



ALLIANCE *for*
REGIONAL
STEWARDSHIP

**Regional
Emergency Preparedness
Compacts:**

Safeguarding the
Nation's Communities

Prepared by:

William R. Dodge

With the assistance of:

Doug Henton and Chi Nguyen

Members of the Alliance for Regional Stewardship

National Academy of Public Administration

National Association of Regional Councils

MARCH 2002

Table of Contents

Foreword	3
Introduction	4
The State of Regional Emergency Preparedness	6
Promising Regional Approaches to Emergency Preparedness	13
Supporting the Pursuit of Regional Emergency Preparedness Compacts	34
Recommended Reading	40

Special thanks to the members of the National Association of Regional Councils who responded to a survey on regional approaches to emergency preparedness and provided information for the examples shared in the monograph.

Foreword

Fellow Regional Stewards:

Regional cooperation became a life-saving necessity on September 11, but few regions are optimally coordinated to respond to terrorist attacks. According to a National Association of Counties survey in early 2002, less than 1 in 10 counties responded that they were fully prepared to deal with terrorist attacks. “Thirty percent (of the counties) report that insufficient intergovernmental agreements hinder preparedness, while 35 percent report that insufficient communications networks hinder preparedness.”

Regional organizations play an important role in developing and implementing emergency preparedness plans. Public regional councils of governments and regional planning commissions have a long history of recruiting and training fire, police, and other first response personnel. Regional chambers of commerce are assisting businesses to prepare and implement emergency preparedness plans, including mock disaster drills. Regional civic organizations can engage and inform the public, as well as act as a broker to bring the public and private sectors together around preparedness.

It is equally important to have full partnership and engagement from both the business and non-profit sectors in regional planning efforts. Key critical infrastructure is in private hands. Technological and 24/7 operations know-how is in private heads. The media (needed to communicate to the public) and hospitals and doctors (needed to care for the public) are largely in the private sector. In addition, the non-profit sector—organizations such as the American Red Cross, Salvation Army, and community foundations—provides critical disaster recovery support. A complete regional teamwork approach is required.

With federal and state government and national private and civic leaders indicating support for regional compacts, regions have a unique opportunity to demonstrate an effective model of emergency preparedness through regional collaboration.

Bill Dodge’s report will help guide your pursuit of collaborative approaches to safeguarding the nation’s regions. The first section of his report reviews the state of emergency preparedness in our regions. The second section shares some of the most promising examples of regional approaches to emergency preparedness. The last section suggests actions that state and federal governments and national associations and foundations can take to support the development of regional emergency preparedness compacts.

We invite you to join use in taking advantage of this extraordinary opportunity to bring public, private, and civic interests together to make sure that all of our citizens are safe and our homeland is secure.

Glenda Hood

Mayor of Orlando, Florida
Chair, Florida Domestic Security Advisory Panel

George Vradenburg III

Strategic Advisor, AOL Time Warner
Task Force on Emergency Preparedness
The Potomac Conference/Board of Trade
Washington, DC

Introduction

“We hope to change the old relationship—cities-state-federal model—into one based on mutual cooperation, collaboration and partnership.”

—Tom Ridge, Director, Office of Homeland Security

Regional cooperation became a life-saving necessity on September 11.

As downtown Manhattan and suburban Arlington County suffered terrorist attacks, drawing on all available regional resources became critical. “First responders”—police, fire, and emergency medical personnel—descended on the World Trade Center and Pentagon from neighboring jurisdictions and states. By early afternoon, World Trade Center victims were being treated in New Jersey hospitals. At the same time, specially trained crews from Maryland, the District of Columbia, and adjacent Virginia jurisdictions were assisting at the Pentagon.

In both regions, first responders performed admirably but encountered serious communications, data-sharing, and coordination challenges. Some federal agencies in the National Capitol Region were releasing employees; others were closing bridges and restricting the use of transportation routes. State officials were calling for closing schools; local officials were considering keeping them open. Some first providers were unable to assist, especially across state lines, for lack of effective mutual aid agreements. Later, anthrax cases began to show up at hospitals across the region that were not in information-sharing networks.

Since September 11, terrorist attacks have become more covert and scattered. In the National Capitol region, the targets are not only the White House, the U. S. Capitol, and the Supreme Court in downtown Washington, but also the CIA, the National Institutes of Health, post offices, and other sites in Maryland and Virginia. The definition of weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) continues to expand to include chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear weapons; conventional explosives; and any device capable of causing mass casualties.

Regional cooperation was already key to living the good life before September 11. Public, private, and civic sector leaders, along with citizens, had already accepted the need to come together across regions to compete successfully in the global economy, protect air and water quality, and provide roads, transit, airports, parks, and other quality-of-life amenities. They had even begun to come together to shape sensible regional growth to avoid squandering increasingly scarce resources on profligate sprawl.

On September 11, the toughest regional challenge shifted from improving the quality of life to saving lives. Overnight, everyone realized that shaping balanced growth has to begin with safeguarding the citizens, businesses, and institutions and “hardening” the infrastructure that makes our regions competitive in the global economy.

Everyone became a regional citizen on September 11.

Local government leaders, as well as state and federal government leaders, in the National Capitol region began thinking and acting like regional leaders and participating together on regional terrorism task forces. They realized that they were confronting the perfect regional challenge. It was compelling: to fail to deal with it meant almost certain catastrophe. It was local, but beyond the capacity of individual local governments or businesses to address. It would fail without the full support of state and federal governments. It required negotiation of a regional compact to assure that all levels of government and private and civic sectors could make joint decisions and work together effectively.

First responders recognized that they faced a triple regional challenge. First, they needed to be trained jointly with their colleagues in neighboring jurisdictions on the latest terrorist threats—almost while the attacks were occurring—if the responders were to have the collective capacity to address them. Second, they needed to have access to new supplies and equipment and enhanced information and decision-making tools that worked reliably across jurisdictions in the midst of terrorist attacks. Because these items are often prohibitively expensive, they also needed to share the costs with their neighbors or do without. Third, they needed to be prepared to deal with terrorist threats anywhere in the region, because an attack on one affects all and requires the collective efforts of first responders regionwide.

Individual citizens increasingly support regional approaches. Following the September 11 attacks, the Greater Washington Board of Trade commissioned a public poll. It found that citizens even more strongly believed that they were part of the National Capitol Region—from 75% of respondents before September 11 to 81% after. They had qualms about whether either the region (only 43%) or their businesses (65%) have adequate emergency preparedness plans, but had some confidence that their leaders were more up to the task than were their counterparts in other regions (from 32 to 39%).

And leaders, first providers, and citizens were responding, not just in the National Capitol region, but also in every region, nationally. Whereas the targets in the Washington area are especially symbolic to terrorists, regions across the country have military bases, post offices, national parks, and other sites that might become equally attractive targets

The following three chapters of this monograph provide information on the state of regional emergency preparedness, present examples of the range of activities being undertaken to safeguard our regions, and suggest actions that can be taken to foster the development of regional emergency preparedness compacts.

The State of Regional Emergency Preparedness

Emergency preparedness requires collaboration among all levels of government and the private and civic sectors.

Local governments, together with hospitals and other private and civic groups, have the primary responsibility for emergency preparedness, especially in the first 24 hours. State and federal governments have developed support systems for dealing with disasters after the first day, sponsor special disaster rescue and recovery teams, and provide financial assistance following disasters. The federal government also has sophisticated technical expertise, but, with more than four dozen federal agencies, cannot retail it individually to each of the tens of thousands of local governments and first-responder groups.

State and federal governments complement local emergency preparedness efforts, but have invested little in fostering regional cooperation.

Both state and federal governments also provide support for emergency preparedness planning, but have all too often “stovepiped” its delivery to individual units of government. Even though regional approaches, and even regional organizations, are eligible under federal assistance programs, federal agencies have made few regional grants and contracts to date. Now, key federal agencies and progressive states are fostering interlocal and interstate cooperation to safeguard the nation’s regions.

The federal Metropolitan Medical Response Systems (MMRS) program, offered by the Office of Emergency Preparedness (OEP) of the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), supports approximately 100 cities to develop plans to coordinate public safety, public health, and health-services sector responses to terrorist incidents. It awards \$400,000 contracts for preparing initial plans and \$200,000 contracts for their updating. Even though the contracts are mostly with individual cities, some support regional approaches, such as in the Dallas–Ft. Worth, Denver/Aurora, Hampton Roads, Minneapolis/St. Paul, Pittsburgh, and St. Petersburg/Tampa regions. Now, the OEP is fostering greater regional cooperation by requiring neighboring MMRS city contractors to work together in updating their plans. HHS, through the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, also provides grants to states—\$1.1 billion this year—to prepare comprehensive state bioterrorism preparedness plans.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) supports the development of emergency recovery and mitigation plans by state and local governments. It provides hazard mitigation grants to state governments and allows the use of up to 7% of the funds for planning. It offers a strong incentive for preparing recovery and mitigation plans; state and local governments with approved plans receive a 5% bonus in federal assistance to recover from disasters (up to 20% of individual and government disaster costs instead of 15%). Finally, it has historically targeted funding for local government hazard mitigation planning through its Project Impact program. One of these grants helped to develop a regional emergency preparedness plan in the Coastal Georgia region.

Some states—such as Florida, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Texas, Mississippi, and Vermont—have used federal aid and their own assistance to take a regional approach by supporting the development of natural disaster and terrorism plans, in each of the regions of the state. (The following sections of the monograph further describe state and federal government programs.)

Regional organizations, in metropolitan and rural regions, assist first providers to coordinate emergency preparedness activities, but usually with modest resources.

