

## **Summary of Meeting – Public Session**

### **U.S. Department of Homeland Security Homeland Security Advisory Council U.S. Secret Service Headquarters Washington, D.C. March 31, 2004**

#### **Meeting Summary:**

This summary describes the discussions and actions of the fourth meeting of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security's Homeland Security Advisory Council (HSAC). The meeting was held from 10:00 AM – 12:00 noon on Wednesday, March 31, 2004 at the U.S. Secret Service Headquarters, Washington, D.C.

The HSAC met in Washington, D.C. for the purposes of: (1) welcoming and swearing in new members of the HSAC; (2) completing discussions on the Homeland Security Lexicon Project; (3) receiving a briefing on DHS U.S. Coast Guard Academy proposal for Homeland Security Education and Training Conference; (4) received reports from Senior Advisory Committees and subgroups; and (5) holding roundtable discussions with and among HSAC members.

#### **Participants:**

##### *Council Members in Attendance:*

Joseph J. Grano, Jr., Chair  
Judge William H. Webster, Vice Chair  
Norman Augustine  
Kathleen M. Bader  
Kenneth C. Canterbury  
Frank J. Cilluffo  
Dr. Jared Cohon  
Dr. Ruth David  
Lt. Governor David Heineman  
Herb Kelleher  
MG Bruce Lawlor, USA (ret.)  
Governor Mitt Romney  
Dr. Lydia Thomas  
Mayor Anthony Williams

#### **U.S. Department of Homeland Security Representatives:**

Secretary Tom Ridge  
Deputy Secretary James Loy

Christopher J. Furlow, Homeland Security Advisory Council, Executive Director  
Katie Balls, Homeland Security Advisory Council Staff  
Jeff Gaynor, Homeland Security Advisory Council Staff  
Candace Stoltz, Homeland Security Advisory Council Staff  
Erica Bomsey, Office of General Counsel  
Al Martinez-Fonts, Special Assistant to the Secretary for the Private Sector  
VADM Thad Allen, United States Coast Guard  
RADM Jay Carmichael, United States Coast Guard  
Lt. Howard Wright, United States Coast Guard  
Tim Beres, Office of Domestic Preparedness

**Public Attendance:**

Approximately 15 members of the public attended the meeting.

**HSAC Meeting Called to Order at 10:00 am (EST)**

**MR. GRANO:** Good morning, everyone. I'd like to call a meeting of the Homeland Security Advisory Council to order. My name is Joe Grano, Chairman of the Homeland Security Advisory Council (HSAC), I'd like to welcome members, our new members and fellow citizens to this public session.

The Council serves to provide recommendations to the Secretary of Homeland Security on a range of issues. And as we have done in the past, whenever possible, we do open up our sessions to the public.

I would like to mention to members of the public that while our discussions is limited to HSAC members, staff and those briefing the members, at the end of our public session, we will provide information on how you may provide commentary to the HSAC.

Information may also be found on the Department of Homeland Security website, [www.dhs.gov](http://www.dhs.gov), and public session minutes from our previous meetings, in fact, are posted on that website.

Upon arrival this morning, we were welcomed by Ralph Basham, Director of the U.S. Secret Service. And we would like him to know, and all of the dedicated people here, how pleased we are to be at their headquarters for this meeting.

Most Americans know that the men and women of the Secret Service do a fine job protecting the President, Vice President and Secretary Ridge and our other leaders. But they do so much more. They are partners in the war on terror, they work to secure our cyber-infrastructure, they fight financial criminals, and the list goes on and on.

Later today, Council members will have the opportunity to tour this outstanding facility and we look forward to learning more about their work.

Earlier this year, HSAC completed a task charged to this Council by Secretary Ridge, the development of recommendations for a Department of Homeland Security Award for Excellence. Our colleague, Dr. Lydia Thomas, did a fine job leading that effort. Thank you, Lydia.

And today, we're going to have an opportunity to complete perhaps another task assigned by the Secretary: the Lexicon initiative. I cannot stress to the public how important that task will be for all of us.

I believe that one smart man once said that the difference between the United Kingdom and the United States was the division of a common language. I can imagine what that means interagency. If we don't get the language right amongst ourselves and with the public, obviously, it could be a disaster, frankly. And I think it's one of the important things that we've taken on and we thank you for assigning us that task, Mr. Secretary.

But right now, what I'd like to do is welcome our new members before we get into the agenda today. I'd like to begin with David Heinemann. He is the Lieutenant Governor of Nebraska and serves as the state's Homeland Security Advisor. As Lieutenant Governor, he also presides over the state legislature and chairs the Nebraska Information Technology Commission. Prior to his service as Lieutenant Governor, he was elected to two terms as State Treasurer. He has worked in the private sector, served as a local city Council member, and a congressional Chief of Staff. He is a graduate of West Point and the Army's Ranger and Airborne schools.

David, welcome to the HSAC.

**LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR HEINEMAN:** I'm delighted to be here and I'm looking forward to the opportunity and I'll try to bring a Nebraska common sense perspective to this very challenging city.

**MR. GRANO:** Thank you and welcome.

And next to David is Major General Bruce Lawlor, retired from military service early this year after serving for more than 30 years in uniform. Most recently, he served as the first Chief of Staff of the Department of Homeland Security. He had previously served with Secretary Ridge at the White House Office of Homeland Security where he was Senior Director for Prevention and Protection.

Prior to his White House service, he was the first commanding general of the Joint Task Force Civil Support where he was responsible for coordinating the Department of Defense Support of Civil Authorities in the event of chemical, biological, radiological or nuclear incidents.

We're glad to have you here, sir.

**GENERAL LAWLOR:** Great to be here. Thank you very much. I'm looking forward to it.

**MR. GRANO:** Thank you, gentlemen.

And as we alluded to earlier, joining us by phone is Massachusetts Governor Mitt Romney who was elected in November 2002, following his successful leadership of the massive security, financial and logistic sectors of the 2002 Winter Olympic Games.

He serves as a lead governor on Homeland Security for the National Governor's Association, and although a new member of the HSAC, he is already quite active in our activities. He is the Chair of our State and Local Officials Senior Advisory Committee and was named Chair of the Task Force on State and Local Homeland Security Funding that is operating under the HSAC.

Governor, welcome, sir.

**GOVERNOR ROMNEY:** Thank you. Good to be with you.

**MR. GRANO:** At this time, I'd like to turn the floor over to Secretary Ridge.

**SECRETARY RIDGE:** What I'd like to do first is to swear two of the three new members in. I can't do it to Governor Romney by phone, but he's already been sworn in. So if everybody would indulge us for a moment, and I'll ask Lieutenant Governor and General Lawlor to please stand and take --- raise your right hand and repeat after me: I, and please state your full name, do solemnly swear, that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies foreign and domestic, that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same, that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office upon which I am about to enter, so help me, God.

**LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR HEINEMAN AND GENERAL LAWLOR:** (Repeat oath.)

**SECRETARY RIDGE:** Thank you very much.

Very good. First of all, Joe Grano, let me thank you for your continued and steady leadership and the focus and the energy you bring and join with all our colleagues on the Homeland Security Advisory Council. Every one of you have very important day jobs. In spite of your individual responsibilities on a regular basis, you find time not only to attend these meetings, but what the public will not see today is the considerable work you engage in with either the advisory committees or the individual projects you spend so much time on during your private time.

So I thank you, thank you very much for being here.

I want to welcome the Lieutenant Governor. Great to have you here, and the notion that you bring a little more common sense to the deliberative nature of this group, you're going to find that a lot of people around here that have that same point of view, we don't necessarily think that we make the perfect the enemy of the good. We know that this is a marathon, not a sprint and that we've got a lot of work to do. We've made a lot of progress in the first year and a lot of it has to do with the considerable efforts undertaken by the Advisory Council. But we're grateful for your participation. And as my counterpart, you're the Homeland Security Advisor, I thank you for the work you do on behalf of your state and the input we get from you from time to time. We have phone conversations, so we'll be engaged at different points in time in this next year.

So, to my friend General Lawlor, 30 years in the military, a couple years with me, and it's good to be back working with him again. We were a small band when we set up the operation on March 1st. We still needed to get a lot of the under secretaries and assistant secretaries identified. So we began very early on working together and I'm grateful to have his perspective, particularly based on the work he did within the Department of Defense. He really adds a lot to our discussion. I'm glad he's back and working with us.

And my friend, Governor Mitt Romney.

**GOVERNOR ROMNEY:** Hello, Mr. Governor.

**SECRETARY RIDGE:** I know you're pretty busy out there in Massachusetts.

**GOVERNOR ROMNEY:** Well, we've had a couple of busy days here. But we keep on fighting ahead.

**SECRETARY RIDGE:** I must tell the Advisory Council that you just spent two days here. One, you are chairing the Task Force and State and Local Homeland Security Funding, and you're Chair of the State and Local Officials Senior Advisory Committee. And so you all need to know that the Governor was here Monday and Tuesday. There were some important matters in Massachusetts that he left yesterday and I appreciate you taking the time to join us by phone today.

**GOVERNOR ROMNEY:** Thank you. Good to be with you.

**SECRETARY RIDGE:** And to Chuck Canterbury. Again, let me thank you for serving as Vice Chair of the Emergency Response Senior Advisory Committee as well. And again, thank all of you.

I do have a couple of thoughts. First of all, this Homeland Security Award for Excellence. Dr. Thomas, I want to thank you for the great work on this. We wanted to recognize excellence and promote it at the same time. And I remember the first discussion we had about designing an award similar to the Malcolm Baldrige Award. So it was not only to say, you've done a good job, but also to encourage others to do an even better job.

