



# **FY 2006 Homeland Security Grant Program**

## **After Action Report**

**September 2006**



**Homeland  
Security**

**Preparedness Directorate's  
Office of Grants and Training**

# **FY 2006 HSGP After Action Conference Summary**

## **Overview**

The Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) is the Department of Homeland Security's (DHS) primary means of homeland security assistance to state and local communities. As such, HSGP is one of DHS' most important and visible mechanisms to manage national strategic risk.

Fiscal Year (FY) 2006 marks the first HSGP grant cycle in which the Interim National Preparedness Goal is in place to identify National Priorities and guide the focus of state and local expenditures. This common planning framework, and the tools that support it, allows states and local communities to better understand our current level of preparedness, identify how prepared we need to be, and determine how to prioritize efforts to close the gap.

In FY 2006, building on state and local partner feedback, DHS introduced a new funding approach that aligns HSGP resources with the National Priorities established by the Interim National Preparedness Goal. Grant allocations were based primarily on two factors:

1. analysis of relative risk to assets, populations, and geographic areas; and
2. analysis of the anticipated effectiveness of state and urban area grant proposals in addressing their identified homeland security needs.

In FY 2006, HSGP provided approximately \$1.7 billion for state and local preparedness through the following grant programs: the State Homeland Security Program, the Urban Areas Security Initiative, the Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program, the Metropolitan Medical Response System, and the Citizen Corps Program.

The HSGP After Action Conference was held in San Diego, California on July 11 and 12, 2006 to solicit feedback from state and local partners on the overall FY 2006 HSGP process; as well as suggestions for FY 2007 and future fiscal years. Approximately 130 state and local representatives from 46 states and territories participated, and actively contributed through four working groups that focused on homeland security planning, HSGP guidance and application, the effectiveness analysis, and the risk analysis. Each working group reviewed a portion of the FY 2006 HSGP process and developed recommendations to improve it moving forward.

This After Action Report represents state and local feedback and suggestions, and should not be considered to represent DHS' formal review of the FY 2006 HSGP process.

## ***FY 2006 Successes***

Overall, state and local partners agreed that the FY 2006 preparedness planning process was the most effective and constructive thus far. It required states and territories to focus on mapping goals and objectives to a common planning framework with a focus well beyond FY 2006. The process helped to underscore the reality that HSGP funds are not entitlement programs. The application process also aided state and local planners in defining how their goals would be achieved and what additional funding sources beyond HSGP could be utilized to help achieve those goals. Furthermore, the FY 2006 process helped to standardize state and local programmatic focus around key homeland security capabilities and increased accountability across all levels of government. In determining anticipated effectiveness, state and local partners concurred that the FY 2006 peer review process worked well, noting that the balanced review panels had vast experience and the knowledge necessary to objectively evaluate the applications.

## ***Recommendations for FY 2007 and Future Fiscal Years***

State and local partners suggested many substantive recommendations for improving upon the HSGP process for FY 2007 and future fiscal years. While there were many recommendations for improving certain elements of the HSGP process, state and local partners agreed that the overall HSGP process is sound and the Department should ensure stability in the process by building upon this foundation.

For the purposes of this HSGP After Action Conference Summary, the recommendations from state and local partners are summarized below. These recommendations are organized by each of the four working groups on the HSGP process but are not prioritized.

### **Working Group 1- Homeland Security Planning:**

1. Build upon the HSGP process, but do not dramatically change it since it has been the most effective planning process to date.
2. Provide guidance and examples for new requirements and the relationships between existing requirements.
3. Develop a set calendar, with advance notice on new requirements.
4. Keep focus on national and state/local priorities throughout the planning process and do not increase the number of capabilities in the Target Capabilities List.
5. Develop a planning cycle – conduct risk assessment, conduct capability assessment, update Homeland Security Strategy, update Enhancement Plan, and translate into Investment Justification.

6. Provide additional guidance on a DHS-comparable risk assessment methodology that state and local planners can employ to determine their jurisdiction-specific risks.
7. Develop new technical assistance services and build on existing services, develop new hire education, and provide ongoing resource information to states and territories through a single source.
8. Identify potential links among the State and/or Urban Area Homeland Security Strategies, Enhancement Plan, and Investment Justification.
9. Allow state, territory, and urban area representatives to present their own State and/or Urban Area Homeland Security Strategy to the DHS Strategy Review Board.
10. Provide additional guidance on and incentives for states and territories to demonstrate regionalization.

#### **Working Group 2- HSGP Guidance and Application:**

1. Move “nice to have” information that is currently in the appendices (i.e. geospatial guidance, cyber security guidance) to other documents and provide links as reference materials.
2. Provide the grant guidance in both Microsoft Word and Adobe Acrobat formats.
3. Include the application scoring criteria in the program guidance and application kit.
4. Ensure that end user requirements drive the design and functionality of the G&T secure portal utilized for the Investment Justification. These requirements would include spell check, funding formulas, graphics, ease of printing, etc.
5. Utilize a page limit per Investment Justification rather than character limits to allow flexibility for the applicant to determine the amount of detail for each question/section while still maintaining limitations.
6. Condense/consolidate the 17 questions from the Investment Justification into the following five areas:
  - Background/Scope/Scalability of Investment
  - Impact
  - Funding Plan
  - Long-Term Plan/Institutionalization

- Regionalization (including tribal and international partners)

7. Add an area in the Investment Justification that allows applicants to direct readers to specific sections of the Enhancement Plan to provide greater context about the overall Initiative that the Investment supports.
8. Allow greater coordination with Preparedness Officers throughout the application process.

### **Working Group 3- Effectiveness Analysis:**

1. Keep overall process simple, streamlined, and repeatable. The overall framework and groundwork should remain the same and consistent as much as possible, recognizing that guidance comes from Congress.
2. Further refine questions and scoring criteria and provide additional scoring guidance during the peer review process.
3. Reformat the Investment Justification template to be a more flexible template and contain some level of a budget narrative.
4. Strive for more realistic timelines to the extent possible.
5. Eliminate the overall Investment Justification score; instead incorporate its components into the individual Investment scores and have the individual Investments speak for themselves.
6. Provide more transparency in the process by including better access to peer reviewer comments. DHS should also provide better guidance to peer review panels so that the comments are more useful to applicants.
7. Communicate upfront how the effectiveness analysis will affect HSGP allocations.
8. Develop a white paper or after action report that is provided to all applicants regarding lessons learned about the peer review process from a peer reviewer perspective. This white paper could form the basis of a technical assistance program.
9. Maintain the balanced approach employed in the FY 2006 peer review process, including composition of the panels, the number of Investment Justifications reviewed by each reviewer, the number of Investments in each Investment Justification, the range of subject matter experts, etc.
10. Consider having urban areas develop an Enhancement Plan separate from the state or as an annex to the state's Enhancement Plan.

11. Consider allowing state, territory, and urban area representatives to be present or contacted during the peer review.