Regional councils of governments and other public regional organizations have a long history of recruiting and training fire, police, and other first-response personnel, especially in emergency preparedness. They also house the regional information centers that gather, review, develop, and update critical information on resources and infrastructure for rescue and recovery, such as information on the locations of medical facilities, drinking-water supplies, and transportation routes, as well as terrorist targets, such as water reservoirs, power plants, and military installations. They help individual local governments to develop their own emergency preparedness plans. Most important, they have begun to help local governments to weave their individual plans together, at times with state and federal government support.

Regional chambers of commerce and other private regional organizations have complemented the work of regional councils by developing emergency preparedness guides for businesses and integrating business resources and infrastructure into emergency preparedness plans. In New York, the New York City Partnership has created a number of initiatives to assist businesses affected by the terrorist attacks, including an Emergency Business Information website, a Financial Recovery Fund, and Restart Central which provides discounted goods and services for reestablishing damaged businesses. Chambers of commerce have been involved in protecting international border crossings, such as in the Buffalo and Detroit regions. Chambers of commerce in Florida and South Carolina have been involved in assisting businesses to prepare for and recover from hurricanes.

Regional civic organizations, which are often a hybrid of public, private, and civic representatives—such as the 21 Collaborative Regional Initiatives (CRIs) in California's regions—are exploring how they can contribute to the development of regional emergency preparedness activities. For example, the Orange County Business Council and the South Bay Economic Development Partnership are now exploring ways to bring public, private, and civic groups together to foster regional emergency preparedness initiatives. In the New York region, the Regional Plan Association has convened a regional coalition, the Civic Alliance to Rebuild Downtown New York, to develop strategies for the redevelopment of Lower Manhattan in the aftermath of the attack on the World Trade Center. Similarly, regional nonprofit organizations, such as local chapters of the American Red Cross and Salvation Army, coordinate feeding and other support for first providers during disaster recovery and distribute community disaster and education materials developed by their national organizations.

Most of the support for these emergency preparedness activities is cobbled together from a variety of public, private, nonprofit, academic, foundation, and other sources.

Now, all levels of government and sectors are coming together to prepare regional compacts for safeguarding the nation's communities.

Regional compacts refers to agreements negotiated among public, private, and civic interests to address tough challenges that cut across regions and cannot be addressed by any single jurisdiction successfully. Regional compacts have already been negotiated in many regions to address transportation and related air and water quality challenges. Regional compacts are under negotiation in many regions to shape growth and related environmental and equity challenges.

Regional compacts are always a work in progress. They bring all the key public, private, and civic interests and the general public together to negotiate a comprehensive deal. They almost always develop incrementally, component-by-component, focusing on designing the protocols, policies, practices, and programs to address the most pressing aspects of the challenge.

Increasingly, public, private, and civic leaders are calling for preparing regional compacts to safeguard their communities. Over time, regional emergency-preparedness compacts would help prepare regions to deal with any terrorist threat to homeland security as well as any natural disaster—hurricane, tornado, earthquake, and the like—that threatens the region. They would also eventually address all the aspects of emergency preparedness, including risk assessment to identify potential targets and their vulnerability, capability assessment, improvement and maintenance, emergency planning, training and exercises, and incorporation of local, regional, state, and federal resources. They could focus equally on disaster preparedness to plan, train, and equip regions for disaster response and on hazard mitigation to reduce the possibility of disaster as well as the amount of damage when a disaster occurs.

Most important, regional compacts would breathe life into the informal mutual aid agreements that already exist among almost all local governments, formalizing and updating them to cover terrorism and other new threats and continually testing them in mock disaster drills. They would also foster the development of parallel agreements among local businesses and facilitate the use of private “first providers”, along with private materials and equipment, to respond to natural disasters and terrorist attacks.

A number of regions have already developed components of regional emergency preparedness compacts, such as the Hampton Roads (Norfolk/Newport News) and Coastal Georgia (Brunswick) regions, and all of the regions in Vermont and Florida, with state support. Since September 11, regional organizations have been holding regional summits, such as the Potomac Conference, a public/private/civic leadership group in the National Capitol region, and the North Central Texas Council of Governments in the Dallas-Forth Worth region. Regional organizations are also launching new regional emergency planning processes to address terrorism threats, such as the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOG) Task Force on Homeland Security and Regionalism Preparedness and complementary Greater Washington Board of Trade Regional Preparedness and Recovery Task Force. MWCOG received a federal grant of \$5 million to develop a new regional emergency preparedness compact for the National Capitol region.

Collaborative decision-making is receiving special attention in the development of these regional compacts. Participants are exploring ways to make sure all sectors—public, private, and civic—are jointly engaged in making tough decisions and communicating them effectively in the midst of a disaster. Ideas such as coordinated incident command systems, regional information communications centers, regional decision-making hotlines (such as among school superintendents or hospital officials), regional coordinated training/equipment/supplies coalitions (such as the Tidewater Emergency Medical Services Council, Inc. in the Hampton Roads region), and regional emergency centers are being built into regional compacts.

Regions are looking for new models to respond to Governor Tom Ridge's wish: "We hope to change the old relationship—cities-state-federal model—into one based on mutual cooperation, collaboration and partnership." Public, private, and civic regional organizations offer a cost effective way to develop regional emergency preparedness compacts that safeguard our communities.

The 2002 Winter Olympics in Salt Lake City offer timely lessons for preparing regional emergency preparedness compacts. Even though the federal government assumed the lead responsibility for providing security at the Olympics, the development of the partnership among local, state, and federal government; private and civic sectors; and even international interests, provide important insights for preparing regional emergency preparedness compacts. (The following section further describes regional emergency preparedness activities.)

Regional compacts are especially critical for addressing the needs of smaller jurisdictions in metropolitan areas and rural regions.

According to a National League of Cities survey in September 2001, more than 8 out of 10 (83%) large cities (more than 100,000 population) have terrorism or prevention plans in place. However, only 6 out of 10 (59%) middle-sized cities (10,000 to 100,000 population) and only 4 out of 10 (40%) small cities (less than 10,000 population) have such plans in place. Similarly, whereas more than half of large cities (57%) have received some terrorism training in the past year, only one-third (33%) of middle-sized cities and fewer than one-fifth (19%) of small cities have received such training.

According to a National Association of Counties survey in early 2002, fewer than 1 in 10 counties responded that they were fully prepared to deal with terrorist attacks. Almost 6 out of 10 (56%) counties responded that they have no preparedness for terrorist attacks. "Thirty percent (of the counties) report that insufficient intergovernmental agreements hinder preparedness, while 35 percent report that insufficient communications networks hinder preparedness."

Without regional compacts, many small communities will continue to be unprepared for terrorist threats and natural disasters.

Regional compacts are also critical to shepherding the use of increasingly scarce resources.

The U. S. Conference of Mayors estimates that security costs in the nation's major cities increased by approximately \$2.6 billion from September 11 through the end of 2001. Regional compacts can help guarantee development of the most cost-effective strategies and can help preclude the purchase of redundant or incompatible equipment, organization-by-organization, jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction, across regions.

FEMA Director Joseph M. Allbaugh summed up the situation succinctly: "We [FEMA] do not have the wherewithal to deal with 100,000 communities."

Regional compacts can help smaller local governments develop joint emergency preparedness capacities with their neighbors. Simultaneously, they can facilitate federal government contacts with first providers, by reducing them from tens of thousands to a few hundred, and assure the economic use of scarce state and federal resources.

Regional compacts are enjoying growing support from all sectors.

The U. S. Conference of Mayors calls for Metropolitan Emergency Management to "accelerate the development of regional approaches to emergency and disaster management." It argues that such a regional capacity is needed to organize supplies of emergency-response equipment and coordinate federal and state resources available during disasters. The National Association of Counties (NACO) calls for a Homeland Security Block Grant that would "enable local governments to enhance regional planning and coordination toward preventing, preparing for and managing a response to terrorism." It recently conducted a webcast to counties nationwide to "demonstrate the necessity for regional approaches to bioterrorism and strategies for achieving regionwide cooperation."

The National League of Cities has called for cooperation, coordination, and communication in emergency preparedness, with a focus on working regionally. State health officials recommend that state health departments "plan in advance for multi-jurisdictional issues with regional input." The National Emergency Management Association has recommended that "Interstate and intrastate mutual aid assistance must be recognized and supported by the federal government as an expedient, cost-effective approach to disaster response and recovery."

Most important, federal government leaders have indicated their support for regional compacts.

President George Bush and Governor Tom Ridge call for a number of regional approaches in the 2003 Fiscal Year budget.

The Office of Homeland Security's proposed "**Supporting First Providers**" program will assist state and local governments in developing comprehensive plans to prepare for and respond to terrorist attacks. It requested more than \$100 million to support state and local

governments in developing interjurisdictional agreements and mutual-aid compacts to prepare for and respond to terrorist attacks.

Through FEMA, the **“Supporting First Providers”** program will also provide support for equipment, training, and exercises. It requested \$245 million to support a coordinated, regular exercise program to improve response capabilities, practice mutual aid, and assess operational improvements and deficiencies. “Through joint planning, clear communications, comprehensive coordination, mutual aid at all levels and increased information sharing, America’s first responders can be trained and equipped to save lives in the event of a terrorist attack” (pages 9 and 10). Finally, FEMA’s 2003 budget also requests funds to train 400,000 citizen volunteers for Community Emergency Response teams.

The Office of Homeland Security’s proposed **“Defending Against Biological Terrorism”** program makes funding available “to support the development of regional mutual aid compacts. In the event of an emergency, these compacts will enable State and local emergency managers to augment local medical care providers quickly and efficiency” (page 11). In its 2003 budget statement, the Department of Health and Human Services indicates that it “is taking a new approach to managing and distributing funds for state and local bio-terrorism preparedness. This process will ensure that public health departments, hospitals, emergency medical services, and other first providers develop integrated detection and treatment systems to provide a seamless response to potential acts of terrorism.”