And I remember the discussion being, should we have one for the states and the locals and the private sector? And everybody said, that sounds like stovepipes and when things were trying to break down as we integrate the Department and the different federal agencies as stovepipes, we've got a splendid way ahead, I think, that makes a lot of sense and you've got very solid but not overly complex criteria. We're anxious to hear about this. I think it's a way we can build on the honor that we hope to award this year, and there will be, obviously, more to do in the future, but I thank you, Dr. Thomas, and everybody associated with your work for this great effort.

**DR. THOMAS:** Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary.

**SECRETARY RIDGE:** Joe Grano mentioned the Lexicon Project. For those people who are not familiar with it, certainly the Homeland Security Advisory Council is, but with the evolution of the Homeland Security mission and the evolution of the Department, we have discovered that there are many acronyms and words and protocols that, depending on where you see them in print or where you hear them in the course of a conversation, they may mean different things to different people. And if we're going to have a unified, integrated, national strategy and a national plan to deal with homeland security issues, as well as an evolving Department of Homeland Security, we thought it was very, very important to deal with the similarity of terms, but often have different definitions.

The last thing we want are first responders or command center leaders or anybody else that has to interact, dealing with a homeland security issue, to be singing off of different song sheets. And so the Lexicon Project -- and Dr. Ruth David has been working very, very hard on this project -- is, again, trying to bring some common sense, as the Lieutenant Governor reminds us, to the notion that when people are involved in homeland security work, the same acronyms and the same words should have the same meaning.

The relevance may not be so easily discernable by the general public, but we think internally it is very, very important. I can't imagine, in your experiences in Special Forces, Joe, that if you use the term and somebody else in the command structure had an entirely different definition, how confusing that would have been during training, let alone during operations. And it's basically the same concept.

And so I appreciate the work that Dr. David has done, and again, I look forward to your recommendations as part of the public meeting today.

A couple other quick comments. Admiral Jim Loy, former Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, is going to review with you our mission priorities for fiscal year '05. You should know, in addition to going over these seven stated objectives, and I'll briefly summarize them, our Commandant, the Admiral, my Deputy, is also very, very involved in leading a milestone project that we have working internally as we set up an operational and management structure. It is a lengthy document where we have set -- we have

identified needs, identified people who have to meet those needs, given them dates upon which to accomplish their missions.

And so in addition to talking about the public priorities we've set for '05, among other things, my friend Jim Loy is very much involved in the structural realignment of the Department as we integrate procurement, IT, personnel, and at the same time, make some operational changes.

And so we won't give you that briefing on the milestone project today, but the next time around, I think, we'll do that.

Jim is going to talk to you a little bit about our seven projects. I'm going to briefly outline them.

Information-sharing and infrastructure protection. By the end of the year, we want a national system for information-sharing built on the internet, and we want a national critical infrastructure list, developed with our friends, particularly the governors and the mayors and first responders around the country.

Secondly, interoperability, primarily with communications, but there are other aspects of interoperability. But clearly, by the end of this year, we need to set the standard for communication and that's a very high priority for us.

The integrated border and port security program. The last two meetings, we did one in Detroit, we did one in Miami. You know why it's a problem and why it's a challenge and why it's a good thing to do, dealing with our ports and dealing with our borders and integrating the personnel, the technology resources and the like, is a high priority.

New technology and new tools. Dr. Cohon from Carnegie-Mellon, he likes that, but we all like that. And this is an initiative that was really driven by our science and technology unit and I wanted Jim just to highlight a few aspects of that.

Better prepared communities. The Homeland Security Advisory Council and some of the Senior Advisory Committees helped us with Homeland Security Presidential Directive 8, dealing with preparedness; you helped us with the National Incident Management Plan, two terrific documents that will help drive community preparedness. Basically, it's a place sheet. These are the kinds of things we expect communities to undertake, and we will now go from the National Incident Management Plan down to creating templates to deal with different kinds of emergencies so that basically, in time, if a particular kind of terrorist incident occurs in any particular community, there are certain basic things that all the communities know they need to do.

Six goes back to a very important function that we inherited in the new Department, and that is keeping our doors open to legal immigrants. And we've got to improve customer service to these men, women and families who seek to become American citizens. There is no more profound statement about who we are as a country you can ever see than at a

naturalization ceremony, when people from all around the world raise their right hand, take the oath of citizenship.

The last one I went to was in California. There were 4200 people from 120 countries, all became citizens of the United States with the Oath of Citizenship. And there's not another place on the face of the earth where people will congregate to say, we want to be Americans.

And it has nothing to do with government. It has a lot to do with who we are, what we believe in, our value system. The opportunities are there. We know we need to improve service and Jim will talk to you about that.

Finally, the President has given us the opportunity -- and I know that's why many of you accepted service on the Advisory Council -- we need to make this Department a 21st century in every manner, shape and form. so it's about innovation, it's about accountability, and really kind of redefining the role of the federal government vis-à-vis state and locals, but also doing some things that a 21st century government, that some of the older, more traditional institutions in Washington have done in the past but may not be as mobile, as agile, and as connected with the 21st century way of doing business. We have an opportunity to do that in this Department and I've asked Jim to talk a little bit about those seven goals that we've set publicly.

**DEPUTY SECRETARY LOY:** Thank you, sir. What I'd like to start with is a thank you to the Council, and certainly of its senior leadership, that as we embarked on the Secretary's challenge to interpret the National Strategy for Homeland Security, that document that was issued by the President for our guidance, to help us interpret for our workforce and for the public at large, is precisely what the Presidential document should mean to each of us as members of the DHS team and as citizens of the United States.

And we have worked very hard to create a Strategic Plan over the course of the last couple of months, which I'll be happy to pass out as many copies as we have. But many of the members of the Council were reached to help us sort through exactly what ought to be the interpretation we make of the President's direction.

I'm deeply appreciative to all the Council members for the feedback that we got, and I trust that we've incorporated most of that into the public document that now represents that strategy the Secretary has put forward.

Enormously important for us to congeal for our workforce and for the public at large, that this Secretary, this Department, is clear in its game plan with respect to how we're going to go forward. Many of the notions that have been sold around this town and around our country for years were looked at and examined very carefully to see if they still fit this post-9/11 security environment that we're all grappling with.

One of them, for example, was the simple notion that FEMA and Coast Guard and lots of other agencies that serve America so well over the last many years had sorted into a sort



of a prevention, response and consequence management paradigm and that was sort of how we went about the business of doing things.

And we wondered aloud to not only ourselves but to those who could comment on the drafts that we had taken on the Strategic Plan whether that simple three-way paradigm was adequate to this new security environment that we're living in and found it, frankly, not to be the case.

One of the things the Secretary has focused on from the very beginning is information-sharing and the means by which we can communicate both horizontally, with other federal agencies, and vertically, down literally to the first responders who are literally almost always the first on the scene and the last to leave the scene of any kind of a crisis, and how we were going to grapple with those things and grapple with them well.

And we had to break out from this original notion of prevention, something that we have come to call awareness. So one of the strategic goals of this organization is to truly understand everything that's going on in the domain that we're responsible for so that we can build better prevention and response protocols across the rest of what we do for the country.

So the seven strategic goals that parallel those seven items that the Secretary has focused on for us for this next year became the idea of awareness up front, truly understanding what's going on around you, then preventing those things that can be prevented, a direct lift, if you will, from the President's charter for our National Strategy for Homeland Security, going on to protecting, because the other major goal of this Department is to, in addition to information-sharing, is to protect the critical infrastructure of America.

We are literally just embarking on that. The Secretary cited a moment ago HSPD 8, Homeland Security Presidential Directive 8, which is about preparedness. But the one just before that, HSPD 7, is about the direction that the President has given to the Department with respect to protecting the critical infrastructure of the United States.

One of the Secretary's goals therein for this upcoming year is to embark on that with the notion that those 13 economic sectors and those five lists of key assets that are enumerated in HSPD 7, that we have taken a game plan and moved out with each of the most responsible players at the federal level and on down to the state and local first responder tribal chieftains, whoever they may be, that can help us understand and carefully orchestrate how we are going to move out and move forward with those challenges.

So in this array of seven strategic goals for the Department, let me complete that list for you. It starts with awareness, it goes through the notions of preventing bad things from happening, goes one to protecting the critical infrastructure of our country, those three major operational missions, if you will, in a -- before the, God-forbid, event, should anything like that actually occur.

And then the immediate aftermath of an event, should it occur, which is the rest of the challenge offered to the Department by the President's National Strategy, is to press on with response to that event, recovery from that event, and those become the five of the seven strategic goals for this Department to live by over time, that grapple with those operational challenges given to us by the President.

The last two, again, citing specifically two things that the Secretary has focused on for our second year, through March of '05, are about service and about a 21st century agency. And what we mean by service is to recognize that many of the things that came to the Department from the 22, with the 22 agencies or pieces of agencies that came to us last year, were not specifically focused on the general notion of homeland security as we've come to understand it, but are enormously important services that should continue to be provided to the American people, whether those are the Coast Guard Search and Rescue services or servicing immigrant populations who are seeking naturalization or citizenship here in the United States, those are fundamental to us doing our jobs well.

So the Secretary has made it quite clear time and time again that we cannot forget the non-homeland security responsibilities that the Department of Homeland Security has.

