-term mitigation solution.

The sub-applications identified for selection will be approved for funding in phases. We have approved a list of sub-applications identified as Phase I and Phase II. An application from North Troy, Vermont, The River Road Acquisition Project, is included in Phase II. FEMA's Region I staff soon will be contacting Vermont Emergency Management staff to discuss program and grants management requirements that must be addressed in order to make a final determination and to proceed with a grant award for this project. A final phase of PDM awards will follow later this spring. Because of the competitive nature of this program, details about the status of the remaining sub-applications cannot be released until funding decisions are made. At that time, I will provide an update to you. In fiscal year 2003, Vermont also received a \$248,275 non-competitive planning grant to help the State and its local communities protect lives and property by developing multi-hazard mitigation plans.

In addition, we have a number of Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) projects that address flood hazards underway in Vermont. FEMA recently obligated \$233,575 for 13 projects and planning grants in various Vermont communities with HMGP funds made available after disaster declaration DR-1428-VT (severe storms and flooding, July 2002). The final project to be awarded under DR-1428-VT is in Richford, Vermont. FEMA is providing \$54,375 for a project to relocate the town's water main from a precarious location under the river where it is subject to damage from ongoing scouring. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is the lead agency on this project. We are waiting to review their environmental assessment and expect, if

there are no problems, to obligate funds this spring. Vermont Emergency Management currently is soliciting applications for HMGP projects that will be funded following disaster declaration DR-1488-VT (severe storms and flooding, September 2003).

Under the Multi-Hazard Flood Map Modernization Program, FEMA has provided \$800,000 to fund flood map updates for Windsor County, Windham County, Washington County, and the Towns of Hinesburg, Stowe, and West Rutland. FEMA plans to distribute preliminary versions of the updated flood maps for Windsor and Windham Counties and the three towns during this summer. FEMA will send these preliminary versions to community and county officials, State officials, and other key stakeholders to facilitate a thorough review. The study being performed for Washington County, which is still in the scoping phase, includes a component of the Fluvial Hazard Morphology initiative, specifically, riverine erosion assessment protocol and tools developed by the Vermont Agency of Natural Resources.

The FEMA regional office staff in Boston has a regional business plan that describes its 5-year strategic plan for executing the Multi-Hazard Flood Map Modernization Program. The Vermont Agency of Natural Resources has expressed an interest in taking some responsibility for managing local flood hazard data and is preparing its State business plan to identify the activities it desires to undertake and its 5-year flood map project priorities. FEMA will use this information to update the regional and National business plans for the Multi-Hazard Flood Map Modernization Program.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR HERB KOHL

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE GRANTS

Question. I am concerned about the Administration's budget cuts and policy changes to the Emergency Management Performance Grants. First, I disagree with the President's decision to move the grants from FEMA to the Office of Domestic Preparedness. No one in my State thinks this is necessary, and they are concerned that this diminishes the role and power of FEMA. FEMA was one of the most successful agencies to be folded into Homeland Security and it would be a shame if the Department undermined FEMA by taking away programs it handled well in the past. I think the Administration should avoid trying to fix grant programs that are not broken.

In addition, not only is there \$9 million less than last year for the grants, but the \$170 million that is included in the President's budget will no longer fund all hazard planning. This is a real disappointment for county emergency managers in my state. They used these funds to help them prepare for terrorist attacks as well as natural disasters like floods and tornados. A reduction in funding, especially when adjusted for inflation, could force some counties to reduce staff as well as leave them unprepared for non-terrorism catastrophes.

Why did the Administration reduce these funds, and why did they prohibit these funds from being used for all hazard planning?

Answer. The Emergency Management Planning Grant Program provides vital support to the State and local emergency management system. The purpose of EMPG is to assist the development, maintenance, and improvement of State and local emergency management capabilities, which are key components of a comprehensive national emergency management system for disasters and emergencies that may result from natural disasters or accidental or man-caused events. At this time, the Administration's priority is assisting states in building capabilities for homeland security.

These grants are a critical part of our homeland security efforts and an existing strength that must be maintained. The President's fiscal year 2005 request includes \$170 million for continuation of this program, which is the most any administration has requested for this program. In fact, the fiscal year 2005 request is \$20 million or more than 10 percent above the fiscal year 2004 request.

The funding increase, and restriction on the amount of funds that can be used for salaries, will result in a more robust emergency planning and management system at the State and local effort.

Follow up: The Administration has also decided to allow only 25 percent of these grants to be used to pay personnel costs. The counties in my State have used these grants to hire people that facilitate disaster planning and help the local communities to make the best use of the State and Federal funds they receive. The emergency management community in my State has told me that this would force them to lay-off workers and planners, leaving them less prepared for any disaster. Will

the Administration change its position on capping personnel costs, and if not, how do you expect the states and counties to continue to pay for this staff?

Answer. The Administration's fiscal year 2005 request for the Emergency Management Planning Grants is \$170 million, which is higher than any previous request for this program. The funds will be used to assist the development, maintenance, and improvement of State and local emergency management capabilities, with a focus on building local capabilities for homeland security.

As you note, though, the request does cap the amount that states can use for salaries, thereby significantly increasing the amount of funds available for planning, training and exercises. The Administration's budget request still allows for award funds to support salaries. The request shifts the emphasis to Federal support for planning while properly aligning responsibility for staffing and salaries with the states and local governments. The Administration and Department have consistently supported the idea that homeland security is a shared responsibility between Federal and State and local governments. Additionally, it is important to remember that we are operating in a fiscal and security environment where we must ensure maximum security benefits are derived from every security dollar. To do that, we must be able to take a new look at the way in which we allocate resources, including sharing financial responsibility with our State and local partners.

SUBCOMMITTEE RECESS

Senator COCHRAN. Our next hearing on the budget request for the Department of Homeland Security will be held on Tuesday, March 2, in this same room. At that time, the Under Secretary for Science and Technology, Dr. Charles McQueary, and the Under Secretary for Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection, Mr. Frank Libutti, will be here to discuss the budget for the programs under their jurisdiction.

Until then, the subcommittee stands in recess.

[Whereupon, at 11:10 a.m., Thursday, February 26, the subcommittee was recessed, to reconvene at 10 a.m., Tuesday, March 2.]