The Office of Homeland Security’s **“Using 21st Century Technology to Defend the Homeland”** proposes creating a uniform national threat advisory system to inform federal agencies, state and local officials, and the private sector of terrorist threats and appropriate actions. “Federal, state, and local government agencies, as well as the private sector, must work seamlessly together. Having the right system of communications—content, process, and infrastructure—is critical to bridging the existing gaps between Federal, State, and local governments, as well as the private sector.” It calls for tearing down the unwarranted information “stovepipes” (page 18).

In addition, members of the U. S. Congress have introduced legislation calling for regional approaches to emergency preparedness. For example, Representative John Larson has introduced the Municipal Preparation and Strategic Response Act (HR3161). It directs FEMA to provide grants to local governments and emergency response units to develop plans for clearly defined and coordinated responses to emergencies and to provide grants to police and fire departments for counter-terrorism training.

Targeting federal and state government and other national resources on developing and implementing regional emergency preparedness compacts today could help assure that first providers effectively address the threats to homeland security tomorrow.

Regional councils of governments, along with private and civic regional organizations, could take the lead in bringing first providers together to develop regional emergency preparedness compacts that weave together the resources and plans of individual jurisdictions. Federal and state government emergency preparedness liaisons could be assigned

to each region to coordinate training and technical assistance on the latest terrorist threats and provide financing for key compact strategies. The Alliance for Regional Stewardship, National Academy of Public Administration, National Association of Regional Councils, and national associations of first responders, and their friends, could help develop a regional learning network to share the most promising emergency preparedness tools and techniques. Together with the regional emergency preparedness liaisons, they could facilitate access to information on responses to recent terrorist attacks, such as the bombing of the Murrah Federal Office Building in Oklahoma City, or to prevent future attacks.

Investing in regional compacts could result in equally important spin-off benefits. The same regional cooperation that is critical immediately to safeguard our regions could lead to regional strategies for addressing the short-term challenge of economic recovery for businesses and neighborhoods especially affected by terrorism. And in the longer term, it could even lead to strategies for shaping sensible regional growth that help make us competitive in the global economy and live the good life at home. Regional cooperation is a common-sense approach to our shared challenges.

Promising Regional Approaches to Emergency Preparedness

Public, private, and civic regional organizations in almost every region are engaged in a wide range of regional emergency preparedness activities. Some are planning coordinated responses to natural disasters and terrorist threats, from coordinating mutual aid agreements to developing regional strategies and plans. Some are also carrying out emergency preparedness activities that benefit from regional cooperation, including conducting joint training programs and mock disaster drills for first providers, developing maps and gathering information for disaster responses, designing interjurisdictional communications systems and public-education programs, and preparing regional stockpiles of equipment and supplies.

As the need for interjurisdictional approaches to emergency preparedness has grown, so has the involvement of public, private, and civic organizations.

Public regional organizations—regional councils of governments and regional planning commissions—have the longest and most varied histories of emergency preparedness activities. Whereas most of the activities focus on developing strategies for using public resources to respond to and prevent natural disasters and now terrorist attacks, some of them include private regional organizations in their preparation, especially private hospitals and health-care resources, and prepare guides and provide training on emergency preparedness for private businesses.

Private regional organizations—regional chambers of commerce and regional growth associations—assist businesses to prepare and implement emergency preparedness plans, including developing emergency preparedness guides and conducting mock disaster drills. Some of the newer private efforts, such as in the National Capitol and Chicago regions (see descriptions below) are also collaborating with public regional organizations to develop regional strategies that address terrorist attacks.

Civic regional organizations—such as the Collaborative Regional Initiatives in California and other regional civic organizations—are just beginning to engage in emergency preparedness activities. They are serving as the “brokers” among these interests and helping to guarantee that they negotiate and implement regional emergency preparedness compacts. Regional civic organizations could help sponsor the regional summits and create the “regional commons” where new terrorist and other threats could be discussed, new components of regional compacts critiqued and adopted, and progress in implementing regional compacts shared.

This section shares information on a range of the most promising practices. The examples include regions that have addressed preparations for terrorism threats as well as natural disasters. First, it provides examples of the origins of emergency preparedness activities being implemented by regional organizations. Then, it provides examples of regional organizations that now provide a range of activities and are becoming models for regional approaches to emergency preparedness.

Sometimes, emergency preparedness activities have emerged from the monthly meetings of regional caucuses of police chiefs, fire chiefs, mayors/county commissioners, city/county managers, and other groups staffed by regional councils of governments and other regional organizations.

- **The Regional EMS Advisory Council in the Raleigh/Durham/High Point, North Carolina region** has developed a strategic plan and work program with a growing focus on disaster response and mutual aid, public education/public support, technician skills, retention and recruitment, and changes in the Medicare law. It is composed of representatives of EMS and rescue departments, hospital personnel, local governments, and consumers, and it is staffed by the Triangle J Council of Governments. The Triangle J Council of Governments has also established a critical incident stress-management team to assist first responders to deal with reactions to traumatic events (www.tjcg.dst.nc.us).
- **The Capital Region Public Safety Council in the Hartford, Connecticut region** is composed of members from the 29 municipalities and ten towns participating in the Capital Region Council of Governments. Its programs include the CAPTAIN Mobile Data Communications System that provides laptop computers to the police departments to link them to local, state, and national criminal information files. Its Capital Region Emergency Planning Committee is preparing a comprehensive Greater Hartford Disaster Management Plan (to be completed by May 2002). Its Public Safety Answering Point group is conducting a dispatching consolidation study.
- **The Metro Mayor's Caucus in the Denver region** is exploring the regional implications of emergency preparedness. It is focusing on developing a regional resource inventory, providing regional training on the Incident Command System, consolidating emergency management and preparedness initiative efforts, and creating a regionwide training and exercise program.

Sometimes, emergency preparedness activities have grown out of long-established programs for jointly testing first-provider job applicants and providing regionwide 911 services and distributing radio frequencies to first providers. Regional communications systems are critical for coordinating the activities of first providers and others during disasters. They are also becoming more critical for facilitating joint decision making between first responders and other public, private, and civic decision makers and communicating consistent messages to public, private, and civic interests regionwide:

- **The Firefighter Interregional Recruitment and Employment (FIRE) program in the Denver region** is a cooperative testing program that allows an applicant to make a single application and take a single entry-level exam to be eligible for hiring by 17 metro fire districts. A parallel program, the Centralized Organization for Police Protection (COPs) program, offers the same cooperative service for entry-level law enforcement officer applicants in 25 cities. Both programs are staffed by the Denver Regional Council of Governments (www.drcog.org).
- **The Regional Police Academy in the Dallas–Ft. Worth region** presents training programs of current and future interest to the law-enforcement profession. It is staffed by the North Central Texas Council of Governments (www.nctcg.dst.tx.us). Similarly, Texas A&M University and the Alamo Area Council of Governments coordinate training for first providers and local officials regionwide in emergency management operations (www.aacog.dst.tx.us).
- **Central Oklahoma 911, a regionwide 911 system in the Oklahoma City region**, came online in 1989 following a citizen vote to finance the program. It includes a 911

ACOG Call-Taker Institute that uses local call takers to train others in basic telecommunications and publishes the *911 Dispatch*, a quarterly publication to first providers. It is administered by the Association of Central Oklahoma Governments (www.acogok.org).

- **The Houston-Galveston Area Council 911 System, a nationwide 911 system**, was upgraded to Enhanced 911 in 1999. Its ongoing activities include providing basic and specialized call-taker training classes, maintenance of a selective routing database, collection of 911 service fees and payment of telephone bills, and distribution of public education materials. It is administered by the Houston-Galveston Area Council (www.hgac.cog.tx.us).
- **The Public Safety Radio Communications system in the Dallas–Ft. Worth region** develops and implements a plan for the effective distribution and use of radio frequencies for both mobile and base-station communications. It covers 42 counties in 4 planning regions and is administered by the North Central Texas Council of Governments (www.nctcog.dst.tx.us).

Sometimes, emergency preparedness activities have grown out the data-gathering and mapping programs of regional councils of government and other regional organizations. Almost every region has a regional database/information center providing critical information and maps for emergency preparedness activities. Maintaining accurate data on the response resources, supporting facilities, infrastructure (transportation, water and sewer, telephone, and radio, television, short-wave communications, and media), at-risk populations (elderly, infirm, disabled, children, etc.), and hazardous materials (chemical plants, gas stations, munitions/explosives, etc.) and making the data readily available during disasters is critical. Equally important, having these data available in electronic formats is critical to planning evacuation routes or designing strategies for accessing supplies and equipment as part of emergency preparedness plans.

- **The Metropolitan Service District in the Portland region** provides an example of the benefits of a sophisticated geographic information system for disaster planning and response. The Metro Area Disaster Geographic Information System (MAD GIS) offers software that contains hazard and risk data that allow even non-technical users to create maps for natural hazards mitigation, response, recovery, and preparedness planning. As a result, MAD GIS has been used to identify earthquake hazards in land-use planning and building-permit administration and to designate emergency routes to be used in major disasters. MAD GIS is a program of the METRO Council (www.metro-region.org).

Finally, some of these emergency preparedness activities are emerging from private regional organizations.

- **The East West Corporate Corridor Association (EWCCA)**, a business association in the DuPage County part of the Chicago region, has focused on developing emergency preparedness manuals for businesses. Seven years ago, EWCCA prepared an Integrated Disaster Plan and Recovery manual in collaboration with the major research laboratories in the county, such as Argonne National Labs. The manual was distributed to all research laboratories and businesses and used to develop customized safety manuals. Now, EWCCA is working with public agencies, including the Northeastern Illinois Planning

Commission, to update the manual to apply to terrorism threats. The EWCCA has established task forces to address warehousing/logistics, communications, health and welfare, finance, insurance, and mutual aid. As part of the preparation process, the EWCCA conducted a mock disaster drill in February of this year (www.ewcca.org).