The last piece is about the 21st century nature of an agency. We brought to the table, with the 22 agencies, as you might imagine, a legacy of, some would call it baggage, some would call it challenges, some would call it 22 different cultures, and some would call it 22 different ways of doing business. And our challenge is to integrate horizontally those things that were brought to the table to make efficiency and effectiveness the bywords of this Department and allow us to literally, because we had a clean sheet of paper as we sat down, set the bar high for efficiency and effectiveness in the federal government so that bureaucracy's not a bad word, but rather, if they do it the way the bureaucracy known as the Department of Homeland Security does it, they will be doing it efficiently and effectively for the well-being of the American people.

So in such things as our human resource embarkation on an effort where we are literally trying to recognize that the Civil Service system of the United States has served us well for 50 years or more, but this is a new century. This is a new set of challenges, this is a new security environment that we're all living in. What might be the tweaks that we would make or radical adjustments that we would make to the means by which we incentivize people or that we pay people or that we move people, that we deal with people as the most important ingredient in the well-being of our Department.

We have sat together in a very inclusive fashion with all those folks who have equities in that issue, including union presidents who have sat with me around a table to offer counsel to the Secretary as we embark on this new HR design system for our Department.

But it's also about recognizing that what came to the Department was 22 different HR systems. We really only want one. There were 19 different places where people were being paid out of federal payroll centers. We really only want one. And we have made dramatic achievements there already, where those 19 have become seven on their way to

one, or those 22 have become nine on their way to one, only in the course of the first year of our work.

So the notion of horizontal integration of things like acquisition and procurement and HR systems, as well as those things outside the support realm, where there are truly operational implications to doing a better job, for example, at the borders, where heretofore, when we inherited, when we established the Department, there were three different hoops one jumped through when you came back from a foreign country. You jumped through the Customs hoops, you jumped through the INS hoop for immigration purposes, and you jumped through the agricultural hoop, depending on what you might be bringing back into the country.

Now we have one face at the border, with a training program that offers initial primary screening for anyone returning to our country. If a red flag goes up as a result of that one face at the border officer reviewing your paperwork and your intentions as you come back in, we can go to so-called secondary screening and get more intense examinations as appropriate.

But 99 percent of the people will have a quick flow through that portal as they return to our country, because we have made much more efficient this One Face at the Border concept.

So it's not just about the support side, it's also about the operational side of what DHS does for a living that we need to integrate.

There are an awful lot of people who cite for the Secretary and I that we have one or two of the toughest jobs in Washington here, and I suppose, to a lot of degrees, that's correct, in terms of taking on this awesome responsibility that the President has offered to us and that the Congress has offered to us. But it's also, perhaps, the biggest opportunity that has come by in years and years and years, by the far the largest organizational reallocation of assets in the federal government since the Truman Administration, and an opportunity to set in place and to set in motion all the right ways of doing business, to listen to the private sector carefully.

I sat with Kathleen and her private sector subcommittee just a couple of weeks ago as they began to set off on the kind of work that they're going to take on for the Department and for the committee as a whole. We went very carefully over the Strategic Plan so that they had an idea of what the outline of intent was that the Secretary had put in place for us.

We are now marching down that path. We will listen carefully to the inputs that we get from them, representing our private sector colleagues, because at the other end of the day, if there's a single notion I would leave on the table, it is that the only way we will succeed in the enormous tasks that we have undertaken is by way of public/private partnerships.

At the other end of the day, it's about what citizens do, it's about what corporations do, it's about what companies do, it's about what organizations do, and then at the other end of the accumulation of all of that, it is, as a result of that, what we can do as a single nation to secure our citizens and their property from the scourge of international terrorism.

That's what we are about and we look forward to every opportunity that this public session offers to hear constructive criticism. There is absolutely no corner on the market of good ideas, and we want to make sure that we recognize that up front and every time so that we can get better at what we're doing day after day.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. GRANO:** Thank you, sir.

I'll just continue to segue right into the Lexicon Project. To reiterate what Secretary Ridge has said, I think it's perhaps one of the most important things that we're doing. As you discussed the barriers of integration and coalescing the diverse cultures, obviously a common language is a good place to start.

So if I can, I'll turn it over to Dr. Ruth David, please.

**DR. DAVID:** Let me first thank you, Mr. Secretary, Mr. Chairman, Admiral Loy, for the opportunity to formulate a set of recommendations for this very important and very difficult challenge that you face -- actually, that we all face.

I'd like to thank the members of the working group. They brought a set of very diverse perspectives that, I will say, equal passion to the task. Everyone recognized the importance.

I also want to thank Jeff Gaynor whose support was instrumental in developing some of the research that went into formulation of our recommendations.

Let me first remind very quickly the audience, our objective for this project was fundamentally to ensure efficient and effective communications. The Lexicon is all about how people not just talk in times of crisis, but how they plan together, prepare together. So it's not just in the aftermath.

It really is about making, letting the nation put into place the right goals and objectives and strategies to achieve homeland security. Our caveat is, of course, coalescing on a single unique definition for any term we very rapidly realized was impossible. I think Dr. Cohon pointed out very early that English is a context-based language, and even normally used words very rarely have a single unique meaning. So we certainly came up against that.

I want to very quickly provide just a couple of quick examples, just to illustrate some of the challenge. We looked at the term "first responder" and dug our way through a

number of different sources. And from that, I have distilled just two of the different definitions for first responder. This is two of a much longer list, I will say.

One of my observations is that our definition process for words like this has evolved over time. Some of the early documents tended to define the term through examples. You know, first responder means these kinds of people. We're now getting to where definitions provide functional descriptions, what those people do, which I think is very important. Both kinds of definitions are useful, but I think defining in terms of what people do is the important next step.

At this point, I want to applaud the authors of HSPD 8, the most recent Presidential Directive, because the front page of that document was a set of definitions. I thought this is a very good practice, because it gave you right up front a context for interpreting the rest of the document.

That being said, I would point out that I can look at these two definitions, both of which are in relatively recent documents, and say they're not inconsistent, but one appears to be an expansion of the other, because if you read the second definition, it appears to include some functions that don't occur in the NIMS definition.

So this is why I say that the importance of defining what is meant when a term is being used. In particular, it appears that the HSPD 8 definition extends beyond simply the incident response, because it specifically speaks to prevention, response and recovery. It also appears to more clearly point out the need for, I'll say, the law enforcement aspect, the protection of evidence. So it appears that it's a broader definition. I'm not saying that's good or bad, but I think we need to understand how definitions have evolved over time and the implications of that.

Now we come to acronyms. And again, I provide only a few very brief examples to illustrate the problem. My personal favorite is the RDD, because frankly, this one just came up within the last couple of weeks. I have for many years assumed RDD was radiological dispersal device. And in a document that just fairly recently came out, RDD was remote detonation device. So my concern here is that the proliferation of acronyms and frequent use can lead to miscommunications.

This is a very difficult challenge, but I think it's one that is very important that the Department take on in terms of how we provide guidance to the authors who create new acronyms.

**SECRETARY RIDGE:** I'll give you a further complication, that the Operation Safe Commerce -- we actually have a couple of programs, different missions, different demonstration projects for Operation Safe Commerce. So it's not only the acronym, but we actually employed the same three words to mean two entirely different things. I mean, it's just a little confusing.

**DR. DAVID:** That's even worse. That's even worse.

So let me cut to the chase. What do we recommend? First of all, I was pleased to hear your comment again, and you've reiterated many times this is a marathon, not a sprint. We actually have a three-pronged approach that I would divide into the three terms, building the foundation and then sustaining it, you know, keeping it current over time. But then let people -- get people to use, because what we're really talking about is writing the dictionary, but that isn't very helpful unless people actually use the dictionary.

Our working group believes that these are really three different kinds of activities. The creation ought to be, in our minds, a very urgent up-front project that ought to be initiated rapidly and completed rapidly. But then there's the parallel ongoing effort that is required to sustain.

So if we look at "create," our recommendation is that the Department select a set of core documents. And the ones we've listed there are sort of our off-the-top recommendation. These are driving documents that already exist. Yours is to pick how long that list is. Our preference is that it not be terribly long, but you pick the most important documents across which you need to build a common understanding, to build the foundation for your Lexicon.

In particular, we put at the top of the list the recently published plan that Admiral Loy was describing. I would pick the key objectives, start there: awareness, prevention, protection, response, recovery. What are the definitions for those terms and how else have they been defined in other documents? And I think that's a very, very important element of moving forward coherently.

In terms of national strategies, I would certainly pick the Homeland Security Strategy, but also the Cyberspace Strategy and the Critical Infrastructure Strategy, all fairly recently published documents. Legislation -- certainly the Homeland Security Act, probably the Patriot Act, probably also the Maritime Transportation Security Act and the Aviation Act as well.

So again, this set may not be the right list, but the general idea is pick the ones that are most relevant to moving the Department forward. And then, of course, the National Response Plan and the National Incident Management System.

So from that set of documents, our recommendation is that you identify the key terms, the ones across which you must have a common understanding, and also that you compile the list of acronyms that are used or misused across that set of documents.

And then for each of those, we think it's very important that you either extract or derive a definition, because very often, the terms are used without definition, in which case a professional may need to derive the definition from the context of the document.

So this is not an easy task but we think it's critical to build this solid foundation with a finite set of core documents.

The next step, of course, is recognizing that this is a limited set from the universe of documents, which is vast. Jeff did a little research, and there are literally hundreds of thousands of relevant documents floating around. So the next step, of course, is really two-fold. It's extending the set of core documents to include other legacy documents, documents that were perhaps brought in by the original organizational elements that created the Department, that still guide many of their activities. So it's, again, it's a part of the integration aspect that you were describing.