**Working Group 4- Risk Analysis:**

1. Provide detailed briefings to state and local partners on the core components of the risk methodology used in the FY 2006 process.
2. Establish/convene a working group of federal, state, and local representatives to provide additional input on the specific components of the risk analysis process.
3. Involve state and local representatives in the data vetting process.

The open dialogue among all partners at the FY 2006 HSGP After Action Conference provided valuable input that will assist in building upon the FY 2006 HSGP process. This input will improve HSGP for future years and assist in improving the nation's overall preparedness.

# Table of Contents

<b>FY 2006 HSGP After Action Conference Summary</b> .....	<b>i</b>
<b>I. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FY 2007 AND FUTURE FISCAL YEARS</b> .....	<b>1</b>
Homeland Security Planning .....	1
Background.....	1
Recommendations for FY 2007 and Future Fiscal Years .....	2
HSGP Guidance and Application .....	5
Background.....	5
FY 2006 Successes.....	5
Recommendations for FY 2007 and Future Fiscal Years .....	5
Effectiveness Analysis.....	8
Background.....	8
FY 2006 Successes.....	8
Recommendations for FY 2007 and Future Fiscal Years .....	9
Risk Analysis.....	12
Background.....	12
FY 2006 Successes.....	12
Recommendations for FY 2007 and Future Fiscal Years .....	12
<b>II. NEXT STEPS</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>Appendix A: State and Local Feedback Results</b> .....	<b>A-1</b>
<b>Appendix B: Conference Attendee List</b> .....	<b>B-1</b>

## **II. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FY 2007 AND FUTURE FISCAL YEARS**

### ***Homeland Security Planning***

#### **Background**

DHS has emphasized homeland security planning during the entirety of the state homeland security program and throughout the FY 2006 HSGP process by utilizing a common planning framework, including the State and Urban Area Homeland Security Strategy and the Program and Capability Review, and developing the Enhancement Plan and the HSGP application's Investment Justification.

#### **Homeland Security Strategy Update**

State and Urban Area Homeland Security Strategies provide the context for the evaluation of preparedness programs and capabilities within and across state boundaries, as well as a foundation for homeland security planning centered around national, state, and local priorities. In 2005, states and urban areas were required to update their strategies to align with the Interim National Preparedness Goal and the National Priorities. This represents the first step in linking the FY 2006 HSGP cycle with the vision of the Interim National Preparedness Goal.

#### **Program and Capability Review**

The Program and Capability Review (PCR) is a process for discussing and evaluating the homeland security program and its component activities. The PCR emphasizes an enterprise-wide, multi-disciplinary, and multi-jurisdictional approach to states' preparedness planning to increase the Nation's level of preparedness. States were encouraged to leverage existing resources, including the State Homeland Security Strategy, current state and local plans, and assessments and grants data references, providing a starting point to conduct the PCR.

#### **Enhancement Plan**

As the final step of the PCR process, states developed an Enhancement Plan, a multi-year, funding-source neutral program management plan that outlines a prioritized list of initiatives that the state plans to implement to sustain strengths and mitigate weaknesses within the state's homeland security program beyond FY 2006. This enterprise-wide program management plan prioritizes areas of focus for future spending, not only G&T funding, but all potential resources.



## **Recommendations for FY 2007 and Future Fiscal Years**

For homeland security planning, DHS should:

- 1. Build upon the HSGP process, but do not dramatically change it since it has been the most effective planning process to date.**

State and local partners agreed that the FY 2006 planning process was the most constructive planning process to date and that it should not be fundamentally changed. The planning process should continue to consist of assessments, strategic planning, and program planning. Although there are some areas of the process that need further development, state and local partners are satisfied overall with the direction in which homeland security planning is headed.

- 2. Provide guidance and examples for new requirements and the relationships between existing requirements.**

G&T Information Bulletin #202, which defined the Investment Justification criteria, was repeatedly cited as the most valuable guidance document of the cycle because it provided specific guidelines and examples on the Investment scoring process. This type of guidance and other draft templates should be provided to state and locals in advance as often as possible.

However, state and local partners recommended that DHS provide specific examples of all new requirements, such as a sample completed Investment from the HSGP application and a sample Initiative from the Enhancement Plan. Although the state and local partners acknowledged the new HSGP process is competitive, they still agreed that clear examples and best practices in strategic and operational planning would assist in completing their applications properly and therefore help the peer reviewers interpret the applications during the review process.

- 3. Develop a set calendar, with advance notice on new requirements.**

State and local partners indicated that they appreciate receiving notification from DHS of new requirements well in advance of established and anticipated deadlines. The development of a calendar would enable state and local officials to prioritize their resources well in advance of deadlines and therefore develop more robust application requirements, such as the Enhancement Plan and Investment Justification.

**4. Keep focus on national and state/local priorities throughout the planning process and do not increase the number of capabilities in the Target Capabilities List.**

State and local partners appreciated focusing their State and Urban Area Homeland Security Strategies and Program and Capability Reviews on the National Priorities, eight priority capabilities, and three to five state-specific capabilities. They concluded that narrowing the focus created some standardization of assessment across the country. Most state and local partners would like DHS to refrain from increasing the size of the TCL as they concluded that more target capabilities would more thinly spread their resources and prevent them from conducting in-depth reviews of the target capabilities.

**5. Develop a planning cycle – conduct risk assessment, conduct capability assessment, update Homeland Security Strategy, update Enhancement Plan, and translate into Investment Justification.**

State and local partners agreed that FY 2006 was the most effective homeland security planning process to date. They also agreed that DHS should develop a set planning cycle for state and local jurisdictions consisting of conducting a risk assessment, conducting a capability assessment, updating the Homeland Security Strategy, updating the Enhancement Plan, and translating all planning tools into the Investment Justification. The cycle concludes by reincorporating grant awards back into the Enhancement Plan and Investment Justification.

**6. Provide additional guidance on a DHS-comparable risk assessment methodology that state and local planners can employ to determine their jurisdiction-specific risks.**

State and local planners can conduct their own risk assessments, but have received little guidance on a DHS-comparable risk assessment methodology from the Department. States and territories need assistance with identifying their local risk and how to manage and mitigate that risk. State and local partners agreed that if there is a standardized risk assessment methodology with a complementary technical assistance service, they would be able to contribute a synopsis of their local risks to DHS rather than have the Department determine their risks. Preferably, this risk assessment methodology would have an all-hazards focus.

**7. Develop new technical assistance services and build on existing services, develop new hire education, and provide ongoing resource information to states and territories through a single source.**

State and local partners stated that they would like to receive additional technical assistance services, including assistance with strategic planning, operational planning, conducting risk assessments, and completing the Investment Justification. State and local partners also remarked that because it was difficult to familiarize and train new employees on DHS programs and initiatives, it would be helpful if DHS created a new hire orientation program to be conducted on a quarterly basis via virtual teleconference or the internet. State and local partners also requested a single web portal that consolidates the current multitude of G&T portals.