Some regional organizations have begun to put all these activities together and provide the planning and coordination support needed to develop regional emergency preparedness compacts. Each of these activities is described in more detail in the exhibits in this monograph:

#1. The National Capitol Region (Washington, D.C.): Developing A New Model for Regional Emergency Preparedness Cooperation (www.mwcog.org and www.bot.org)

#2. The Columbus Region: Developing a New Model for Regional Emergency Preparedness Cooperation (www.morpc.org)

These new models focus on developing regional compacts that support the activities of first providers; give terrorist threats priority attention; engage the public, private, and civic sectors; and assure effective communications and decision-making processes in disasters. Both started with summits and are being guided by task forces of public, private, and civic representatives.

#3. The Kansas City Region: An Interstate Region with a History of Interstate Regional Emergency Preparedness Cooperation

The Mid-America Regional Council in the Kansas City interstate region has been building a base of regional approaches to emergency preparedness for more than half a century (www.marc.org).

#4. The Hampton Roads Region: Using the Federal Metropolitan Medical Response System Program for Regional Emergency Preparedness Cooperation

Similar regional approaches to developing Metropolitan Medical Response System plans have been developed in the Pittsburgh, Minneapolis/St. Paul and Denver/Aurora, Phoenix/Mesa/Glendale, and Los Angeles regions (www.hrpdc.org).

#5. The Coastal Georgia Region: Using the Federal Project Impact Program for Regional Emergency Preparedness Cooperation

The regional councils of governments in the Hampton Roads and Coastal Georgia regions successfully used federal programs to initiate regional approaches to emergency preparedness in urban and rural regions, respectively (www.coastalgeorgiardc.org).

#6. Regions in the State of Florida: State-Supported Regional Emergency Preparedness Cooperation

#7. Regions in the State of Vermont: State-Supported Regional Emergency Preparedness Cooperation

The states of Florida and Vermont foster regional approaches to emergency preparedness through all their regional planning commissions. Other states, such as New Hampshire and Texas, also support regional approaches to emergency preparedness.

EXHIBIT # 1

The National Capitol Region (Washington, D.C.): Developing a New Model for Regional Emergency Preparedness Cooperation

Task Force on Homeland Security and Emergency Preparedness (MWCOG)

www.mwcog.org

Regional Preparedness and Recovery Task Force (GWBOT)

www.bot.org

Background and Key Participating Organizations

The Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOG), which represents the two dozen local governments in the region, has taken the lead to develop a regional emergency-response plan. It is building upon the efforts of its local governments, each of which already has emergency preparedness strategies for addressing natural and artificial disasters but not terrorism. It is also building upon its own efforts to foster regional cooperation—through regional committees of fire chiefs, police chiefs, disaster and emergency preparedness workers, and health, solid-waste, water-utility, and chief administrative officers—to strengthen mutual aid agreements. Just before September 11, MWCOG released a report that its committees had prepared on pursuing a regional health response to bioterrorism threats.

The Greater Washington Board of Trade (GWBOT) has created a task force to explore how private businesses across the region should prepare for terrorist threats and identify the private-sector assets that they can use to deal with these threats. In addition, federal and state agencies in Maryland and Virginia have created task forces to develop strategies for addressing terrorist threats for their particular organizations or states. The GWBOT as well as key federal and state agencies have agreed to participate in the MWCOG process and develop a coordinated public/private strategy for addressing terrorist threats in the National Capitol Region.

Process for Preparing Regional Emergency Preparedness Strategy

The mission of the MWCOG Task Force on Homeland Security and Emergency Preparedness for the National Capitol Region is to “enhance regional preparedness and insure a coordinated regional response to future public safety challenges.” It is composed of representatives from the federal Office of Homeland Security and key federal offices, the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia emergency-management and transportation agencies and the public and private first providers across the region. The MWCOG Task Force is organized into six working groups, most of which use the existing committee structure of MWCOG—public safety, health, waste and debris management, and water and energy. Transportation uses the regional Transportation Planning Board that guides regional transportation planning. The sixth working group is in communications.

The six working groups were asked to make three types of recommendations: those for immediate implementation, those for implementation during the life of the Task Force (by April 2002), and those for longer-term implementation. Working groups developed more

than 50 recommendations, which they presented to the region at the MWCOG annual meeting in December 2001. The Task Force will make its recommendations to the MWCOG Board of Directors by April 2002 and prepare a comprehensive homeland security and emergency-response system work program in late 2003.

The mission of the GWBOT Regional Preparedness and Recovery Task Force is to “prepare for regional emergencies and economic recovery in a model public/private partnership.” Its efforts were launched at a meeting of the Potomac Conference in November 2001, bringing together public, private, and civic leaders across the region to endorse creating the Task Force and coordinating its activities with the MWCOG.

The Task Force is organized into four work groups: emergency preparedness, business and nonprofit community, economic recovery, and communications. Simultaneously with MWCOG, the GWBOT Task Force is developing recommendations for fostering the development of emergency-preparedness strategies by regional businesses and facilitating the use of private-sector assets (trained personnel, rescue and disposal equipment, communications facilities, etc.) in addressing terrorist threats. The GWBOT Task Force will make its recommendations at the next Potomac Conference meeting in April 2002 and integrate its activities and recommendations with the MWCOG Task Force.

MWCOG and GWGOT members provided the seed funding for the Task Forces. Since the National Capitol Region was one of the targets of the September 11 airplane attacks and subsequent anthrax threats, it is entitled to substantial federal government support. Approximately \$250 million will be provided to state and local governments to provide coordinated communications equipment and implement the regional emergency preparedness strategy. Approximately \$5 million of this funding will be available for regional security planning activities. Additional funding will be available for carrying out the emergency preparedness activities of federal government agencies.

Key Recommendations

The MWCOG Task Force recommendations include developing and implementing:

- A comprehensive regional emergency preparedness, coordination, and response plan that will incorporate transportation management and coordinated workforce dismissal/release policies and procedures
- A GIS-based critical infrastructure threat assessment planning tool that will collect information on critical infrastructure elements in the region
- A regional emergency communications plan that will permit local, state, and federal leaders and providers of transportation and other critical infrastructure providers to communicate on a real-time basis to coordinate and manage regional and local response
- Protocols and procedures for frequent regionally conducted exercises to test, evaluate, and revise regional and local emergency preparedness, coordination, and response plans

The MWCOG Task Force is also investigating the need for legislation to address liability issues between jurisdictions when the region’s police and fire mutual-aid agreements must be used.

The MWCOG Board of Directors has already approved establishing an initial Regional Incident Communications Center to be hosted by the District of Columbia Emergency Management Agency.

The GWBOT Task Force is focusing on “having a well-understood system of command-and-control and public information,” “knowing every business and non-profit has made plans to keep their businesses up and running,” and “having contingency plans for jobs, commerce, and ways to keep the economy pumping.”

EXHIBIT # 2

The Columbus Region: Developing a New Model for Regional Emergency Preparedness Cooperation

Regional Emergency Preparedness Task Force (MORPC)

www.morpc.org

Background and Key Participating Organizations

The Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission (MORPC), which represents the five counties and 60 municipal jurisdictions in the Columbus region, has taken the lead to develop a regional terrorism emergency preparedness strategy. It is building upon the efforts of its local governments, each of which already has emergency-preparedness strategies for addressing natural and artificial disasters, but not terrorism.

MORPC is also building upon the efforts of a coalition led by MORPC to develop a Central Ohio Regional Transportation Center (COTRAN) to “eliminate duplication, enhance communications and streamline operations in our regional transportation system by combining safety, transit and traffic professionals in a single transportation center.” COTRAN was already envisioned as an information clearinghouse before September 11, receiving and processing transportation data and turning it “into practical information that will be used to alert and prepare motorists for everything from construction delays to accidents.” Now, the Task Force is examining the feasibility of making COTRAN a regional emergency center as well.

Process for Preparing Terrorism/Preparedness Strategy

The mission of the MORPC Regional Emergency Preparedness Task Force is to “coordinate emergency preparedness and management activities on a regional basis...to work in coordination with public and private entities to develop a broad-based mutual aid mechanism for those jurisdictions who wish to participate in being able to seek and offer help and resources to those affected by a catastrophic event as well as a model regional protocol to help communities expeditiously restore and rehabilitate damaged public and private community infrastructure (including housing).”

The Task Force is organized in six working groups:

- **COTRAN (Central Ohio Regional Transportation Management Center)**—Creating a joint regional emergency center linked to regional transportation management systems within the same facility
- **Government Relations**—Securing new federal resources and relief of some current federal mandates to free up other local government resources
- **Major incidents**—Evacuation and related issues
- **Bioterrorism Protocols**
- **Enhancing Mutual Aid and Recovery Among Mid-Ohio Jurisdictions**
- **Communications**

Each of the working groups made reports early in 2002 that were combined into a joint report to MORPC and the region in February 2002.

Key Recommendations

Recommendations being considered by the MORPC Board of Directors include:

- Use MORPC as a distributor of information to local and regional government bodies about current and future efforts to address bioterrorism.
- Provide reliable communications as well as crisis backup by using the full array of communications systems available regionwide.
- Capitalize on existing and proposed incident/emergency-management and traffic-operations systems, such as CORTRAN.
- Conduct a tabletop emergency scenario to clearly illustrate the synergies between the partner systems.
- Establish a regional clearinghouse at MORPC consisting of written operational procedures, a series of general queries, and readily accessible database of available resources that may be needed in the event of a disaster or emergency.
- Formulate mutual-aid agreements between local emergency-management agencies to enhance their emergency planning and response capabilities.
- Use public agencies to assist regional businesses and industries in developing emergency procedures and disaster plans that meet the particular needs of each business entity during a critical incident.