We also think there is value in developing at least a dialogue with some of the international collaborators, because there is a need for a common understanding in some areas among the international community. So there is the retrospective look at other documents, but then there is also the forward look. We believe this needs to be an ongoing activity that constantly scans the environment for newly released documents, recognizing that the Department isn't the only author, that there will be many, many more documents that will impact how the National Strategy is implemented.

And here again, this is something that we discussed in December. We do recommend the engagement of a professional lexicographer, because a part of this -- while a part of the task is certainly compiling the definitions that are provided, there's another part that is deriving the meaning for some of these terms. And we do believe that a professional lexicographer would add significant value to the "create" and "sustain" aspects of our recommendations.

Our final recommendation is a little bit different. And we chose the term "promote" -- there were a lot of options here but there are actually two prongs to this. One is inside the Department: how do we build a discipline inside the Department? And our top-level recommendation is for the official documents and communications, so the plans that come out from the senior levels. And we think there really needs to be a policy and a review process, and perhaps the Executive Secretariat is the right place for that.

But we recognize also that the Executive Secretariat cannot possibly review every document that is generated by the Department. So we really believe there is a role for distributed implementation, ownership by the line organizations to instill the discipline and review so that the Lexicon is used over time. So this is not an easy task and we recognize this.

And at this point, I'm going to ask you to review with me a virtual view graph, because in my zeal to data compress, I edited out a view graph. The other side of promoting the Lexicon is for all of those authors who are not a part of the Department, over whom you have, I'll say, limited control. And it's a very vast community, as you well know, ranging from the White House Homeland Security Council, to media, to the research and academic community, to state and local participants, to private industry. So lots of people are writing relevant documents.

And our belief is that there is a role here to develop outreach strategies for each of those audiences. You're going to have to focus it in on each audience, but to enlist their help. To do that, though, we believe it's very important that you make the Lexicon readily accessible, and my inference is electronically accessible, at their fingertips, so an internet-based system. In fact, Merriam-Webster Online is an interesting example that I personally find quite useful as a dictionary and a thesaurus. So just suggest that as a model.

But we really believe that you need to enlist the help of the very, very broad and diverse Homeland Security community in converging toward a common Lexicon. And we suggest that the Office of Public Affairs and Legislative Liaison could be a big help in reaching a couple of your primary audiences and enlisting their aid. That's the other audience that I should have suggested, which is the Congressional staffers, who very often draft legislation, sometimes with definitions. So the engagement of your external stakeholder audiences is another aspect of this that we think it quite important.

So our bottom line is, we think the problem is real and as you pointed out, it has potentially dire consequences. We also observe that the situation is worsening. There are a lot of documents coming out on a daily basis. But we think it's possible for the Department to lead the way, to build a common Lexicon and we think doing so will help the nation come together in implementing the strategies that you've talked about.

**MR. GRANO:** Thank you very much. I'd like to open up for commentary and discussion the recommendations from Ruth. So any volunteers to begin? Kathleen, any observations?

**MS. BADER:** Thank you, Joe. In my opinion, Dr. David and her team have done exactly the right thing here in setting up the boundaries that we've got. This would be an impossible task to simply create a dictionary and expect, without any kind of a management of change program, that that was going to be a sufficient result. So the approach you've taken, I think, is exactly what it ought to be. I'm very supportive of the recommendation.

**MR. GRANO:** And can I assume that the Executive Secretariat reports to you two gentlemen?

**DEPUTY SECRETARY LOY:** Indeed.

**MR. GRANO:** Okay. Because crossing organizational lines, it has to be at the right level, because you'll have turf issues. I endorse that recommendation as well.

**DEPUTY SECRETARY LOY:** I also think that, Ruth, your group has done a very good job of making a recommendation of how to put together a good dictionary. And I'm also struck by the importance of it. I think we were told in one of our prior meetings, about the one group of members of the Homeland Security Department, if you tell them to secure a building, that means to put guards around it and make sure no one goes in and



out. To another group, it means going in and blow the dickens out of the building and get rid of the bad guys. It's pretty important when someone says "secure the building" that you know what they mean.

Ruth, I do have a question, though, that you really touched on, that even if we had the world's great dictionary, and very few people sit down and read dictionaries. What's the Department going to need to do to make this something other than a document that sits on everybody's shelf?

**DR. DAVID:** That's exactly why we recommend both the inside the Department enforcement and the outside engagement. And in fact, one audience that I failed to mention is the American public. So demonstrating the availability, demonstrating the value to these diverse external audiences, we see as a critical element of this process. And I think each audience will require a specific and unique outreach strategy.

So this, the promotion aspect is really critical. Creating the dictionary is well and good, but if you don't then promote its use, you haven't solved the problem.

**MR. GRANO:** That's an observation I'd like to add. We have the same problem with security. Anyone who wanted to create an abbreviation for security, and you will have no rhyme or reason to understand what the abbreviation meant, and until we put the protocol and discipline that you didn't have the authority to create that abbreviation or acronym, without going through due process, and just the due process itself forced them to go to the dictionary, because we went through the same exact issues there.

But that protocol has to be in place for future use or the dictionary's going to be out of date in a year anyways if you don't do that. You have to put discipline in alongside with it.

**MR. AUGUSTINE:** I was wondering if it might be useful to have an abbreviated dictionary for different groups that was adapted to their particular needs that would be worth their reading.

**MR. CILUFFO:** If I could just add a point, because I think Dr. David and the team really did put this together well, and I don't think that what Norm Augustine brought up is mutually exclusive. But I think the training and education component, where the nouns are actually translated into verbs, where lives are either saved or lost, those are the folks where they'd need a front seat at the table from a customer service perspective.

So I think that they're actually going to help define -- it's the old Eisenhower quote, the difference between plans and planning. Ultimately, the planning becomes very important in the training and exercise component. I think they need to be the driving force of that constituency, whether federally or state and local or private sector. And obviously, the old congressional policy -- resources should follow policy, not the other way around, and once you tie it to the resources, that will also help enable some standardization in terms of terminology.

But I just bring up the training and education components, which I think would be a good thing.

**MR. GRANO:** And Ruth, I have a question as well. Relative to the execution of these recommendations, do you envision that the SAC will provide an action plan or would you expect whoever's going to be assigned the task to build the action plan, out of curiosity?

**DR. DAVID:** Let me ask you that, Mr. Secretary. We can certainly be directive on this, but I guess my sense is that it's probably the Department's job to take these. And the reason we broke it up as we did with the "create" piece, we envision that as a finite project. I mean, developing a project plan for that, we could do in an hour. I mean, this is not terribly difficult to lay out a project plan for that.

But then the institutionalization, the "sustain" piece, I don't think we're the right ones to develop policy. So I think much of this is up to the Department to do, but we stand ready to help. We will certainly be happy to review, to help, to brainstorm in any way you'd like.

**SECRETARY RIDGE:** I think you have framed a way ahead for us within the Department, and since you will sustain that working group, I think it is up to us now to take this plan. And I think one of the most important ingredients in the plan, which is very thoughtful and very inclusive, is that we have to enforce the discipline internally before we can expect anybody else to do it. So we need to take the plan, identify the three stages, begin with the creation, identify the documents, get the lexicographer to, perhaps, contractually work with somebody else in order to pull this thing together.

But we can refer to you and will continue to refer to the working group as we develop our own plan and execute it within the Department. So I think that's the way ahead. And I think your recommendation that, over time, we do it through the Executive Secretariat is a very good way, particularly the enforcement of the discipline internally. A lot of work to do there, but you've really given us a good way ahead.

**DEPUTY SECRETARY LOY:** My thoughts would only be twofold. One, to pick up on Dr. Augustine's notion, I think there probably are subsets that are going to be much more relevant, and therefore, much more consumable by parties. In other words, if we've got a Lexicon that's capsulated for procurement and acquisition kind of players, you know, the folks in the trenches in BTS aren't really too worried about that stuff when they're, you know, between a rock and a hard place of actually getting the work done on the line. So differentiating between those kinds of consumers is good.

Secondly, I think there is always the sort of classic marketing value of repeating. You know, if the Secretary says it and I say it and everybody else is saying it from the leadership cadre, pretty soon the workforce is believing that those things that the Secretary says, not once but twice or three times or a dozen times or however many times it takes. You know, it's the old adage about teaching. You go up to the front of the

classroom and you tell them what you're going to tell them, and then you tell them, and then you tell them what you told them and you hope they got it one out of three. I think that's a lesson for us here with respect to Lexicon things.

The Secretary made it quite clear that this Strategic Plan -- he does not want this to be shelf ware. He wants this to be a dynamic living document that truly describes what the Department is all about. So we're visualizing it, you know, so that the core values are seen on the bulkhead with -- that's walls, for those that aren't sailors, right -- but the opportunity to not only hear the boss on the occasion of an anniversary speech tell us about his new strategic plan, that's great. But if they see it often, then it becomes embedded into the fabric of the Department, which is what the boss wants it to be.

**DR. DAVID:** Can I just add one thought on -- I agree with Norm about different audiences for the Lexicon. My only concern with that is that we have found within specific functional areas, that communications are pretty good already. It's when you start crossing areas that we begin to run into problems.

And so my caveat is that we not segment this too much or you may well defeat what you're trying to accomplish, which is the integration across very diverse communities of stakeholders in Homeland Security.