**8. Identify potential links among the State and/or Urban Area Homeland Security Strategies, Enhancement Plan, and Investment Justification.**

State and local partners agreed that the State and Urban Area Homeland Security Strategies, the Enhancement Plan, and the Investment Justification are valuable; however, these documents have a significant amount of overlap. The state and local partners concluded that if DHS could redesign the templates to remove this duplication and link the three of them more effectively, the documents would be more useful for planning and allocation of funding. State and local partners recommended the Enhancement Plan also be scored in the future, once it more strongly aligns with the Investment Justification.

**9. Allow state, territory, and urban area representatives to present their own State and/or Urban Area Homeland Security Strategy to the DHS Strategy Review Board.**

State and local partners commented that they would like to be able to present their own State and Urban Area Homeland Security Strategy to the DHS Strategy Review Board in order to provide additional clarification for review board members. Some state and local partners concluded that, although Preparedness Officers are well-informed and good presenters, the states, territories, and urban areas should be able to defend their own material, especially as the strategy update process is not competitive.

**10. Provide additional guidance on and incentives for states and territories to demonstrate regionalization.**

A number of state and local partners cited the need for incentives to engage in inter-state activities to promote regionalization. Although a number of partners listed regionalization in their Investment Justification, they agreed there was no specific guidance provided as to how much their overall anticipated effectiveness score improved based on these regional efforts. If DHS provides specific guidance and incentives in the upcoming year, state and local partners agreed it would help to promote and encourage regionalization.

## ***HSGP Guidance and Application***

### **Background**

By congressional mandate, the FY 2006 HSGP Guidance and Application Kit had to be released within 45 days following the DHS Appropriations Act, and applicants had to submit applications within 90 days following the release of the guidance. Thus, the actual date the appropriations bill is signed dictates the HSGP timelines each fiscal year.

In FY 2006, the Investment Justification described how funds were to be utilized to support initiatives outlined in the Enhancement Plan. The Investment Justification was evaluated based on how well the state's plan addressed the identified needs and mitigated risk by answering all questions in each section. The four (4) high-level sections of the Investment Justification included: Background, Regionalization, Impact, and Funding and Implementation Plan. States and urban areas were permitted to propose up to 15 Investments each to support the achievement of an initiative from their Enhancement Plan. States and urban areas were strongly encouraged to coordinate with each other to present an application that represented a collaborative, integrated approach, and to avoid duplication of efforts.

### **FY 2006 Successes**

State and local partners supported the number of Investments included in the Investment Justification. Several remarked that their state, territory, and/or urban area were able to accurately and logically combine many projects into Investments and also combine similar Investments into one.

State and local partners also confirmed the need to continue to maintain the Emergency Management Performance Grant Program as a stand-alone program separate from HSGP to allow states and territories access to these funds for personnel functions in a timely manner.

### **Recommendations for FY 2007 and Future Fiscal Years**

For the HSGP Guidance and Application Kit, DHS should:

- 1. Change the Guidance structure, moving certain information to the appendices.**

The state and local partners valued the overall structure of the HSGP guidance. "Cheat sheets" provided in the Guidance (e.g., the Allowable Cost Matrix, Historical Allowable Data, and the Relationship of Grant Programs to Target Capabilities) were extremely helpful and the color coding of each section allowed ease of use in locating specific grant information.

State and local partners discussed the topic of reference materials in the HSGP Guidance and Application Kit. They noted that although this information is helpful, the applicants are often not the subject matter experts and not the consumers of the information. They also commented that this information is somewhat confusing, as it is not clear if it is intended as a requirement, recommendation, or simply a reference. The collective group determined that having links on a webpage to this information would suffice, would keep the application kit to a more manageable size, and would allow them to more easily pass along this information to the appropriate subject matter experts.

**2. Provide the grant guidance in both Microsoft Word and Adobe Acrobat formats.**

State and local partners identified the need to provide the HSGP Guidance and Application Kit in multiple formats, which would allow applicants to easily cut and paste sections into documents for distribution to those responsible for meeting certain requirements or implementing specific programs.

**3. Include the application scoring criteria in the program guidance and application kit.**

Participants noted that they started to develop their applications based on the guidance provided in the application kit released December 2, 2005. However, DHS then released G&T Information Bulletin #202 on February 8, 2006, only a month before the applications were due. This Information Bulletin provided more details and clarification on the criteria. Several participants recounted that they had to rewrite draft Investments to meet the criteria outlined in the bulletin. They recommended that this information be included in the FY 2007 HSGP Guidance and Application Kit.

**4. Ensure that end user requirements drive the design and functionality of the tool utilized for the Investment Justification. These requirements would include spell check, funding formulas, graphics, ease of printing, etc.**

State and local partners stated that the Investment Justification's format was a workable tool that allowed them to maintain a "neat and tidy" document. They noted that not requiring web connectivity was definitely a benefit by allowing them to work both at their desks, in meeting space, and after hours.

However, they remarked that the inability to conduct spell check or to add graphics was a detriment. Without this functionality, additional hours were required for cutting and pasting from Microsoft Word to ensure that spelling and grammar were correct. In addition, the template actually counted characters rather than words, as stated, which made it more difficult to

complete the task within the assigned space. Permitting flexibility with the tool to include spell check, an accurate word count, and graphics would allow state and local partners to formulate a more accurate finished product in a shorter amount of time. In addition, the use of graphics would permit more complex details to be easily explained, thus allowing more complete answers with less text.

**5. Utilize a page limit per Investment rather than character limits to allow flexibility for the applicant to determine the amount of detail for each question/section while still maintaining limitations.**

Many state and local partners discussed the lack of space provided in the Investment Justification to accurately and completely answer questions. They understood the need to have character limits in order to level the playing field, but remarked that one size does not fit all. They recommended the use of a page limit rather than a character limit. This would allow the applicant to determine which sections/questions require more detail and enable them to tailor it to meet their needs. State and local partners also recommended conducting a test bed for the next version of the Investment Justification, which would allow DHS to build a more user-friendly tool.

**6. Condense/consolidate the 17 questions from the Investment Justification into the following five areas:**

- **Background/Scope/Scalability of Investment**
- **Impact**
- **Funding Plan**
- **Long-Term Plan/Institutionalization**
- **Regionalization (including tribal and international partners)**

The state and local partners discussed the number of questions within the existing Investment Justification template and concluded that 17 questions were too many. The group recommended condensing the questions into five broad areas and providing examples of information to include in each.

Participants also requested that DHS provide clear definitions for the terms used throughout the Investment Justification. For example, DHS should define terms such as “innovative” to clearly convey what is expected in the application responses. One other suggestion was for DHS to utilize commonly used program management terminology since these terms are understood throughout business.