EXHIBIT # 3

The Kansas City Region: An Interstate Region with a History of Interstate Regional Emergency Preparedness Cooperation

Mid-America Regional Council (MARC)

www.marc.org

Background

The Mid-America Regional Council (MARC) is an association of city and county governments and a metropolitan planning organization for the eight-county Kansas City metropolitan area. MARC coordinates a number of regional emergency preparedness and response efforts, including work in 911 and other emergency communications, hazardous materials incident response, emergency medical services, emergency-management planning, public-health promotion, and public information. The bistate, multijurisdictional nature of the region requires cooperation among local agencies to ensure adequate protection from significant natural or terrorist incidents. Many of the regional initiatives coordinated by MARC support the region's efforts to increase its capabilities to respond to domestic terrorism.

Since 1999, MARC has worked with federal, state, and local agencies in metropolitan Kansas City to increase the region's capabilities to respond to acts of domestic terrorism involving weapons of mass destruction (WMD). MARC has been involved with the Kansas City Metropolitan Medical Response System (MMRS) effort led by the Kansas City, Missouri, Fire Department to prepare regional response plans and design protocols, organize and conduct training for first responders and hospital personnel, purchase and distribute equipment to agencies throughout the region, and develop enhanced relationships among agencies. MARC managed two U.S. Department of Justice grants for domestic-preparedness equipment.

Specific Efforts Following September 11

Given the events of the September 11 and the anthrax threats that followed, MARC has been working with local communities to assess their emergency-management plans, security protocols and response resources; communicate with one another and the public; implement new communications systems and protocols for emergency response; and train and conduct exercises to test the region's abilities to respond.

Public Information—MARC activated a Regional Information Coordination Center on September 11 to assist local emergency-operations centers in sharing information. MARC has committed to further planning for an ongoing capability to activate a regional ICC.

As a result of Y2K, a Regional Association of Public Information Officers (RAPIO) formed. The group meets monthly and began working together after September 11 to develop a common message to the public about local capabilities and to identify cooperative public information materials. It produced two flyers to inform the public and help local government personnel respond to questions. MARC has added a page to its website,

www.marc.org/emergency/readiness.htm, and will continue to place new information on the site and link to local, state, and national information.

MARC has convened groups to discuss issues, determine joint efforts, inform constituents, and develop common public-policy agendas. MARC is working with its Metropolitan Emergency Managers Committee to produce a CD-ROM on emergency preparedness and disaster recovery.

Planning and Resource Identification—MARC is working with the MMRS and the Local Emergency Preparedness Committees to assess training and equipment needs. At the request of the Missouri Governor's Office of Homeland Security, MARC prepared a security assessment of the region's capabilities, critical assets, and needs. MARC is represented on a statewide homeland security panel.

MARC cosponsored a regional tabletop bioterrorism exercise with the Kansas City, Missouri, Health Department in late November 2001 and will continue to respond to committee and community requests for exercise coordination.

MARC is working with an organization of city and county public health directors to assess capabilities and needs to respond to bioterrorism threats, and MARC has prepared a model bioterrorism plan for local health departments.

MARC is coordinating a Radio Interoperability project that will place seventy 800-MHz radios throughout the region to allow for communications among local agencies during major incidents. MARC is working with the MMRS and MARCER to determine if new systems or improvements to existing systems are needed.

Program Implementation—MARC supports a committee of representatives from emergency medical service agencies and area hospitals, MARCER. MARCER manages a regional two-way communication system allowing EMS field crews from more than 30 agencies to communicate with area hospitals on pre-hospital care. An upgrade to this system is under way. MARCER has implemented EMSys, a web-based program that provides real-time information on hospital emergency department status for the region's 25 hospitals. This system is used to coordinate both routine and mass casualty operations. Enhancements to this system were recently completed.

MARC is designing a Metropolitan Emergency Information System that will feature a secure server housing emergency response databases accessed through the Internet. This system will allow metropolitan area agencies and hospitals to access plans, standard operating procedures, protocols, site-specific response and floor plans, etc. The system will allow local emergency response agencies to use a uniform system to track personnel at the scene of incidents. The system should be operational in late 2002.

EXHIBIT # 4

The Hampton Roads Region: Using the Federal Metropolitan Medical Response System Program for Regional Emergency Preparedness Cooperation

Hampton Roads Planning District Commission (HRPDC)

www.hrpdc.org

As a result of a three-year contract between the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission ((HRPDC) and the United States Health Service (USPHS), the Hampton Roads region of Virginia has developed one of the first Metropolitan Medical Response System (MMRS) plans in the nation. The \$1.2 million contract was awarded to the region to create a response plan and purchase pharmaceuticals and equipment to be used in the event of a Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) incident. HRPDC also plans to train first responders of all types to recognize and respond to such an event. This plan emphasizes the medical aspects of such an incident, leaving the normal response to an event under the auspices of Regional Emergency Haz-Mat teams.

What began in August of 1999 as a concept has evolved into a full-fledged plan that was created from the minds of experts in all 16 Hampton Roads jurisdictions using the talents of the emergency managers, communications experts, Fire and Paramedic personnel, laws enforcers, and public health departments—including mental-health and local hospital and military units. The HRPDC was the catalyst for this effort and convened an MMRS Steering Committee consisting of the previously mentioned experts. This Steering Committee then formed multiple subcommittees to address each area of the plan that was required by the contract. These areas include a Field Operations Guide, Health and Medical, Mortuary Affairs, Law Enforcement, Statewide Mutual Aid Agreement, Mental Health, the Military, Decontamination Procedures, Public Affairs, and Training Annexes, as well as coordination with the Virginia Department of Emergency Management and the local hospitals to be repositories of drug and equipment caches with easy access to stored supplies wherever an incident might occur.

The Plan has gone through multiple levels of review, starting with the subcommittees reporting to the Steering Committee that wrote the plan. It was subsequently submitted to our regional emergency managers and to the USPHS. Once comments were received, the subcommittees were involved in rewrites and revisions.

Now that the Plan has been submitted to USPHS for its final review, the region has recognized that a sustainability piece needs to be developed to continually revise the Plan, keep training schedules current, and replace expired pharmaceuticals and equipment. This sustainability piece consists of a Program Manager reporting to an MMRS Oversight Committee and will be funded by all 16 jurisdictions on a per capita basis in their annual budgets. The HRPDC will continue to be involved in this budget process for the first several years in order to provide continuity to the Plan. Once the Program Manager and Oversight Committee have become accustomed to the procedures, the HRPDC will turn

over all responsibility to the Tidewater Emergency Medical Services Council, Inc., which is a regional organization responsible for the effort once the Plan becomes operational. Members of the Oversight Committee include many of the authors of the Plan as well as representatives of area Haz-Mat teams, hospitals, policy, and fire and state emergency management.

As this description is being written, the Steering Committee Chairs are actively seeking volunteers to participate in the MMRS Advance and Strike Teams. These responders will be the first ones called in the event of a WMD incident. The Advance Team members will arrive within the first 30 minutes of a call, with the rest of the Strike Team members alerted and ready to move whenever called. This approach will enable all members to be used and ready to move whenever called. The Advance Team members will be the ones to assess the ongoing needs of the incident and will be the ones to advise the incident Commander that other Strike Team members are available as needed.

A redundant Emergency Operations Center (EOC) call feature is also part of the plan, with the Norfolk EOC being the prime contact, and York County's EOC the secondary. This redundancy was built into the Plan because of the unique geography of the Hampton Roads Region, which is divided by the Hampton Roads Harbor into the Peninsula and Southside areas. If an event were to occur in either place and incapacitate that EOC, the other EOC is up and running to take over the notification of the Advance and Strike Teams as needed.

Equipment and pharmaceutical caches are also somewhat redundant, with caches in every jurisdiction to ensure that whatever supplies are needed can arrive swiftly. It also lessens the possibility that an incident might occur at the site of a central cache thus totally destroy our regional supplies.

The Plan should be operational in the summer of 2002. Pharmaceuticals are already on hand, with additional stockpiles in inventory at many pharmacies, at their insistence and expense, and the equipment purchase is imminent. Once in place, our first responders will be scheduled for OSHA training on how to handle the various pieces of equipment, and the personal protective equipment (PPEs) will be distributed to hospitals, fire, and law-enforcement agencies.

EXHIBIT # 5

The Coastal Georgia Region: Using the Federal Project Impact Program for Regional Emergency Preparedness Cooperation

Coastal Georgia Regional Development Center (CGRDC)

www.coastalgeorgiadc.org

The Coastal Georgia Regional Development Center (CGRDC) has used regional approaches to bring emergency preparedness to a rural region.

South Coastal Georgia Project Impact Initiative

In 1980, CGRDC was chosen by the Federal Emergency Management Agency to coordinate the first regional—tri-county—Project Impact community in the nation. FEMA awarded Camden, Glynn, and McIntosh counties \$500,000 to “Build a Disaster Resistant Community” by developing public/private partnerships with federal, state and local government officials, as well as businesses and citizens.