That said, I understand the reason for subsets. I will also give you a personal bent, which is to put as little of this as possible in hard copy that goes out to individual offices, and as much as possible in electrons, that is, at their fingertips, in part because it will continue to change.

But I just would encourage you to think about not creating additional stovepipes.

**DEPUTY SECRETARY LOY:** Such things as the strategic goals for example, just those seven words, or those seven notions --

**DR. DAVID:** Absolutely.

**DEPUTY SECRETARY LOY:** -- those are going to be vibrant for us, I think, for several years. And there may be a cycle of a five-year new one that comes out and then we make the adjustments as appropriate. So those are universals. But Lexicon associated with the specifics of what the Customs and Border Patrol officers are doing may be that crowd of players. There's a best of both worlds in there that we can deal with.

**MR. GRANO:** Any other commentary?

Well, then, I would suggest that we go to final recommendation and submit to the Department. And everyone is in accordance with that?

Again, excellent work, Ruth, and please thank all the members of the team on our behalf. Excellent. Wonderful.

Okay. I'd like to basically get an update report from the balance of our SACs. Starting with the State and Local Official SAC, it's in conjunction with the Emergency Response SAC, they met yesterday to receive reports from the Task Force on State and Local Homeland Security Funding. Secretary Ridge requested that the Task Force be established under this body to assist in making state and local funding more effective and efficient.

The Task Force is developing recommendations that we'll have an opportunity to deliberate at our next meeting. HSAC members serving on the task force include the leadership of both of these SACs: Governor Romney, Mayor Williams, Dick Andrews -- who is not here today -- and Chuck Canterbury.

Governor Romney, would you please give us an update as to how your SAC is evolving, and are there any issues we can help you with?

**GOVERNOR ROMNEY:** Yes, I certainly will. First, with regards to the Task Force itself, I think the report of the Task Force and the input of the SAC members as to that report was the largest portion of our meeting yesterday, and so let me report on that first.

The Task Force, as you've indicated, has been given the responsibility by the Secretary to gain a better understanding of why there is a delay between the award of a grant to a state for homeland security purposes and the actual expenditure of funds by a city or town consistent with that grant. And that's the first part, which is to understand why there is a delay.

The second element is to make any recommendations we may have as to possible options or perhaps even a single recommendation as to action to be taken to reduce or eliminate the delay.

We are in the stage currently of gathering information, gathering data and fleshing out the options. We are not near resolution of the causes of the problem nor the prescriptions for improving matters. Nevertheless, there was a great deal of data which we did review and which we reacted to, and members of the task force, as well as members of the SAC, reached a number of hypotheses and preliminary observations in reviewing the data and in drawing from their own firsthand experiences.

I'd note, to begin with, that we looked at several states and looked at the status of funding. We saw, for instance, in the '02 and '03 budget year that certain grant amounts had been provided to a state. Then we looked to see whether the state had, in turn, obligated those funds further down the chain. And indeed, in the examples we saw, each state reported that they had obligated those funds further down to the localities. Our understanding is that either every state or virtually every state in the nation has so obligated those funds.

The preliminary hypothesis is that the obligation process by the state is not the source of our problem, therefore, and that we have to look further down the chain. But, of course, it's always possible the states are overstating their compliance.

Assuming for a moment that we're getting a straight report from the various states, then we're looking to say, okay, how come, in one of the states we looked at, \$22 million has been obligated by the state to localities but only \$2 million has actually been spent by the locality?

And we recognize that there are three major categories of reasons for the gap between funds being obligated and funds actually being spent.

One is that the planning process of identifying what equipment is appropriate to purchase for a particular community and so forth is not complete. That planning process may be at the state level, the county level or the locality level. And while this was technically a problem and potentially a problem, the members of the task force felt that the planning process was unlikely to have been the major holdup. As we spent time talking about planning processes, people felt that the Department of Homeland Security has, you know, put everyone's feet to the fire to such an extent that plans are now in place or being pulled in place, and that planning is not the primary source of the problem. Again, this is a preliminary hypothesis and we will spend a lot more time really delving into this planning issue to find out whether we've got some problems there.

One area in planning that did stand out as a potential source of real problem is that states are told that they must obligate the funds within a certain time period, either 45 days or 60 days, to the next level of government, to the local levels of government. That includes counties. And in most states with a strong county structure, they have obligated those funds to the counties, but there is no further obligation on the part of the county to further obligate the funds to the localities.

So it's possible for the state to say, yeah, we got our \$22 million obligated, but the county now has their obligated amount but has not further identified the amounts to go to localities. So localities don't have any money to spend because they haven't been given that indication by the county.

In other words, we've put a time fuse on states but we have not put a further time fuse on counties. And some members of our task force indicated that if this turns out to be a significant source of the problem, as they think it may, that we may want to consider in the future not only putting a time fuse on states for making obligations but such a time fuse also on any level of government prior to the level that's actually going to be doing the spending.

So the first area was that the planning process seemed to be a potential issue, although people felt that it was not as big as the next two.

The next area was bureaucratic issues, and not meant in a negative sense but in recognizing the normal processes of spending money at the state government level. It was pointed out that various states, counties and communities, over long periods of time, have developed procedures for spending federal grants to make sure that we comply with federal regulations as well as state regulations. This includes the budget process, in many cases the involvement of a legislature, procurement processes, and finally vendor issues as well. Vendors, for instance, may have equipment on back order and it may take a year or more for them to actually provide the equipment that is being requested by a locality.

These bureaucratic issues and vendor issues, it is believed, are a major source of the problem with actually having money spent. We ranged through a whole series of possible solutions to overcome some of these bureaucratic issues and there are some solutions which seem like they have some merit, such as communities being able to purchase from federal approval lists. Some states actually are allowing communities to purchase directly from a state list of approved vendors and to move on a more expedited basis.

But there was generally recognition that these processes, these bureaucratic processes -- budget process, legislative process, procurement processes -- have been put in place over time to protect the public from misuse of public funds, and that somehow short-circuiting or bypassing these processes would be fraught with dangers all its own.

And so I think it's fair to say that there's a great deal of hesitation to establish new bypassing procedures to allow money to be spent much more quickly. And this is an area where I think we're going to do a lot more work and get a great deal more information.

That was the second area. So planning process first, bureaucratic issues second. The third area of potential reason for the gap between obligated funds and actually spent funds is the reimbursement process itself. In the past, there has been a step in the reimbursement process which the Department of Homeland Security has now removed, which will help things, and that's the approval of Department of Homeland Security to actually purchasing a particular piece of equipment. That step is removed and that will speed things up.

But there was nonetheless a belief on the part of a number of people in the task force that some localities have a requirement that, prior to a purchase order being signed, that money must be in the bank to meet the obligation of the purchase order. And when there is a reimbursement process which is required, that would, of course, make that impossible. So we're looking to see whether, indeed, this is a source of the slowdown and, where it is a source of the slowdown, we're looking to see what kind of procedures might be put in place to avoid this particular issue.

The final area, which goes back to the state obligation process, this is the fourth area, the state obligation process does not appear to be a major source of problem, as I indicated at the outset, but we will be testing that further.

What I've just described for you in terms of the gaps between obligation and spending, all related to equipment, and our discussions primarily related to equipment purchases. We use that as the, if you will, the example to get a better handle on why this gap exists. And so we focused on equipment, but our task force felt it was important and the SAC also felt it was important to recognize that similar issues revolve around the issues of training, or the areas of training and intelligence work. And we wouldn't want to indicate that by only having focused on equipment that we're not just as concerned with training and intelligence funding as well as code reimbursement funding and the like.

So we will look at all of those areas, but I think the discussion of equipment gives you a full sense of the kinds of things that we think may be at the source of the problem.

Let me just summarize, then, very briefly by saying that the hypothesis of our group and the data we have reviewed so far suggests that the reason that there is a gap between a grant by the Department of Homeland Security, or ODP, and the actual spending of funds does not appear that the states are holding on to the funds or are unable to make obligating awards, but instead that bureaucratic processes, planning processes and reimbursement processes are slowing the actual spending. And I neglected on that list to also note that vendor issues as well may be slowing the spending of those funds.

With that, I will turn the time back to the meeting and respond to any questions you may have. And I have one more observation of our task force that I -- excuse me, of our SAC that I also would make.

**MR. GRANO:** Thank you, Governor. Mayor Williams, anything to add, sir?

**MAYOR WILLIAMS:** I would just add, too, that one of the things I got from the report yesterday was that there is an issue, there seems to be, at the county level where the money has been obligated by the states, it gets down to the county, and while time frames are being set in place for the states there isn't a corresponding time frame for the counties. So that's one issue.

Another issue is somehow or another, in the execution of the plan from a kind of programmatic point of view, it's unclear whether the counties' priorities and their philosophy and their strategy are mapping particularly with the bigger cities in those counties. I know I've heard from big cities that happen to be in a strong county, and there's some friction in there that needs to be worked out. I think that's where a lot of the noise and clanking is in the system.

**SECRETARY RIDGE:** There has been a lot of noise and clanking, and I thank Governor Romney and his team, and thank you, Mayor, for taking on this task.

Homeland Security funding to first responders and others for training and exercises since 9/11 has been increased about 900 percent. I mean, there's about \$13 billion on the books. And for the longest time, if you pick up a newspaper or you listen to local public

officials, their assertion was that they weren't getting the money and they looked to Washington.