**7. Add an area in the Investment Justification that allows applicants to direct readers to specific sections of the Enhancement Plan to provide greater context about the overall Initiative that the Investment supports.**

State and local partners discussed the connection between the Enhancement Plan and Investment Justifications in great detail because there is considerable confusion surrounding how the two should be linked. State and local partners agreed that the Enhancement Plan is a key piece of the homeland security puzzle, as it details the broader State Homeland Security Strategy. They recommended adding a section within the Investment Justification to show the direct linkage to specific sections of the Enhancement Plan. This addition would help demonstrate the necessity for the plan and allow an applicant and peer reviewer to easily reference the Enhancement Plan for more details surrounding the Investment Justification.

**8. Allow greater coordination with Preparedness Officers throughout the application process.**

State and local partners identified the need to have a more open line of communication with Preparedness Officers during the grant application process to provide clarification and assistance on the application. Limiting the ability of the Preparedness Officers to address application issues was damaging to state and federal relationships due to the lack of communication. They commented that, by keeping Preparedness Officers fully engaged and integrated, the best possible Investments could have been submitted.

## ***Effectiveness Analysis***

### **Background**

FY 2006 marks the first time that DHS asked states and urban areas to develop Investment Justifications as part of their HSGP applications. The purpose of the Investment Justifications was to demonstrate the anticipated effectiveness of the state or urban area's proposed solutions in meeting identified needs. The HSGP application review process incorporated peer reviewers to evaluate the anticipated effectiveness of these proposed solutions. Peer review panels assigned effectiveness scores to individual investments and an overall effectiveness score to each state and urban area's submission. Effectiveness scores were paired with the DHS risk analysis scores to determine final HSGP allocations.

This process introduced the first competitive grant review for the HSGP, and created incentives for states and urban areas to develop innovative solutions to effectively leverage HSGP funds for the management and implementation of their overall homeland security program.

### **FY 2006 Successes**

State and local partners commented that the FY 2006 Peer Review worked well overall. The review panels brought with them the experience and knowledge necessary to effectively evaluate the applications. The structure of the panels

and the facilitators worked well and allowed the process to run smoothly. The FY 2006 application process aided state and locals in defining how their goals would be achieved and what additional funding sources could be utilized to help meet those goals.

### **Recommendations for FY 2007 and Future Fiscal Years**

For the effectiveness analysis, DHS should:

- 1. Keep the overall process simple, streamlined, and repeatable. The overall framework and groundwork should remain the same and consistent as much as possible, recognizing that guidance comes from Congress.**

The FY 2006 application process was labor intensive. By maintaining the framework established in FY 2006, and streamlining the Investment Justification template per state and local recommendations, the applications would be easier to complete in future years. Some modifications would be necessary and timelines may have to be modified, but by continuing to streamline the process applicants would be able to focus more on the content (as opposed to the format) of the Investment Justifications.

- 2. Further refine questions and scoring criteria and provide additional scoring guidance during the peer review process.**

State and local partners commented that reviewers need more guidance on the meaning of the numerical scores, which would also aid applicants in completing the Investments. Including a qualitative score with each numerical score would also alleviate some of the confusion associated with the scoring. Reviewers should receive detailed instructions on the scoring process and have an opportunity to ask questions before they are required to score the Investment Justifications.

- 3. Reformat the Investment Justification template to be a more flexible template and contain some level of a budget narrative.**

Participants stated that having the budget next to each answer on the Investment Justification would have been helpful and would have saved reviewers time and effort. The budget should be tied to the narrative or put in an actual budget narrative to accompany the Investment Justification. State and local partners determined that it would be helpful to have the ability to import and export data in the Investment Justification template. The Excel spreadsheet was not flexible and prevented states from sending out the template to locals or urban areas for input. A Word document would be more accommodating, even if the budget remains in Excel.



**4. Strive for more realistic timelines to the extent possible.**

State and local partners concurred that the Investment Justifications were extremely time consuming and coincided with several other DHS deadlines. Many states and urban areas do not have funds available to hire additional staff to accommodate the daunting workload the FY 2006 process created. The quality of many applications was negatively affected by the tight deadlines and delayed release of information relating to the Investment Justifications and Enhancement Plans.

**5. Eliminate the overall Investment Justification score; instead incorporate its components into the individual Investment scores and have the individual Investments speak for themselves.**

Participants believed that the overall score for the Investment Justifications was not beneficial and was not a true representation of the quality of the application. Some state and local partners believed that each Investment could stand on its own. The components of the overall Investment Justification score would be more valuable if they were incorporated as questions in the individual Investments. This would also allow the reviewers to provide more specific feedback.

**6. Provide more transparency in the process, to include better access to peer reviewer comments. DHS should also provide better guidance to peer review panels so that the comments are more useful to applicants.**

States and urban areas need more time to review peer review comments before the after action meeting is held. Some of the comments received were not useful to applicants. Several partners commented that facilitators should encourage the panels to develop meaningful comments that will assist applicants in writing more successful applications in years to come. Additionally, it is beneficial for applicants to receive both positive and negative feedback. DHS should provide more guidance on the commenting process before convening the peer review panels.

**7. Communicate upfront how the effectiveness analysis will affect HSGP allocations.**

In order to add transparency to the entire process, it is imperative that states and urban areas are informed early in the planning process how each component of the scoring process will be weighted. State and local partners who were reviewers found it frustrating to learn that the effectiveness analysis of the application process accounted for such a small percentage, considering the amount of work the process necessitated. In future years, the

effectiveness analysis should count for a larger percentage of the funding allocation.

- 8. Develop a white paper or after action report that is provided to all applicants regarding lessons learned about the peer review process from a peer reviewer perspective. This white paper could form the basis of a technical assistance program.**

A technical assistance program relating to the completion of the Investment Justifications would be advantageous to states and urban areas; it would also decrease the inconsistent quality of the Investments. Individuals who have experience in managing or writing DHS grants should conduct the technical assistance. A white paper developed by peer reviewers including lessons learned would provide an opportunity to even the playing field for future years.

- 9. Maintain the balanced approach employed in the FY 2006 peer review process, including composition of the panels, the number of Investment Justifications reviewed by each reviewer, the number of Investments in each Investment Justification, the range of subject matter experts, etc.**

Allowing 15 Investments per Investment Justification was sufficient and worked for most applicants. Partners concurred that the composition of the panels also worked well. Having representatives from different jurisdictions in each panel provided different perspectives, and each was a subject matter expert in their own right. Some reviewers found the federal subject matter experts beneficial for providing unbiased points of information and clarity on various subjects.

- 10. Consider having urban areas develop an Enhancement Plan separate from the state or as an annex to the state's Enhancement Plan.**

Participants noted that the urban areas have specific needs and their goals and objectives often differ from the state. An urban area Enhancement Plan could stand alone or be added as an appendix to the state's. This document would ensure that urban areas are better represented in the state's Enhancement Plan. Participants stressed that here needs to be more delineation between the urban area and the state; they should be considered separate but equal.