Because Project Impact promotes community involvement in assessing risk, implementing projects, and minimizing the impact of future storms and hazards, CGRDC established the South Georgia Project Impact Initiative committee structure; two lead committees (the Partnership Committee and Executive Committee), and three subcommittees (Risk Assessment/Hazard Mitigation, Public Information/Human Services, and Business Sustainability)

Project Impact regularly participates in community festivals, like the Brunswick HarborFest, the Darien Blessing of the Fleet, and the Woodbine Crawfish Festival, to prepare south coastal Georgia families for hurricane season and coastal hazards. A Tri-County Hurricane Expo was held in 2001 to bring storm-preparedness demonstrations and products to citizens. Other projects include building a mobile disaster-resistant demonstration home, preparing disaster-education pamphlets, retrofitting a county emergency-management agency office, preparing hurricane storm surge maps, and retrofitting schools, police stations, and city and county halls for generator readiness.

Flood Plain Map Modernization Demonstration Project

During the late 1960s, the federal government established the National Flood Insurance Program to subsidize flood insurance as a means of assisting those residents of the United States whose homes may be vulnerable to flooding because of storms or snowmelt. To determine which structures may be at the risk of flooding, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) issued Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) to identify the location and elevation of these structures.

Many of these maps were issued in the 1970s and 1980s. In the meantime, a number of factors, such as the development of many coastal areas and improved mapping techniques, have created a great demand for updates to these original maps. In many large urban areas that have the available resources, map modernization efforts are under way. However, in rural areas, smaller governmental organizations often lack the resources to carry out this work.

Seeing the need for up-to-date maps for the rural areas, FEMA selected CGRDC to conduct a pilot project that would develop the techniques and methods for modernizing floodplain maps for rural jurisdictions in a cost effective and methodical manner that could be used by regional development organizations in the future.

The CGRDC is beginning the process to create the accurate, up-to-date flood hazard maps for the rural area that the CGRDC serves, as well as developing the prototype that can be used elsewhere in rural areas in the country to develop up-to-date floodplain maps. The cost of the project, which began in September 2001, is \$400,000.

The CGRDC serves nine counties that encompass the entire coastline of the state, so it includes many areas that are particularly prone to flooding. The counties that may be mapped will include those in the rural areas, i.e., the counties of Bulloch, Bryan, Camden, Effingham, Liberty, Long, and McIntosh. A final report and technical manual describing the techniques used will be completed in order that other rural areas across the nation can use it for their own mapping updates.

The project will be implemented with a number of federal and state agency partners. The project will cover a period of three years and is organized into four phases. The first phase will be a mapping needs assessment. It will evaluate the seven-county area to determine a priority of mapping needs. This evaluation will include collecting existing base data from appropriate sources and ranking them by use of a weighted matrix that is to be developed. This phase will last for six months.

Phase 2 will include the development of composite base and topographic mapping with detailed flood elevations in the counties approved for remapping by the FEMA. Phase 3 will be the application of the revised/updated flood studies to create new preliminary countywide digital FIRMs for the counties studied in Phase 2. Phase 2 and Phase 3 will each take place over a one-year period.

The last phase of the project will be the outreach portion whereby local governments in our region will be trained in the use of the mapping technique, including the incorporation of mapping into other Geographical Information System (GIS) products. This phase will be completed in a six-month time frame.

EXHIBIT # 6

Regions in the State of Florida: State-Supported Regional Emergency Preparedness Cooperation

Regional Domestic Security Task Forces

<http://www.doh.state.fl.us/terrorism/>

Florida Regional Councils Association

Sheri Coven

850-488-6211

The State of Florida has supported regional approaches to emergency preparedness for a variety of threats. Regional planning councils have a long history of staffing Local Emergency Planning Committees to address hazardous materials threats and prepare hurricane emergency evacuation plans. Chambers of commerce have worked with the regional planning councils to assist businesses to prepare for hurricane seasons.

After September 11, Governor Jeb Bush created seven Regional Domestic Security Task Forces to improve Florida's ability to detect and prevent potential terrorist threats. In addition, he created the Florida Domestic Security Advisory Panel, chaired by Orlando Mayor Glenda Hood, to make recommendations for strengthening the state's capacity to enhance domestic security and combat terrorist activities.

Background

Florida's Regional Planning Councils (RPCs) provide a consistent geographic infrastructure within which planning and technical assistance activities and regional initiatives are developed and implemented. RPCs are Florida's only multi-purpose regional entities that are in a position to plan for and coordinate intergovernmental solutions to growth-related problems, which extend beyond the boundaries of a single local government. There are 11 RPCs in Florida, each governed by a Board of Directors that sets the Council's work program and budget. All of Florida's 67 counties are represented on the RPCs, along with approximately 100 of Florida's 405 incorporated municipalities. Due to their membership and structure, RPCs have a strong direct public policy and fiscal accountability to the local governments they serve. As conveners in their Regions, RPCs strive to articulate those multi-jurisdictional issues that need resolving, and through intergovernmental coordination, champion the unique themes of Florida's 11 Regions.

Common to all Regions has been the issue of public safety, not only due to Florida's susceptibility to certain natural disasters, but particularly in light of the events of September 11, 2001. The purpose of this white paper is to briefly describe the role played by Florida's RPCs in the area of emergency preparedness. This includes assisting the public and emergency responders to address hazardous materials public safety issues and natural disaster preparedness, as well as to assist the Governor in his efforts to assess the State's vulnerability to potential terrorist attacks.

Local Emergency Planning Committees (LEPCs)

LEPCs were created in the late 1980s to help the public and emergency responders address hazardous materials public safety issues. The focus of the committees is on hazardous materials planning, training, regional coordination, education, and awareness. LEPCs in Florida are organized in conjunction with the eleven Regional Planning Councils, which provide staff support with funding from the Florida Department of Community Affairs. LEPC members are appointed by the State Emergency Response Commission for Hazardous Materials (SERC), a policy board appointed by the Governor, which administers the hazardous materials laws for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency at the Florida level; and at the local level, through the 11 LEPCs statewide. Membership in the LEPC includes representatives from many occupational categories including firefighting, emergency management, law enforcement, first aid or Emergency Medical Services, health, community organizations such as the Red Cross, facility owners and operators, the media, local environmental agencies, elected and non-elected local officials, and interested citizens.

Many LEPCs offer training courses in the areas of hazardous materials awareness, incident command, air monitoring, decontamination, and confined space rescue. Many LEPCs also offer terrorism response training. Valuable training opportunities are also offered by the LEPCs through multi-agency, multi-county regional disaster exercises. LEPCs also serve as a local mechanism to compile and analyze information regarding facilities that store large quantities of extremely hazardous chemicals.

LEPC activities include a planning component, in which natural disaster and evacuation issues are addressed. This is accomplished through the development of regionally specific Comprehensive Emergency Management Plans and agency response procedures. Regionally specific planning activities also take place. For instance, the North Central Florida RPC helped to create the North Central Florida Regional Hazardous Materials Response Team, by assisting in writing an interlocal agreement, which was initially signed by five counties and three municipalities, to create an organizational framework to allow responders from different agencies improve their emergency response capabilities. In the Apalachee Region, the Council is presently involved in coordinating an initiative creating a Tri-State Hazardous Materials Response Compact among fire departments in Florida, Georgia and Alabama. A final example is provided by the Tampa Bay RPC's work with the U.S. Coast Guard Marine Safety Office in Tampa, in the area of spill contingency planning. Council staff also chairs the Coast Guard's Preparedness Subcommittee.

Natural Disaster Preparedness

The role of the RPCs in natural disaster preparedness began with development of the nation's first hurricane preparedness plans. In fact, several RPCs pioneered the hurricane evacuation planning study methods commonly used today as a nationwide standard. Although a consistent source of funding is not available to carry out the many duties associated with natural disaster preparedness, the RPCs continue to find non-recurring funding sources to support their role in this arena. For instance, they continue to repeatedly update the hurricane preparedness plans to keep the state's natural disaster planning efforts

current. These plans include components that address public information; evacuation routes; direction, volume and timing of traffic; and public and private shelter availability and capacity.

This regional approach also serves as the basis for the Councils' role in providing technical assistance to local governments. One of the most recent technical activities is an ongoing endeavor by the RPCs to develop and keep up to date Local Mitigation Strategies, a key element in local government comprehensive plan implementation. At the request of the North Florida Area of the Florida Emergency Preparedness Association, the Northeast Florida RPC created the North Florida Area Evacuation Information Utility. The utility is a web-based tool that allows instant communication between authorized users during emergency evacuations. The South Florida RPC prepared a Hurricane Survival Guide for small businesses. Together with local chambers of commerce, the guide assists in planning and preparing for hurricane seasons, and in the recovery phase in the event a business is damaged during a hurricane.

Domestic Security

Given the events of September 11, 2001, the new challenge of domestic security is also moving towards a regional approach in Florida. On October 11, 2001, Governor Jeb Bush signed Executive Order 2001-300, creating a Regional Domestic Security Task Force in each of the Florida Department of Law Enforcement's (FDLE's) seven regions. The goals of each Task Force include: (1) coordinating domestic security efforts among local, state, and federal resources to ensure such efforts are not fragmented or unnecessarily duplicative; (2) coordinating appropriate domestic security training for local and state personnel; (3) coordinating the collection and dissemination of investigative and intelligence information; and (4) facilitating responses to terrorist incidents within each region.

Through their own initiative, the RPCs contacted the FDLE Regional Directors and the Department of Community Affairs' Division of Emergency Management, to encourage these agencies to partner with the LEPCs to accomplish the goals of the Domestic Security Task Forces, particularly given the existing statewide emergency response infrastructure created by the eleven LEPCs. To further cement this relationship, a representative of FDLE was invited to the February, 2002, meeting of the Florida Regional Councils Association (the statewide association of Florida's 11 RPCs), for an exchange of information and ideas.

The level of participation of each RPC and/or its LEPC in the activities of the Regional Domestic Security Task Forces varies from one Region to the next. Most are now serving on the Task Force in their Region and provide much of the data needed to assess the conditions and resources in each Region. For instance, the Northeast Florida RPC assisted in developing an initial draft report of the vulnerability assessment criteria specific to potential terrorist threats in the Northeast Florida Region.