And we had been prepared to write checks literally from day one, particularly since the Congress said we've got to get the money out the door in 45 days. As the Governor mentioned, there's a mandate that we get it out, a mandate that the states get it out, within a certain proscribed time period, but after that we lose the mandates.

But there are just some real mundane practical problems associated with getting it down to the local level. And so instead of pointing fingers of responsibility, we've got the League of Cities and the Conference of Mayors and the state legislators and the National Governors Association and everybody else, the group of seven, together on a Task Force that Governor Romney is overseeing that, and he's also, obviously, a part of our Homeland Security Advisory Council as well.

So we've got literally staff from these government organizations working with us -- Chris has been coordinating that effort -- and then having our first responders and our state and local officials and work with them to give us some recommendations. The money's not doing us any good sitting in the bank. We are prepared to write checks. Governors are prepared to write checks. You do have vendor problems. You have some local procurement problems. Their own policies and procedure inhibit or retard or slow down their ability to access the money quickly. We want to break through this logjam with some constructive recommendations to folks because we all want the money to be distributed as quickly as possible.

But it also helps, I think, dispel the myth that the problem is within the Department or the problem is in Washington. We're ready to cut the checks and we're ready to adjust accordingly, and we've gone a long way in a very short period of time, in less than a month, and I hope we have these recommendations to be reviewed by our State and Local Officials and our First Responder Senior Advisory Committee for you to take a look at by the next meeting in June, we can break the logjam and get the money out the door for the equipment purchases and for the training and exercises.

So, Governor, you and your team did a great job. That's the first impression, those four basic items that you've identified. We'll work through those in the next several weeks, and hopefully, we'll have some strong recommendations by our next meeting that we can implement almost immediately.

**GOVERNOR ROMNEY:** I certainly hope so. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

**MR. CANTERBURY:** I think the only thing that we could add would be actually more to reiterate the training and the intelligence seem to be very high on the Emergency Response Committee's list of priorities with the spending, and education locally of the plans; the local first responders actually having a buy-in to what the plan in that community really is so that there's not expectations of manna from the federal government that's actually never been designated even by the county. And I think that



would, through the education process and the training, that would help to alleviate some of that "We're not getting a piece of our pie" when they were actually never designated to get it anyway from the first responder level.

And then, obviously, we agreed with the other recommendations that the task force had brought forward.

**LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR HEINEMAN:** Joe, I'd like to make a point and I think it's a very good report. Mr. Secretary, I think I can speak for a lot of people around the country. We are delighted that we are getting this money. It's making a difference out in the field.

One of the issues Governor Romney raised about the bureaucratic issues that I think is critical, and one of the ways that I think we've made progress in Nebraska, for example, I don't like to use the word "mandate" because none of us like that, but we have a high expectation when the money we allocate to the county, they have to bring together all the municipal jurisdictions in their entity to a meeting like this, all the police chiefs, fire chiefs, everybody, and they decide how that money is going to be spent locally, not at the state level. We don't make that determination. The county can't make it unilaterally. They've got to involve their jurisdictions. And it's worked very, very effectively and it also moves it quicker in the process.

So I want to say thank you on behalf, I think, of first responders and Homeland Security directors around the country. This money is making a difference and it's critical to our future.

**SECRETARY RIDGE:** Governor Romney, just the question with regard to dollars available for training and exercise, clearly if the vendors are backed up, I mean, the vendors see there's a billion floating around out there, probably exceeds their production capacity in many areas. But the one thing you can invest in now is more training and exercise.

Is there a special or a different path you think we should take or you think you will recommend that we take with regard to the money for training and exercises?

**GOVERNOR ROMNEY:** Well, you know, we did not, as a Task Force, lay out a different series of issues there other than to point out that the -- that what is an approved training effort or approved training program has been very confusing. And this is probably an area where there was a sense that there is more to be done at the federal level.

There was more to be done at the federal level than with regards to equipment. On the equipment side, people felt like, hey, guys, the federal government's giving us everything we need to know, the states have obligated the funds, and now we're dealing with what's down the chain.

But with regards to training, there was a sense that we're having a hard time getting programs approved, that we're all to be going to the same, you know, Tulane University, which doesn't have the capacity to train us all, and that we really need to do more in the training arena.

So I do think that's going to be an area we're going to find, based on the comments of members of the team, that there's more to be done at the state, federal, as well as local levels.

Let me note as well just before I leave the floor here -- I don't mean I'm leaving, I just mean take the podium away from you here -- that the SACs yesterday felt that it was important to underscore the view that we all recognize, and this was not only the responders but as well, the government administrative types, that we will have failed if a bomb goes off, so to speak; that our primary responsibility is not to respond to the crisis but instead to prevent it; and that we felt that of highest priority would be a delineation, a more clear delineation, of the responsibilities of the state and local government entities toward the intelligence and prevention effort, identifying where our effort should be extensive and how it coordinates with the federal effort, and where instead the responsibility lies with the federal government; and, in particular, that we would link our training efforts to those prevention efforts. Specifically, if we know exactly what we expect local communities to do with regards to intelligence gathering or intelligence analysis and reporting, then we would be able to devise a training program to help those local police and other responders be able to be part of that responsibility.

So that was perhaps the area we -- it was really not part of our task to define those things, but instead the conclusion of both of the SACs together was that we wanted to bring to the HSAC our collective view that it would be helpful to define the roles, intelligence roles, between federal, state and local government, and to fashion our training programs to help us fulfill our respective roles.

**MR. GRANO:** Very good. Okay, we're going to look forward to the recommendations, Governor. Thank you very much.

Moving on to another very important activity, and that's the Private Sector Senior Advisory Committee, which is headed by Kathleen Bader, and Herb Kelleher serves as Vice Chair.

I understand, Kathleen, you had a very productive meeting in the last month, could you please provide the public with a brief summary of what we're trying to get done in that SAC and give us an update, please?

**MS. BADER:** Thank you.

On the screen behind you, the first slide lays out for you what the intent is of the Private SAC, and I will review that momentarily. But with the invaluable help of my co-chair, Herb Kelleher, as well as Candace Stoltz, our DHS liaison seated behind me here, we did

get a running start on defining fundamentally how we were going to operate. And you see it on the screen.

The first bullet deals with the feedback and the advice and the recommendations that we will make to DHS on how what they do impacts the private sector, whether that is good, bad or indifferent.

Secondarily, to come to an understanding of best practices using most effective technology, not necessarily prohibitively expensive best available technology, but most effective technology, and how to leverage that technology both across the private sector and perhaps into DHS itself as it goes forward to this 21st century effective and efficient Department that Admiral Loy referred to.

The third bullet, on facilitating and engaging the private sector itself in assisting Homeland Security in its efforts. There's an immense amount of talent out there in the U.S. today in the hands of the private sector that can be brought to bear to move forward with more speed than we are.

And finally, to assist in executing the National Strategy which, again, Admiral Loy reviewed for us within this document.

So we did have a very productive meeting, Joe, on the 10th. If we can go to slide two, we had some very excellent assistance from subject matter experts who helped us define what the priorities of the Private Sector SAC should be. We had -- Admiral Loy came in and spoke to us at length. We had Under Secretary Frank Libutti from the IAIP group represented there. Assistant Secretary Bob Liscouski spent some invaluable time with us on IP issues and Al Martinez-Fonts, who is seated here to my left, from the private sector office.

In addition, we heard from the Secret Service, who gave us an update on their capabilities, and again, who are very generously hosting us here today.

If we could go to slide 3, please. The members utilized a strategic approach to identify our priorities based on the areas where we felt we could maximize both efficiency and effectiveness in helping HSAC and DHS achieve their goals. So these priorities were achieved through going through the process you see on the screen, which involved bringing in the key stakeholders, identifying their issues, identifying the issues that were defined not only in this document on the DHS strategy, but all the earlier documents that Dr. David reviewed. And then fundamentally beginning a catch-ball process with HSAC and with the other SACs as to how those priorities interrelate.

And if you could go to the next slide then, I'll show you what we fundamentally identified as our first pass priorities to include improving information-sharing within the private sector; protecting private sector critical infrastructure, an obvious one; establishing private sector protection standards by industry; making a credible business case for homeland security itself, including the protection of a corporate brand, corporate

assets, and fundamentally, business continuity; promoting public/private partnerships to encourage preparedness in local business and homes and effective planning within communities.

The Private Sector SAC also discussed, as you can see on the bottom of the screen, two other issues. The first was non-immigrant visas. We've begun evaluating the business community's concerns regarding the process for non-immigrant visas. And some groups as, you know, such as the U.S.-China Business Council, have reported significant loss of business as a result of the existing process, if you will, what we feel is a lengthy and somewhat unpredictable process. And I know, Mr. Secretary, that you're aware of the problem and are working on it. We have discussed that.

As the private sector moves forward, we look forward to assisting you with that. We will play catch-ball with Dr. Cohon's Academe and Policy Research SAC, because you folks are also significantly impacted by this visa process, as is business today. We have a series of thoughts we have worked through that we'll share with you as we go forward.

The second arena that we looked at was private sector best practices. As I indicated earlier, we need to assist DHS in the development and exchange of best practices, using what at least we at Dow would refer to as most effective technology, as opposed to, again, the prohibitively expensive ideal best available, but simply may not be commercially viable.

We would do that by helping to set standards, by providing a seal of approval or some kind of a certification for those folks who have been identified as model industries or model companies within their industries, by establishing emergency response, crises response, and survivability preparedness, doing industry monitoring to help everyone focus on what needs to be done as a minimum standard and awarding those folks who move beyond the minimum and using focus groups to help identify that.