- 11. Consider allowing state, territory, and urban area representatives to be present or contacted during the peer review.**

Allowing states and urban areas to be present during the review of their application would enable them to clarify components of the application and would also provide them the opportunity to learn what can be improved in future years. Another option would be giving reviewers the option of calling a

state or urban area for clarification during the peer review. Though this could prove beneficial to both reviewers and applicants, it could also decrease the impartiality of the competitive process.

## ***Risk Analysis***

### **Background**

The FY 2006 risk methodology represents a major step forward in the analysis of the risk of terrorism, resulting in the most accurate estimation to date of the relative risk faced by our Nation's communities. In response to state and local partner feedback, the FY 2006 methodology incorporates a number of significant enhancements over previous years' analyses, including:

- Incorporation of strategic threat analysis from the Intelligence Community
- Improved attribution of threat and law enforcement activity data
- Greater depth and breadth in critical infrastructure and key asset data
- Inclusion of populated areas outside official city limits to encourage regionalization
- Incorporation of transient populations, such as tourists and commuters

### **FY 2006 Successes**

State and local partners agreed that they are in favor of the risk-based approach to national preparedness.

### **Recommendations for FY 2007 and Future Fiscal Years**

For the risk analysis, DHS should:

#### **1. Provide detailed briefings to state and local partners on the core components of the risk methodology used in the FY 2006 process.**

State and local partners would like to improve the transparency of the risk analysis process and gain a working knowledge of the data sources used to determine risk in FY 2006. The partners discussed a need for greater outreach on behalf of DHS, to include visits to each jurisdiction by Office of Infrastructure Protection representatives, Preparedness Officers, and Protective Security Advisors to provide detailed explanations of the FY 2006 risk analysis process and to offer an opportunity for state and local partners to ask questions.

Although DHS provided several communications detailing the risk analysis used in the FY 2006 HSGP (including the HSGP Risk Methodology Introduction, Risk Analysis Fact Sheet, FY 2006 Risk Methodology Technical Paper, and the Risk Methodology FAQ), state and local partners agreed that these documents for the most part added to the confusion rather than serving as tools to clarify the process and enable them to translate their

understanding of the process to other representatives within their jurisdictions. This feedback emphasized the need for in-person briefings (either on an individual basis with all states and territories or on a regional basis), and perhaps a more plain language document outlining the risk analysis methodology.

The partners recognize that the risk methodology may not significantly change in FY 2007, but would feel more comfortable with the outcomes if they were more familiar with and had a greater understanding of the process as a whole.

**2. Establish/convene a working group of federal, state, and local representatives to provide additional input on the specific components of the risk analysis process.**

State and local partners would like to convene a working group to examine the geographic characteristics and asset types used in the risk methodology and to evaluate and improve their impact on the risk scores. Some examples include refining the definitions of geographic areas captured in the data count for urban areas (evaluating the 10-mile buffer and population density), improving the risk-based methodology for insular areas and territories, and addressing other geographic issues (international borders, population density, etc).

The working group should also consider ways to factor in risk reduction, natural hazards risk, the Nationwide Plan Review, and the National Infrastructure Protection Plan. Other important items that could be evaluated are the specific thresholds of asset types and geographic attributes that trigger inclusion of related data in the risk analysis model, as well as programmatic interdependencies.

Finally, the partners recommended that the working group consider establishing an appeal process for the information that is fed into the risk process prior to finalizing allocation amounts. It is suggested that this working group be comprised of State Administrative Agency representatives, Homeland Security Advisors, Governors, Urban Area Points of Contact, Preparedness Officers, Protective Security Advisors, and Sector Specific Agency representatives.

**3. Involve state and local representatives in the data vetting process.**

State and local partners agree that further input is needed from the state and local levels in the review and validation of the data utilized in the risk analysis process. This involvement would ensure a greater level of understanding by representatives at all levels of government as to what information should be used when assessing and determining risk. Specifically, state and local

## FY 2006 HSGP After Action Report

partners would like access to the specific list of assets used in the FY 2006 risk analysis to understand what infrastructure is affecting their allocations. The partners also agreed that steps must be taken to enable the sharing of proprietary information.

## II. NEXT STEPS

DHS is committed to improving upon the HSGP process based on the FY 2006 foundation. The Department will consider all of these recommendations provided by its state and local partners to improve the HSGP process for FY 2007 and future fiscal years.

State and local partners also provided recommendations for continuing the national dialogue and agreed that the exchange of ideas would continue to promote national preparedness. They noted how effective the FY 2006 HSGP After Action Conference was in collecting feedback and allowing for open dialogue. Participants remarked that the conference was very successful and a positive experience, and added that meetings such as these should continue.

Regular meetings among federal, state, and local partners would promote the sharing of best practices and lessons learned, reviewing of new requirements, performing draft document reviews, and brainstorming methods of improvement. Participants noted the importance for state and urban area representatives to be involved in the FY 2007 HSGP process to help address some of the issues that arose in FY 2006 and to provide DHS with immediate feedback.

State and local partners noted that regional planning has already begun with both intra- and interstate planning, and state and local partners appreciated that DHS is making an effort to solicit multi-jurisdictional and multi-agency partner input on a more regular basis to fuel a national planning cycle. It was agreed this is an effort that should continue.

State and local partners see the outreach efforts of DHS as allowing federal, state, and local representatives the opportunity to continue the national discussion. America's safety and security is a shared national responsibility and, therefore, open dialogue and continued federal, state, and local partnership is vital.

## Appendix A: State and Local Feedback Results

The following table outlines the feedback results from the HSGP After Action Conference. Each working group presented its recommendations at the plenary session, during which all state and local partners had the opportunity to indicate agreement or disagreement with the presented recommendation. These recommendations are outlined in this After Action Report, although some recommendations may have been combined to facilitate a more natural placement within the HSGP process.

Working Group Recommendations	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Number of Responses	% Agree or Strongly Agree
<b>HOMELAND SECURITY PLANNING</b>							
Best planning process to date; do not change the process, but build on it		4	11	38	33	86	83%
Provide guidance and examples for new requirements and the relationships between existing requirements	1		1	41	44	87	98%
Develop a rolling calendar of a set schedule, with advance notice on new requirements			4	22	61	87	95%
Keep focus on National and state/local priorities throughout the planning process and do not increase the number of capabilities		1	10	27	49	87	87%
Develop a set, annual cycle – conduct risk assessment, conduct capability assessment, update Strategic Plan, update Enhancement Plan, translate Investment Justification		4	4	31	46	85	91%
<b>HSGP GUIDANCE AND APPLICATION</b>							
Move “nice to have” information which is currently in the appendices (i.e. Geospatial Guidance, Cyber Security Guidance) to other documents and provide links as reference materials		2	16	36	34	88	80%
Include the criteria to which the applications will be scored in the actual guidance document		1	2	24	61	88	97%