The Apalachee RPC is working with the 13-county Tallahassee Area Domestic Security Task Force to provide planning support to its Emergency Management and Fire Department Subcommittees. In addition to providing the subcommittees with information describing the approximately 500 facilities storing large quantities of extremely hazardous

chemicals in the 13-county region, staff identified all law enforcement and fire departments in the response area and provided information describing the level of hazardous materials training and incident command training provided to responders prior to the events of September 11, 2001. At FDLE's request, the Apalachee RPC is also coordinating terrorism response training for first response agencies in the Domestic Security Task Force region.

As the Regional Domestic Security Task Forces delve more deeply into their assigned tasks, including response, hazardous materials, and agency capacity assessments, traffic control and evacuation plan data collection, and public awareness and information sharing, the role of Florida's RPCs and their LEPCs will become even more important to this statewide initiative. RPCs have the capability to ensure that the level of interagency coordination and communication necessary to meet the goals of the Regional Domestic Security Task Forces are carried out.

EXHIBIT # 7

Regions in the State of Vermont: State-Supported Regional Emergency Preparedness Cooperation

Regional Planning Emergency Preparedness Committee

Kevin Geiger
802-457-3188

Regional Planning Commissions – Disaster Prevention Planning

Most people would not connect Vermont's regional planning commissions (RPCs) with emergency management activities, but the fit is logical and the growing work that RPCs are undertaking with municipalities and the State in emergency management is impressive. Regional planning commissions initiated efforts when they assisted towns and the State in creating the Enhanced 9-1-1 system. This connected many RPCs and local emergency officials for the first time. Then they started to help towns respond to the string of disasters that have hit the State in the past several years, and soon realized that many towns did not have the resources to do comprehensive emergency planning. Planning for emergencies is very similar to other planning processes, and issues such as development in floodplains and transportation planning took on another facet as RPCs started to connect land uses and disaster effects.

Now, RPCs are involved in everything from emergency drills at Vermont Yankee and replacing undersized culverts on town roads, to working in the Vermont Emergency Operations Center and helping towns recover their costs from floods. All of this work continues the tradition of service to municipalities and makes them stronger and safer. RPCs have also bolstered the state's own efforts in preparing for disasters. Below is a sampling of the many activities we have undertaken in recent years and anticipate in the near future.

Creating Disaster-Resistant Communities

RPCs have led the way on creating more disaster-resistant communities under the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Project Impact grant program. In most other states, this program is handled at the individual municipal level, but four of Vermont's RPCs have applied for and received these funds so that dozens of towns have benefited from this program. Through this program, RPCs have helped to educate the public and local officials on many disaster topics, and have also produced concrete actions to lessen future disasters. RPCs have partnered with towns, federal and state agencies and local responders on a wide variety of projects. These have included: culvert upgrades, road drainage enhancements, emergency generators, installing automatic rain gages to warn of flooding, stabilizing streambanks, studying communications needs, providing local training programs, conducting watershed hazard analysis and relocating citizens to homes in new locations outside of the floodplain. The Project Impact grants have brought in more than \$2 million dollars in federal funds and will save towns money and prevent damage far into the future.

Local Emergency Planning

Regional planning commissions' have used significant amounts of their core state funding to match grants from FEMA to assist communities in local emergency planning work. This has varied from preparing Rapid Response Plans and hazard mitigation plans, to incorporating mitigation planning (especially in flood prone areas) into local comprehensive plans and zoning as part of our routine work. We have also worked with municipalities to adopt access policies and codes and standards for roadway reconstruction that will result in more disaster resistant infrastructure. We will continue to work throughout the state in the next year to enhance local plans and to work with local officials to increase their ability to deal with disasters.

State-level Planning and Preparedness

Planners from Vermont's RPCs are now familiar faces at places like FEMA Region I's Regional Operations Center, Vermont's Emergency Operations Center and the Vermont Yankee Media Center. We are assisting VEM with revising the state's Emergency Operation Plan, chairing the state Hazard Mitigation Committee, serving on the Terrorism Task Force Advisory Council and are working with VEM on training for local emergency coordinators. Our role in most of these ventures is not to be that of an emergency responder, but to ensure that towns are aware of State and federal initiatives and to advise these initiatives so that they are sensitive to the particular needs of Vermont's municipalities. As with many other issues in addition to emergency management, RPCs are a critical link up to, and down from, the State. New federal requirements on local and state mitigation plans will necessitate the involvement of RPCs to make sure that disaster aid funds will not be lost in future events.

Supporting the Pursuit of Regional Emergency Preparedness Compacts

The stage has been set for fostering the development of regional emergency preparedness compacts to safeguard our citizens, institutions, and businesses. The need is clear: to develop the capacity to address terrorist threats wherever they occur across regions. The support is coalescing as public, private, and civic leaders and citizens call for and participate in developing regional approaches for emergency preparedness.

Most important, the federal government is calling for a new relationship built on mutual cooperation, collaboration, and partnership. This new relationship needs to work most effectively at the regional level, where regional emergency preparedness compacts assure that first providers are trained, informed, and working as a team and state and federal governments are providing supporting technical and financial assistance.

The federal government is building on its base of existing programs that have provided some support for regional approaches to emergency preparedness.

The Metropolitan Medical Response Systems program, offered by the Office of Emergency Preparedness of the Department of Health and Human Services, is already supporting approximately 100 “cities” to develop plans to coordinate public safety, public health, and health services sector responses to terrorist incidents. Most of these plans are driven by central cities, but a few cover multiple jurisdictions and at least one is fully regional, in the Hampton Roads region. OEP is more actively encouraging regional cooperation by requiring neighboring city contractors to coordinate the updating of their plans. OEP is proposing to expand this program to 200 metropolitan areas in the next five years and create a counterpart “balance of the nation” strategy for the rest of the country. A relatively continuous stream of planning funding—and priority for funding implementation of MMRS plans—goes to current and, presumably, future participants in the MMRS program.

The Department of Health and Human Services also offers grants to state governments to strengthen their capacity to respond to bioterrorism and other public health emergencies resulting from terrorism. It announced \$1.1 billion in new grants in January 2002 to be released upon approval of state plans for the use of the funds. At least two of the HHS “critical benchmarks” guiding the preparation of these state plans call for regional cooperation: a. Prepare a time line for the development of regional plans for bio-preparedness and response for a bioterrorist event, infectious disease outbreak, or other public health emergency; b. Develop a time line for implementation of regional hospital plans that would accommodate in an emergency at least 500 patients. These plans are due no later than April 15, 2002.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency supports the development of emergency recovery and mitigation plans, mostly through individual state and local governments. It encourages partnerships and intergovernment cooperation through its Project Impact and Hazard Mitigation Grants programs. Its recently announced coordinated pre- and post-disaster emergency management planning program makes an even stronger pitch for regional cooperation by promoting the preparation of multi-jurisdictional plans and

requiring that regional agencies—as well as businesses, academia, and other private and nonprofit interests—have an opportunity to participate in the planning process. A number of states—such as Florida—have reinforced this approach, which supports regional approaches to preparing for hurricanes and other natural disasters statewide.

As the first section noted, the Office of Homeland Security is proposing to build on these programs in the 2003 Fiscal Year by supporting state and local governments in developing comprehensive plans to prepare for and respond to terrorist threats. FEMA is also requesting \$350 million in 2003 to update and digitize Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs), 63% of which are more than ten years old and a third of which are more than 15 years old. Some 270 communities are not mapped at all. This effort will provide maps and update critical information for preparing regional emergency preparedness compacts in the regions subject to floods.

This section presents recommendations to facilitate the development of regional emergency preparedness compacts:

- **Recommendation #1:** Hold Regional Homeland Security Summits
- **Recommendation #2:** Conduct Demonstrations of New Models of Regional Emergency Preparedness Compacts
- **Recommendation #3:** Create a Learning Network for Preparing Regional Compacts
- **Recommendation #4:** Give Priority to Preparing Regional Emergency Preparedness Compacts
- **Recommendation #5:** Designate Federal and State Liaisons to Regions That Are Developing Regional Compacts
- **Recommendation #6:** Give Priority to Implementing Regional Terrorism/Preparedness Strategies

Federal government support is especially critical now. It, more than any other investment, will provide the catalyst needed to reward existing efforts and foster new ones to develop regional emergency preparedness compacts in each of the nation's regions. The federal government needs to be a leader in encouraging all levels of government, together with the private and civic sectors, to experiment with a new "networked compact" approach to replace the old "stovepiped hierarchy" approach. If it does, our capacity to respond to any new challenges, terrorist or otherwise, affecting our growth and development and the quality of our lives will be strengthened in the future.

RECOMMENDATION # 1:

Hold Regional Homeland Security Summits

To facilitate bringing public, private, and civic interests together to explore the merits of preparing regional emergency preparedness compacts, federal and state governments could provide matching funds for holding regional emergency preparedness summits.

At these summits, regional organizations could share background information on the state of emergency preparedness in the region. Representatives from other regions could share

examples of the range of regional approaches being used elsewhere. State and federal governments could share existing and proposed programs that could support the design and implementation of regional emergency preparedness compacts. Participants could assess the merits of pursuing the preparation of a regional emergency preparedness compact, and, if desirable, create an organizing committee to design a process for launching its preparation.

RECOMMENDATION # 2:

Conduct Demonstrations of New Models of Regional Emergency Preparedness Compacts

To test new approaches for preparing regional emergency preparedness compacts, federal and state governments, in collaboration with other public, private, and foundation groups, could sponsor five to ten demonstrations in regions across the country. These demonstrations could represent a variety of regions, including metropolitan and rural, large and small, intrastate and interstate, and even international along the Canadian and Mexican borders. These demonstrations could also test federal and state approaches for working with regions, such as regional approaches for communicating federal government information, training first providers, accessing federal and state disaster resources, and distributing federal and state funding for equipment and supplies.