That's our report. Herb, would you have anything to add?

**MR. KELLEHER:** Excellent report. I think you covered it very thoroughly, Kathleen. Thank you very much, indeed.

**SECRETARY RIDGE:** If I might, I think, particularly with regard to the non-immigrant business visas, I had a roundtable with 20 plus ambassadors when I was in Asia a couple of weeks ago, and just about every ambassador expressed a concern about the visa policy as it relates to the commercial interaction in the global marketplace. It's slow, it's cumbersome, and we've lost -- I'd remind everybody, we didn't set that policy, we inherited the responsibility, because we made adjustments after 9/11 to our visa policy. We are going through a full scrub now. It's a very complex maze of regulations. But we're going to focus on business travel, student travel, humanitarian visas, and the security advisory opinions that are often associated with one or the other, the business or the students.

So it's a high priority. And we'll get back on a private basis to you to understand better your concerns and to share with you some of the recommendations that we may come up to see if it's consistent with your view that this is a way to enhance security to facilitate commerce. We have to do both. I mean, we adjusted in such a way that it is clear to us that there are business transactions that have been compromised, or business transactions that have been lost, because of visa policy.

We're not making any excuses for doing what we did after 9/11. We adjusted. Now we have to take a look to see where we need to adjust the adjustment and we're going to do that. We look forward to working with you.

**DEPUTY SECRETARY LOY:** I would just note that the first block indicated was information-sharing and critical infrastructure as key priorities as perceived by the Private Sector SAC and precisely where the boss is directing us to focus on a course of our second year in business, so to speak, to go there.

It's very reinforcing to hear that commentary back that we're going in the right direction.

**MR. AUGUSTINE:** Joe, I would just like to comment. Mr. Secretary, with regard to student visas, the decline in number of PhD candidates applying to come to U.S. universities, part of that is apparently attributed to the fact that to get a visa to come here, you've got to be able to show that you're going to go home afterwards but that may be exactly the thing you don't want to have happen. Some of these people come here, get PhDs. They may -- maybe those are people we want to have stay and contribute. And I hope that we're looking at that aspect, too.

**SECRETARY RIDGE:** Yes, we are. And Dr. Cohon, I think he may say something about this, I think we admitted publicly that in 2002, the matriculation of foreign students under our Student and Exchange Visitor Program was a good attempt but we failed considerably. There were all kinds of people that we turned around and a lot of delays. Then we engaged the private universities and colleges. They became partners in the 2003 process.

We admitted nearly 300,000 students under that process but we kept nearly 200 out. Literally, there were 200, nearly 200 alleged students who came to our Ports of Entry, and because of the process we set up with the universities and colleges around our country, we were able to say, you might want -- you're looking for entry but we find no recordation that you're actually going to matriculate to any school, so you go home and try it again. So we admitted nearly 300,000. We kept about 200 people out.

What I'm finding now in our conversations is precisely the point you mentioned. And we're doing pretty good with the undergraduates. We still haven't really found the right combination for graduate students. Some are coming in and then when they leave to go to maybe a conference in their own discipline outside the country, they're having a tough time getting back in.

So one of our goals for the 2004 Student and Exchange Visitor Program is to continue to improve the undergraduates, but pay particular attention to the graduate students, for precisely the same reason you talked about.

**MR. COHON:** I think that's an excellent segue.

**MR. GRANO:** Jared Cohon and Ruth David had the Academe and Policy Research SAC. And they have been meeting in the last several weeks. So you have the floor, sir.

**MR. COHON:** Thank you very much, Joe. I'll get into my committee report shortly, but let me sort of jump ahead of myself and just continue this conversation about visas. I think, Mr. Secretary, that your response was perfect and very encouraging, just as you responded in the past so effectively in the case of the SEVIS system and fixed that, and it's working. It's very encouraging to hear that you're turning your attention to graduate students.

I just want to add two thoughts about this, one picking up on Norm's. Unlike the undergraduates, the graduate students really play a crucial role in the progress of this nation. I mean, undergraduates do too, but graduate students, while they are graduate students, as they study, are the key workers, if you will, in the academic research enterprise of this nation. And it's not an overstatement to say that it's that research enterprise that's been at the base of the economic and military power and progress of this country for the last 50 years.

What has us so worried is, in the last year, we've seen a very significant drop in the number of foreign students applying for graduate study, for PhD study. For us to maintain this leadership position in research, we have to have the very best students. That includes foreign students. And this drop, I think, is a very important warning bell for us.

Second point -- and I look forward to collaborating with the Private Sector SAC, all of my colleagues, too -- I think there may be some differences in what our constituency needs or sees vis-à-vis the private sector.

So I think -- and I'm not in any way trying to be definitive here -- but I believe it may be the case that for graduate students, what's far more important than the length of time is certainty, or lack of uncertainty, reduction of uncertainty. So if for 60 days, guaranteed, I would think graduate students could live with that, whereas that may be completely off for the private sector, which really needs rapid turnaround.

It's that not knowing, that's it's not predictable, to use the word that was used before, that it's not transparent. And I think it's important to understand, Mr. Secretary -- again, I'm being anecdotal here -- I think the actual number of problem cases among graduate students is quite small. The problem is the perception. And that's what keeping graduate students away from applying.

So I think it's fixable. I think with the kind of response we've seen before by you and your colleagues, we can really make progress on this. But as you said, we really need to understand what the issues are, and they may be somewhat different in the two sectors.

So I've just covered one of the four things that I wanted to in my report. I'm reporting on behalf of Ruth David, the Vice Chair, and our other members. And I want to acknowledge Jeff Gaynor's work and thank him for putting together a very good agenda in our first real meeting, if I can put it that way, about one month ago here in Washington.

We basically covered four topics. One, was how we -- the role of our SAC within what DHS does. Second of all, the kinds of issues we think we should be taking on as they relate to science and technology. I'll come back to that. The third was visas; I've covered that. And the fourth is a very interesting proposal from the Coast Guard, which I'll be coming back to as well, and I'll hand it off to them.

Let me back up. So the first issue was, how do we coordinate with other units within DHS? In particular, we received a very good presentation by the Under Secretary for Science and Technology Chuck McQueary, who, as you know, is creating a Science and Technology Advisory Committee, as mandated by statute. By happenstance, that advisory committee had its first meeting on the same day as our meeting. That the Under Secretary could make time for us was a great statement of his committing to creating that kind of coordination.

The key point from this is, we know we're not the Science and Technology Committee; there is such a thing. At the same time, though, we all are absolutely committed to coordinating with each other, so we don't trip over what they're doing and we can be supportive of what they are doing and vice versa.

There is a -- an agreement that the executive staff support for the two committees will attend the other committee meetings to provide that kind of coordination.

Second topic. We've heard from Maureen McCarthy, Director of Research within the S&T office, about how they're proceeding with some of the issues that they're facing. We had a very interesting discussion within our committee which identified one overarching theme that we think we can make a real contribution to, and that's what I'll call the "systems view" of homeland security research. It's extremely important, and in fact, I was struck by the fact that if you look at your seven priorities that you mention, you can characterize every one of those as a systems issue. It's about coordination, integration, and you understand that very well.

But this goes also for research. And I'll take a great example that Jeff Gaynor offered, which is, you could develop an exquisitely accurate and effective biosensor, but if you haven't thought through how that piece of technology is going to work in a broader system, as in, okay, we sense something, what do you do about it? You haven't really made any kind of contribution at all.

We're confident that the S & T directorate understands that. But we think, given the kind of committee we have, and that Ruth and I are both systems people, that we can help in that, and work with the S & T office and the S & T Advisory Committee to help in that systems view.

Now, there's an interesting set of organizational and management issues related to this that we are quite interested in and we're not quite sure where to go with it. But having a systems view also implies cooperation. Related to that is the fact that, as significant as the DHS Science and Technology directorate is, it's relatively small compared to the total amount of homeland security-relevant research funded by the federal government.

It's very important, and Chuck McQueary understands this very well, that DHS figure out a way to influence all of that or as much of that homeland security-related research as they can. How do you do that? Well, it's clear that having a good strategy and a clear research agenda are the starting point, and we know they're working on that. But then there's the set of issues about how do you then get -- I don't like your 22-agency problem -- how do you get longstanding research agencies to work together, really work together? There may even be statutory or regulatory barriers to true joint efforts. And we're trying to understand that and assist the Department in working through that.

One can't leave this topic, though, without also noting that, just the way the Congress is organized for Homeland Security purposes, which I know if your favorite topic, I'm sure, plays into this as well. We can't ignore that.

So that's the set of issues we're looking at. It's new, it's fresh. We're moving on this together and -- but we think we can make a real contribution. Let me just pause here and see if Ruth has anything she wants to add before I introduce the Coast Guard.

**DR. DAVID:** No, I think you did a very good job of summarizing. I would only add that you would be gratified to know that the other members of our SAC are equally committed to helping the nation and helping you move forward. So there's a lot of talent at your disposal.

**MR. COHON:** Yeah, thanks for saying that, because I know we both left that meeting, and Jeff did too, really fired up of the SAC. They really work together great. It's going to be, I think, a very valuable group, and as all of us are, we're committed to assisting you, Mr. Secretary, and DHS on the mission.

We received a presentation by the U.S. Coast Guard and we were very impressed by it and felt that what they were proposing was a very valuable thing. And we wanted to commend it to the Homeland Security Advisory Council in the hopes that it would endorse what they are proposing and commend it to the Secretary.