<b>Working Group Recommendations</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Number of Responses</b>	<b>% Agree or Strongly Agree</b>
Allow the end user requirements to drive the tool utilized for the Investment Justification. These requirements would include spell check, funding formulas, graphics, ease of printing, etc.	1	2	3	24	58	88	93%
Utilize a page limit per Investment Justification rather than character limits (will allow flexibility for the state and urban area to determine the amount of detail for each question/section while still maintaining limitations)	4	6	7	31	40	88	81%
Condense Investment Justification questions to address these following 5 areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Background/Scope/Scalability of Investment</li> <li>• Impact</li> <li>• Funding Plan</li> <li>• Long Term Plan/Institutionalize</li> <li>• Regionalization (include international, tribes)</li> </ul>	1	2	8	39	38	88	88%
Add an area in the Investment Justification that includes a direct reference to the Enhancement Plan	5	8	15	26	31	85	67%
<b>EFFECTIVENESS ANALYSIS</b>							
Keep overall process simple, streamlined, and repeatable-keep overall framework and groundwork the same and consistent (as much as it can be per changing Congressional mandates)				25	61	86	100%
Further refine questions and scoring criteria and provide additional instruction during the peer review process on the scoring			7	21	56	84	92%
Release improved criteria further in advance			3	20	62	85	96%
Reformat the Investment Justification template to be a more flexible template and contain some level of a budget narrative	2	1	9	22	51	85	86%
Strive for more realistic timelines to the extent possible			2	24	59	85	98%
Do not have an overall Investment Justification (IJ) score; rather incorporate the components of the Overall IJ into the individual Investment scores and have the individual Investments speak for themselves	2	7	18	29	24	80	66%

<b>Working Group Recommendations</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Number of Responses</b>	<b>% Agree or Strongly Agree</b>
Provide more transparency in the process, to include better access to comments, also guide panels so the forthcoming comments are more useful to applicants			5	30	48	83	94%
Make it clear upfront how the Effectiveness piece will affect allocations		1	5	26	50	82	93%
Develop an overall white paper or after action report that is provided to all applicants regarding lessons learned about the overall process from a peer reviewer perspective and the development of a Technical Assistance (TA) program		1	6	30	46	83	92%
Maintain FY 2006 peer review composition panel assignments (number of IJs reviewed, 15 IJs good number for submissions), range of SMEs, etc.		1	17	25	40	83	78%
Revise Enhancement Plan into the form of an Executive Summary or remove it completely	12	12	10	21	28	83	59%
<b>RISK ANALYSIS</b>							
Provide detailed briefing to state and local partners on the core components of the risk methodology used in the FY 2006 process			2	16	68	86	98%
Establish/convene a working group of Federal, state, and local representatives to provide additional input on the specific components of the risk analysis process			2	20	63	85	98%
Involve state and local representatives in the data vetting process		2	3	12	68	85	94%



## Appendix B: Conference Attendee List

First Name	Last Name	Organization	Job Title	State	State/Territory or Urban Area
Birdsall	Alailima	Territorial Office of Homeland Security	TOHS Advisor	AS	American Samoa
Dawn	Alailima	Territorial Emergency Management Coordinating Office	Chief Response Officer	AS	American Samoa
Daniel	Alexander	City of Milwaukee	Emergency Management Coordinator	WI	Milwaukee Urban Area
Karen	Anderson	U.S. DHS SLSAC/NLC	Former Mayor, Past NLC President	MN	National League of Cities/U.S. DHS State and Local Senior Advisory Committee
Richard	Andrews	Homeland Security Advisory Council	Chair, Emergency Response Advisory Committee	CA	Homeland Security Advisory Council
Marcus	Aurelius	Cit of Phoenix	Emergency Management Coordinator	AZ	Phoenix Urban Area
Robert	Bach	CHDS	Professor	CA	Naval Postgraduate School
Thomas	Baumgartner	State of Iowa Homeland Security and Emergency Management	Homeland Security Coordinator	IA	Iowa
Timothy	Beres	G&T, Preparedness Programs Division	Director, Preparedness Programs	DC	DHS G&T
Scott	Berg	Anaheim Fire	Operations Chief	CA	Anaheim/Santa Ana UASI
David	Berrisford	Minnesota Homeland Security Emergency Management	Field Services Branch Director	MN	Minnesota

First Name	Last Name	Organization	Job Title	State	State/Territory or Urban Area
Matthew	Bettenhausen	Office of Homeland Security	Director	CA	Anaheim/Santa Ana Urban Area
Bill	Bishop	Id. Bureau of Homeland Security	Director	ID	Idaho
Frank	Blas, jr.	Guam Homeland Security	Homeland Security Advisor	GU	Guam
Jack	Bossert	Ohio Emergency Management Agency	Grants Branch Chief	OH	Ohio
Mark	Bruce	Kansas Highway Patrol	Captain/SAA POC	KS	Kansas
Alexia	Brunet	DHS	Risk Management	VA	DHS IP
Brett	Burdick	Virginia Department of Emergency Management	Director, Technological Hazards Division	VA	Virginia
Patrick	Buttron	San Diego MMRS	Bioterrorism Coordinator, Program Director	CA	San Diego Urban Area
Anthony (tony)	Calvo	Emergency Management Office	Federal Programs Coordinator	CNMI	Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands
Jane	Castor	Tampa Police Department	Assistant Chief of Police	FL	Tampa Bay Urban Area
Darren	Chen	DHS/G&T	Program Manager	DC	DHS G&T
Megan	Clifford	G&T - Booz Allen Hamilton	Consultant	VA	G&T - Booz Allen Hamilton
James	Colgan	Vermont Homeland Security Unit	Northern Field Manager	VT	Vermont

<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Job Title</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>State/Territory or Urban Area</b>
Kevin	Comerford	Erie County Central Police Services	Commissioner	NY	Buffalo Urban Area
Bob	Connell	SLED	Homeland Security Grant Program Manager	SC	South Carolina
Annemarie	Conroy	Bay Area UASI	Executive Director of SF OES/HS	CA	Bay Area Urban Area
Dolores	Cook	State Civil Defense	Planner/SAA Representative	HI	Hawaii
Glenn	Coplon	DHS/HITRAC	Risk Analyst	DC	DHS IP
Aaron	Correia	Honolulu Police Department	Lieutenant	HI	Honolulu Urban Area
Dave	Daley	South Metro Fire and Rescue	Division Chief	CO	Denver Urban Area
Steven	Davis	Miami Urban Area	Project Manager	MD	Miami Urban Area
Mike	Dayton	California Office of Homeland Security	Deputy Director	CA	California
Gregorio	Deleon guerrero	CNMI Emergency Management Office	Director	CNMI	Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands
Liz	Digregorio	Office of Community Preparedness	Acting Director	DC	DHS G&T
Meghan	Dudley	NYS OHS		NY	New York State
Jeff	Dulin	Charlotte Fire Department	Deputy Chief	NC	Charlotte Urban Area