It might be possible to fund these demonstrations through existing federal programs, especially those described earlier for HHS and FEMA. Regional approaches have already been tested in a limited number of regions, such as the Hampton Roads and Coastal Georgia regions that the prior section described. New regional applications are being made, and encouraged by federal officials, in both programs. For example, the MMRS plan for the Kansas City region originally focused on Kansas City. Now, the Mid-American Regional Council is staffing the expansion of this plan to cover a larger part of this bistate region.

The demonstrations could especially test new approaches for making compacts work regionwide, across public, private, and civic sectors, successfully. A number of approaches, such as incident demand systems and emergency management centers, have been extensively tested in individual and adjoining jurisdictions. The demonstrations could test them at a multi-jurisdictional, regional scale. Moreover, they could test options for measuring the progress and assessing the performance of regional compacts to assure steady progress in their implementation and building effective working relationships among local public, private, and civic interests and state and federal governments.

Additional regional summits could be held as various components of the regional emergency preparedness compact are completed. Public, private, and civic participants could be asked to critique the components and pledge support—technical, financial, political, etc.—to their implementation. Additionally, progress in the implementation of the regional compact could be shared at these summits.

The benefit of using existing federal and state programs is that they might require little or no new funding. Because they have the potential to be refunded in the future, they help assure that any regional approaches have a greater chance of becoming institutionalized, as opposed to being single-shot pilot projects.

The demonstrations could be administered and their progress monitored by the regional emergency preparedness learning network. In addition, the learning network could assess the performance of the demonstrations and share their results with other regions. (See Recommendation #3.)

RECOMMENDATION # 3:

Create a Learning Network for Preparing Regional Compacts

To assist regions in designing and implementing regional emergency preparedness compacts, federal and state governments, in collaboration with private, civic, and foundation groups, could support the creation of a regional emergency preparedness learning network of national organizations.

The learning network could first survey the technical and other support needs of regions in preparing regional emergency preparedness compacts. On the basis of the survey, it could provide a variety of services, including sharing information among regions designing regional compacts, commissioning research on new models of regional compacts and measures for monitoring their performance, assessing the merits of alternative models for regional emergency preparedness, and holding periodic workshops and conferences on the state of regional emergency preparedness.

Most important, it could be a peer-to-peer network sharing information among regions through publications and a website. It could exchange information on the experiences of regions in designing and implementing regional compacts, even hosting list serves for regions to share this experience in real time, interactively. It could share most promising practices in joint training, mock disaster drills, communications and other standards, and mutual aid agreements. It could share information on the latest tools and techniques, such as on geographic information systems, decision-making software, and performance measures. It could share the results of assessments of regional compact demonstrations and research conducted on new regional emergency preparedness models. It could provide an online surveying tool to update the technical and other support needs of regions in preparing preparedness compacts. It could even establish a mentoring program, matching up experienced regions with those that are just beginning to develop regional compacts.

Finally, the learning network could work with federal and state agencies to prepare guides and other tools that would facilitate the preparation of regional emergency preparedness compacts and tie them to state and federal planning processes. For example, FEMA has prepared excellent CD-ROM guides on disaster mitigation resources and estimating potential losses from natural disasters (HAZUS).

The National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA), which has a long history of conducting similar examinations for federal agencies, could take the lead in developing the regional emergency preparedness learning network. It could explore the purposes of creating such a network, develop options for its potential activities, and design a work program for guiding its implementation. NAPA could establish a working group of representatives of national associations of local, regional, state, and federal agencies; private and civic groups; and first providers to guide the examination process.

Based on the results of NAPA's examination, federal and state governments, with the collaboration of private, civic, and foundation groups, such as the Alliance for Regional Stewardship, could support the establishment of the regional emergency preparedness learning network.

RECOMMENDATION # 4:

Give Priority to Preparing Regional Emergency Preparedness Compacts

Beyond demonstrations, federal and state governments could give priority to preparing regional emergency compacts in all regions, nationally.

In its February 2002 report, the Congressional Research Service suggests that "Congress could condition the receipt of federal grants on state governments organizing and formalizing regional mutual aid compacts to cover every locality in the state. While most localities throughout the United States are already signatories of mutual aid compacts, some observers argue that states and localities rely too often on informal agreements and should formalize their compacts. Advocates assert that by formalizing compacts in a written contract, state and local governments can better prepare for response by eliminating potential legal and administrative obstacles. A written agreement can also help emergency managers by providing a menu of resources available for response. Congress could promote such compacts, if it concurred in this view, by conditioning federal funds on a state's progress toward this goal" (page 17). CRS also suggests that the federal government could provide more funding for joint state/local training and exercises to "test and evaluate existing state and local response plans as well as mutual aid compacts" (page 19).

FEMA and HHS could give priority to regional applications for support in the next round of funding for regional emergency preparedness planning. In fact, doing so is the logical next step for the Metropolitan Medical Responses System program offered by the Department of Health and Human Services. Having funded individual cities to prepare MMRS plans, MMRS is now encouraging coordination of plans among neighboring cities, such as among Phoenix, Mesa and Glendale in the greater Phoenix region. FEMA and HHS could also enter into contracts with regional organizations to foster cooperation and provide coverage for the smaller jurisdictions left out of current plans.

FEMA and HHS could also support the preparation of regional planning guides and offer technical assistance for the preparation of regional emergency preparedness compacts. Finally, they could set a target of developing regional emergency preparedness compacts in all regions, nationally, building on the commitment that HHS has made for developing Metropolitan Medical Response Systems in 200 metropolitan areas in the next five years and creating a counterpart "balance of the nation" strategy for the rest of the country.

State governments could give similar priority to developing regional emergency preparedness compacts border-to-border, and encourage and facilitate interstate compacts where regions cut across state boundaries, such as the National Capitol Region, which includes parts of two states and the District of Columbia.

RECOMMENDATION # 5:

Designate Federal and State Liaisons to Regions That Are Developing Regional Compacts

To facilitate communication between federal and state governments and first providers and reward the steady implementation of regional emergency preparedness compacts, federal and state governments could designate liaisons to regions that are preparing regional compacts.

In the same February 2002 report, the Congressional Research Service raises the suggestion of creating a coordinating office, either in FEMA or the Office of Homeland Security. Such an office could undertake a number of activities, including maintaining a one-stop “clearinghouse” of assistance programs, ensuring that relevant agencies advertise accurate information on their programs, monitoring the content and availability of training courses, monitoring the use of funds by recipients to ensure that congressional (and executive branch) goals are being met, and suggesting measures for streamlining the application process (page 11).

Such an office could designate liaisons to each of the regions that are preparing regional emergency preparedness compacts to facilitate the design and implementation of the compacts. Equally important, these regional liaisons could provide two-way communications between federal agencies and first providers. State governments could designate similar liaisons to foster the preparation of regional emergency preparedness compacts border-to-border.

RECOMMENDATION # 6:

Give Priority to Implementing Regional Terrorism/Preparedness Strategies

Finally, to facilitate the implementation of regional emergency preparedness compacts, federal and state governments could provide priority funding for their implementation. Doing so would also have the added benefit of making sure that requests for assistance are consistent with and reinforce, not overlap with or duplicate, the requests of neighboring jurisdictions.

Recommended Reading

Canada, Ben, "State and Local Preparedness for Terrorism: Policy Issues and Options," Congressional Research Service, Washington, D.C., February, 2002

Federal Emergency Management Agency, Project Impact, www.fema.gov

Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Emergency Preparedness, Metropolitan Medical Response System program, www.hhs.gov

Office of Homeland Security, "Securing the Homeland and Strengthening the Nation," Washington, D.C., February, 2002, www.whitehouse.gov/homeland

Special Report on Homeland Security, CQ Daily Monitor, Washington, D.C., February 7, 2002

About the Author

William R. Dodge is a regional consultant advising community leaders and citizens on strengthening their capacity to address tough regional challenges. He is the former Executive Director of the National Association of Regional Councils and the author of *Regional Excellence: Governing Together to Compete Globally and Flourish Locally*, a guide sharing the range of approaches for fostering regional cooperation. He is currently working on a new book, tentatively *The Triumph of the Commons: Eight Steps to Regional Governance Excellence*, a guide sharing alternative models and a strategy for strengthening regional governance.

William R. Dodge
7112 Exfair Road
Bethesda, MD 20814
301-718-9677
WilliamRDodge@aol.com

About the Alliance for Regional Stewardship

The Alliance is a national, peer-to-peer learning network of regional leaders who benefit by sharing experiences and working collaboratively on innovative approaches to common regional challenges. The Alliance is for proven leaders who recognize the interdependencies of their regions' economy, environment, and society—and are seeking practical ways to effect change. These leaders can come from business, government, education, or community sectors, but they share a common commitment to collaborative action and regional stewardship.

The Alliance supports regional stewardship by helping leaders learn about best practices from other regions, communicate to state/federal leaders and the media about regional challenges and innovations, and develop new leaders to regional civic efforts.

Alliance activities include:

- Semi-annual leadership forums
- Ongoing communities of interest and web conferences
- Monthly e-newsletter
- Monograph series on key regional topics
- Innovation scans of regional best practices
- Media roundtables to bring regional leaders and professionals together
- Pathways to regional stewardship projects

For more information about the Alliance for Regional Stewardship, please visit our website at www.regionalstewardship.org



785 Castro Street, Suite A
Mountain View, CA 94041
650-404-8120

© 2002 Alliance for Regional Stewardship. All rights reserved.