First Name	Last Name	Organization	Job Title	State	State/Territory or Urban Area
Carol	Edgett	Comal County, TX	EMC	TX	San Antonio Urban Area
Greg	Engle	Office of Justice Assistance	Program Manager	WI	Wisconsin
Gary	Faltinowski	NC Emergency Management	Assistant Director	NC	North Carolina
Lauren	Fernandez	DHS	Info Mgmt Branch Chief	DC	DHS G&T
Rene	Fielding	Executive Office of Public Safety	Assistant Director of Grant Operations	MA	Massachusetts
Tom	Filippone	Lafayette Group	program manager	VA	Lafayette Group
Russell	Fillmore	State Division of Homeland Security	Financial Officer	UT	Utah
Luther	Fincher	POC UASI Charlotte, NC	Fire Chief & Homeland Security Director	NC	Charlotte Urban Area
Elaine	Fisher	DEM	Program Manager	NV	Nevada
Timothy	Fisk	Orlando Police Dept	Lieutenant	FL	Orlando Urban Area
Martin	Flahive	City and County of Denver	UASI Project Manager	CO	Denver Urban Area
Richard	Flinn	PEMA	Deputy Director	PA	Pennsylvania
Shelley	Foote	DHS G&T	Contractor	DC	DHS G&T - Conference Support

First Name	Last Name	Organization	Job Title	State	State/Territory or Urban Area
Robert	Fudge	GOHSEP	Preparedness Chief	LA	Louisiana
Marcelino	Galvan	DHS/G&T	Acting Division Director	DC	DHS G&T
Jeffrey	Garofalo	NYC Office of the Mayor	Deputy Assistant Director	NY	New York City Urban Area
Christopher	Geldart	Gov. Office of HS	Assistant Director	MD	Maryland
Julian	Gilman	Commonwealth of Virginia	HS Program Manager	VA	Virginia
Farrah	Gosford	Florida Division of Emergency Management (SAA)	Planning Manager	FL	Florida
Elizabeth	Graham	Connecticut Dept. of Emergency Management and Homeland Security	Manager, Strategic Planning & Grant Administration	CT	Connecticut
Marjolaine	Greentree	Office of Emergency Management	Deputy State Director	NM	New Mexico
Amy	Grzybowski	Rhode Island Emergency Management Agency	Homeland Security Grant Manager	RI	Rhode Island
William	Hackett	CT. Department of Emergency Management and Homeland Security	Emergency Preparedness Program Specialist	CT	Connecticut
Judy	Hampton	Office of Grants & Training	Eastern Division Director	DC	DHS G&T
Andrea	Hatch	Vermont Homeland Security Unit	Southern Planner	VT	Vermont
Tracy	Henke	DHS Office of Grants and Training	Assistant Secretary	DC	DHS G&T

First Name	Last Name	Organization	Job Title	State	State/Territory or Urban Area
Gary	Hindoién	MT Disaster & Emergency Services	Homeland Security Specialist	MT	Montana
Chris	Huston	Oklahoma Office of Homeland Security	Grants Administrator	OK	Oklahoma
Julia	Janka	Atlanta UASI	Program Manager	GA	Atlanta Urban Area
Sheryl	Jardine	WA State EMD	UASI Program Manager	WA	Seattle Urban Area
Melissa	Jenkins	Vermont Homeland Security Unit	Northern Planner	VT	Vermont
Judith	Johns	TN Governor's Office of Homeland Security	Special Assistant/Program Manager CI/KR	TN	Tennessee
Patrick	Jordan	LA County Sheriff		CA	Los Angeles/ Long Beach Urban Area
Kyle	Karsjen	Iowa Homeland Security and Emergency Management	Homeland Security Planner	IA	Iowa
David	Kaufman	G&T, Preparedness Programs Division	Deputy Director, Preparedness Programs Division	DC	DHS G&T
Brian	Keith	Governor's Office of Homeland Security	Deputy Director	CA	California
Scott	Kelberg	DHS/G&T/TAD	Division Director	DC	DHS G&T
Randy	Kennedy	Colorado Division of Emergency Management	Program Administrator	CO	Colorado
Jan	Kimmell	AZ Division of Emergency Management	Assistant Director, Preparedness	AZ	Arizona

First Name	Last Name	Organization	Job Title	State	State/Territory or Urban Area
Robert	Kimmell	Arizona Office of Homeland Security	Assistant Director of Strategic Operations	AZ	Arizona
Heather	King	Office of Community Preparedness	Program Manager, Citizen Corps	DC	DHS G&T
Barbara	Kirkmeyer	Department of Local Affairs	Acting Executive Director	CO	Colorado
Jerianne	Kolby	HLS Office of Emergency Services	Utah Division of Homeland Security	UT	Utah
Michael	Koroluk	DHS Office of Grants and Training	Special Assistant	DC	DHS G&T
Steve	Kral	Office of Homeland Security Grants and Program Management	Director	DC	National Capital Region
Cathy	Lanier	Metropolitan Police Department	Commander	DC	District of Columbia
Marci	Larson	Office of Grants and Training	Branch Chief	DC	DHS G&T
Sharron	Leaon	California Service Corps	Assistant Director	CA	California Citizen Corps
Paul	Lennon	Los Angeles Metro / LASD		CA	Los Angeles/ Long Beach Urban Area
Leslie-anne	Levy	DHS	Branch Chief	DC	DHS G&T
Gary	Lokken	MN Homeland Security and Emergency Management	Critical Infrastructure Planner	MN	Minnesota
Gina	Lopker	City of Phoenix	Management Assistant	AZ	Phoenix Urban Area

First Name	Last Name	Organization	Job Title	State	State/Territory or Urban Area
Jon	MacLaren	DHS Office of Infrastructure Protection	Branch Chief	VA	DHS IP
Charles	Madden	Govenor's Office of HS for Maryland	Lawfellow	MD	Maryland
John	Madden	State of Alaska	Alaska Homeland Security	AK	Alaska
Mattew	Marheine	Emergency Management	Domestic Preparedness Coordinator	OR	Oregon
Elizabeth	Marks	G&T - Booz Allen Hamilton	Consultant	DC	DHS G&T - Conference Support
James	Marks	DHS	Special Assistant	DC	DHS G&T
Jen	Marthia	MSU	Policy Analyst/Project Coordinator	MI	Michigan
Jim	Mcbride	Oklahoma Office of Homeland Security	Infrastructure Protection	OK	Oklahoma
Leigh	Mccook	Georgia Tech Research Institute	Senior Research Associate	GA	Georgia
Paul	Mcdonagh	City of Seattle	Lieutenant	WA	Seattle Urban Area
Jeffrey	Meil	G&T - Booz Allen Hamilton	Consultant	VA	G&T - Booz Allen Hamilton
Carmen	Merlo	Criminal Justice Services Division	Director	OR	Oregon
Tuesday	Mills	EBR Parish OHSEP	Chief of Operations	LA	Louisiana



First Name	Last Name	Organization	Job Title	State	State/Territory or Urban Area
Katie	Mooshian	G&T - Booz Allen Hamilton	Consultant	VA	G&T - Booz Allen Hamilton
Joanne	Moreau	EBR Parish OHSEP	Director	LA	Louisiana
Michael	Murphy	OKC/Tulsa MMRS	MMRS Director	OK	Oklahoma City
Cheryl	Murray	Houston - Mayor's Office of Public Safety & Homeland Security	Division Manager	TX	Houston Urban Area
Leonard	Murray	Des Moines Police	Major	IA	Iowa
Robert	Nations, jr.	MS Office of Homeland Security	Acting Director	MS	Mississippi
Jim	O'Brien	Clark County, NV Emergency Mgt. & Homeland Security	Director	NV	Las Vegas Urban Area
Jill	Olen	City of San Diego	Director of Homeland Security	CA	San Diego Urban Area
Susan	Oliver	G&T - Booz Allen Hamilton	Consultant	DC	DHS G&T - Conference Support
Christina	Parkins	Charlotte Fire Dept	UASI Coordinator	NC	Charlotte Urban Area
Ben	Patterson	Texas Governor's Division of Emergency Management	SAA Administrator	TX	Texas
Laureen	Paulsen	Oregon Emergency Management	Domestic Preparedness Planner	OR	Oregon
Felipe	Perez	City of Los Angeles	Homeland Security Policy Director	CA	Los Angeles/ Long Beach Urban Area

First Name	Last Name	Organization	Job Title	State	State/Territory or Urban Area
Kerry	Pettingill	Oklahoma Office of Homeland Security	Director	OK	Oklahoma
Sara	Phillips	Mayor's Office of Emergency Preparedness	Assistant Director	MA	Boston Urban Area
Robert	Pinciario	Pennsylvania Emergency Management Agency	Terrorism Planner/Emergency Management Specialist	PA	Pennsylvania
Norman	Porter	Office of Consolidated Emergency Management	Director	OR	Portland Urban Area
Jamie	Quarrelles	DC Emergency Management Agency	Exercise Officer	DC	District of Columbia
Susan	Rabil	G&T - Booz Allen Hamilton	Consultant	DC	DHS G&T - Conference Support
Laura	Ragan	US Department of Homeland Security	Program Manager	DC	DHS G&T
Robert	Redden	Office of Emergency Management	Preparedness Unit Manager	NM	New Mexico
Ralph	Reichert	Georgia Office of Homeland Security	Terrorism Division Director	GA	Georgia
Leilani	Ripley	Territorial Office of Homeland Security	Development Officer/ Planning	HI	American Samoa
Judy	Rue	Hennepin County Emergency Preparedness	Deputy Director	MN	Minneapolis Urban Area
Hezekiah	Samuel	Virgin Islands Office of Homeland Security	Project Director	VI	Virgin Islands
Jared	Sandifer	EBR OHSEP	Training & Exercise Coordinator	LA	Baton Rouge Urban Area

First Name	Last Name	Organization	Job Title	State	State/Territory or Urban Area
Dee	Sanfilippo Solindas	State of Missouri Emergency Management Agency	Grant Program Manager	MO	Missouri
Juliana	Schmuke	G&T - Booz Allen Hamilton	Consultant	DC	DHS G&T - Conference Support
Joel	Schrader	Kentucky Office of Homeland Security	Deputy Director	KY	Kentucky
Patricia	Scrutchions	Cook County Judicial Advisory Council	Grant Manager (Planner IV)	IL	Chicago Urban Area
Julie	Secontine	Oakland County	Risk Manager	MI	Michigan
F. David	Sheppard	NYS OHS	Director, WMD Task Force	NY	New York
Chris	Simpson	South Carolina Law Enforcement Division (SAA for South Carolina)	Program Coordinator	SC	South Carolina
Emile	Smith	Office of the Deputy Mayor	Special Assistant	DC	District of Columbia
Michael	Smith	SROHS	Director	CA	Sacramento Urban Area
Noel	Smith	homeland Security	Planner	VI	US. Virgin Islands
Arel	Solie	Washington State Emergency Management Division	Homeland Security Section Manager	WA	State of Washington
Reymond	Souza, Jr.	Office of the Governor	Special Asst-Legal Counsel	GU	Guam
Thomas	Steele	Delaware Dept. of Safety and Homeland Security	Chief Information Officer	DE	Delaware

First Name	Last Name	Organization	Job Title	State	State/Territory or Urban Area
David	Steingraber	Office of Justice Assistance	Executive Director	WI	Wisconsin
Stephanie	Stidham	Louisville Metro Criminal Justice Commission	Criminal Justice Specialist	KY	Louisville Urban Area
Stacey	Street	DHS Office of Grants and Training	Preparedness Officer	DC	DHS G&T
John	Studgeon	IP - Booz Allen Hamilton	Consultant	DC	DHS IP
Merci	Suarez	Kansas Highway Patrol	Grant Program Manager	KS	Kansas
Janice	Sullivan	Metropolitan Police Department	Director	DC	District of Columbia
Steven	Sund	Metropolitan Police Department	Captain	DC	District of Columbia
Patrick j.	Tenorio	State	Special Assistance Homeland Security	CNMI	Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands
Tracey	Trautman	DHS/G&T	Central Division Director	DC	DHS G&T
Mel	Vanterpool	USVI Office of Homeland Security	Director	VI	U.S. Virgin Islands
Rocky	Vaz	City of Dallas	Manager, Homeland Security Funds	TX	Dallas Fort Worth Urban Area
Shelley	Wahrlich	NYS Office of Homeland Security	Contracts Manager	NY	New York
Jim	Walker	Alabama Department of Homeland Security	Director	AL	Alabama

First Name	Last Name	Organization	Job Title	State	State/Territory or Urban Area
David	Weinberg	DHS Office of Infrastructure Protection		VA	DHS IP
Joseph	Wessels	Delaware Emergency Management Agency	Planning Supervisor	DE	Delaware
Jana	White	DHS Office of Grants and Training	Chief of Staff	DC	DHS G&T
Robert	Williams	City of New Orleans, Office of Homeland Security & Public Safety	Operations Manager	LA	New Orleans Urban Area
Virginia	Wise	G&T - Booz Allen Hamilton	Consultant	DC	G&T - Booz Allen Hamilton
Cliff	Wojtalewicz	Indiana Department of Homeland Security	Director of Strategic Plans	IN	Indiana
Lynn	Wright	Executive Office of Public Safety	Acting Director, Homeland Security	MA	Massachusetts
John	Yarboro	North Carolina Emergency Management	Homeland Security Branch Chief	NC	North Carolina
Mark	Zadra	Florida Department of Law Enforcement	Special Agent in Charge - Homeland Security Advisor	FL	Florida