We're very pleased that we have with us today the two briefers that we had at our APRSAC meeting, Commander Joseph Vorbach and Patrick Newman. And I think they're ready to give you the presentation we got, in record time, I'm sure, gentlemen.

**COMMANDER VORBACH:** Good morning, Mr. Secretary, Mr. Grano, Admiral. It's a pleasure to have this opportunity to do this and thank you, Dr. Cohon and Dr. David for the opportunity. Our briefing is going to break down this way, where I'll just explain a little of the context of where -- how it is that we arrived at this proposal, and turn it over to Mr. Newman who is the principal researcher behind some data that we think points to the need for our proposal, which is that there be a national Homeland Security education and training conference.

The first two slides are both a listing of what our briefing is about and the important aspect -- points in it. But briefly, the U.S. Coast Guard Academy where I teach International Relations to cadets and where I direct a small research initiative called the Marine Transportation System Initiative, has 1,000 cadets in a four-year programs, culminates in a Bachelor of Science degree in one of seven majors. And before 9/11, all of the graduates that we had went to sea for a first assignment -- excuse me, prior to 9/11, until this year, they did that.

The class of 2004 that will leave in late May to their first assignments includes a group of about 25 who will go to shore assignments of different varieties and some to flight school.

The Marine Transportation System Initiative is two. It's actually three that we're fortunate to have right now. The idea behind it goes back to 1998 and the idea was that we would find ways to fold cadet learning into comment on strategic directors related to the Marine Transportation System. Principal focus of this effort, though, since 9/11 has been on Maritime security and policy and how can we help the cadet curriculum adjust so that the graduates are ready for the new environment that they're heading off to.

The main piece of that adjustment has been the new war threat and response simulation exercise that we've run since the fall of 2001. Original thinking was that we would have some academic panels to give some perspective on the changed nature of the world and transnational security threats and so on. It's evolved quite a bit since then, so that we now, for example, provide all the participants in the exercise training in the ICS system 100 and 200 level.

We bring in the use of all the resources that we have there and a lot of important Coast Guard resources from -- for example, the National Strike Teams. We use our T-boats and our Shipboard Simulator to run a significant exercise that involves all the cadets in the graduating class, plus all the officer candidates who are in residence at the Coast Guard Academy at the time. And we've worked hard to -- especially with the Coast Guard in New Haven, Connecticut, to bring in the appropriate interagency players so that the cadets will have this interface with them, and we'll do it again in the fall.

Another piece of the academy that's important to this discussion is the Coast Guard Leadership and Development Center that was created in 1998, and among other things, is the home of all the other commissioning sources for officers in the Coast Guard as you can see at the bottom of that slide. In addition, an important piece of what they do is, this command and operation school that sends -- nearly all of the officers and chief petty officers that are going to go to command positions in the Coast Guard will cycle through training programs at the Leadership and Development Center.

The Leadership and Development Center has since 2002 been running an executive leadership program for flag officers selected in the Coast Guard. It's been expanded in 2003 to include SES-level participation from DHS agencies, and the goal is, among other things, the cross-pollination of mission skill sets and solidification of the Department's culture and values.

Approved for 2004 is a sort of related program for mid-level officers and GS-13, 14 or 15 civilians. That's been funded for the upcoming year to run four courses and about 25 people in each of those courses.

Everything that's happened at the academy since September 11th has caused us in the Marine Transportation System Initiative to keep looking at this question: what is the level of coordination of oversight in Homeland Security education and training? Because we -- we're always looking at what's available publicly and on the internet, that what's going on, and taking note of mailings that we get and so on, and arriving at this question all the time.

So last summer, Mr. Newman, along with another researcher that we had the benefit of for the summer, put together a report that they called "Setting the Standard." And I'll turn it over to Mr. Newman to explain to you what are these important preliminary results that lead us again to this idea of a conference.

**MR. NEWMAN:** Thanks, Joe. Thank you for having us. I appreciate the opportunity to address you all on this issue. As Commander Vorbach pointed out, through the course of developing the new war exercise, through the course of talking to many people we started doing quite a bit of reading on homeland security education and training, what was available out there at the agency level, what was available in the private sector at the state level, and started to become concerned.

What we found in our "Setting the Standard" paper, and it was about a year's worth of research, myself and Mr. Chris Patoon, the airmen at the academy, all decided that we needed to really look more closely into the issue. The major finding was primarily that there was an explosion of HSL training and education programs and activities.

At first blush one would think, well, of course, this is good stuff. But then we started to look a bit more closely, and we found that these programs were kind of sprouting up on a day to day basis across all sectors: academe, private sector, state, federal programs. And

the question became, is anyone taking a look at this and providing guidance? And we found that, no, there was not.

Now, with that said, we've been talking to a lot of folks since we started the research. And the research is ongoing. There are some very productive changes that are taking place and opportunities.

One of the things we found in the academic field was that there wasn't, the type of innovation that we thought would be productive in supporting the new Department's missions, that it was a recasting of familiar programs and curricula. Although there may be some value there, certainly what was being taught prior to 9/11 -- and there's much out there that has applicability to what we're doing today and the needs that we have -- we found that in many ways, it was just kind of changing the name of the program or programs or bringing together, without, perhaps, the thought that one would want, a group of curricula that were related based on what happened on 9/11. That concerned us.

We found that there was an emphasis on short-term training versus foundational education. Now this is an understandable situation in light of what occurred on 9/11. However, I mean, long-term -- and I was very gratified to hear a lot of, you know, the discussion on training, education, has already taken place today, I was privileged to listen to -- I think that everyone understands the challenges and there is a positive direction that's starting to come to pass.

We found that there was an emphasis on technology versus HLS policy and strategic studies type of programs. Technology is certainly a very important aspect of this equation. However, we also need to support the type of thinking that we'll need in the future to ensure that we have leaders, succession, and these types of issues.

And then perhaps the most concerning to me -- as Commander Vorbach indicated, we get mailings and a lot of email coming through -- and certification programs over the last several months have really exploded. I'm concerned about that issue perhaps more than any other. And it's a situation where many institutions, associations -- it's really across, again, across sectors -- basically offer certification in homeland security. And some of the criteria is lacking, for lack of a better term.

**SECRETARY RIDGE:** You're trying so hard to be diplomatic. You're doing such a wonderful job.

Your language is so nuanced. But we know where you're coming from. You're right, by the way.

**MR. NEWMAN:** Well, that was an issue. We also saw that, perhaps the level of standards, of accreditation, that there wasn't really any guidance in that area. Now, with that said, again, there are standards that are being developing in other areas as far as equipment, communications. This is a natural follow-on as fair as training and education, that there has to be some type of guidance coming so that programs can be designed and

we can get the biggest bang for our buck, in all the sectors, whether it's the private sector developing programs or others.

Now, I'm glad that slide's over. There are some very positive things occurring. There have been, you know, certainly every one is well-intended in this. Everyone's trying to do the right thing. There are the development of academic consortiums and faculty exchanges that are occurring, productive sharing of information, ideas, the development, and I think we heard a little bit about it this morning, of partnerships for exercises at the private, state and federal level. There are best practices out there that are emerging. There are models that we can use in trying to get our arms around the beast here.

I think I've made that point in the first slide. What we came to, and again, this is based on much discussion with many, many different sectors, I have spoke with folks, based in the last month, on Dr. Cohon's recommendation, the Association of Higher Education, some of the academic associations and consortiums. I've talked to some of our interagency partners. We have just recently met with Department and Human Capital folks. The idea -- everyone kind of acknowledged that there's an issue here. Now, it's a huge issue, because you're talking about so many different folks that have a stake in this. But with that said, it's something that needs to be addressed.

We feel it is important to bring the people together and start talking about these issues. We've developed a little bit more thinking along the lines of how we would best provide some type of framework, something that was useful to the Department to begin looking at this. So it may be not just a one plenary type of conference, even though you'd have multiple workshops. It might be something that is a series of seminars, where you take groups like community college folks, what they have to offer, what they're doing, land grant colleges, private sector folks, federal folks.

I think it's important early on to start looking internally to the Department in all the agencies in trying to look at some integration activities there. And that's something that we've discussed with the folks in Human Capital as well.

Notionally, though, these are strawmen, this is what we would seek to do in this conference, trying to develop some type of framework that would address executive awareness and interagency coordination. We reduce our vulnerability through the education of current and future leaders, and of course, researching new policies, methodologies, pedagogy, to ensure that we've got a force that's adequately trained to meet the challenges.

This would be the gist of the discussion - the base point. And certainly the Academy or the Coast Guard is not presumptuous in this situation to say, this is how we should do it. We need to talk to a lot of different folks. There are so many folks that have something to offer here. But, you've got to start with discussion.

Another important aspect is to conduct some type of formal survey across the sector, so that we really get a true idea of what's happening, so that you have the baseline.

These are some of the proposed conference topics; certainly it's not an exhaustive list, but these are the types of issues that we'll be looking at with our department.

Workshops. Again, the idea would be to provide, you know, opportunities to really get at the meat versus, you know, just having talking heads, these types of issues. At this point, we have the commandant's approval for a concept. We are suggesting a mid-fall timeframe. We are currently working on setting the standard. Again, it's a work in progress, the paper, and we have started initial planning and we are reaching out to all sectors.

Thank you.

**MR. GRANO:** Patrick, if I may, I don't want you to move. We'd like to have a discussion about this. The Secretary has another appointment he has to get to and would like to say a few words.

**SECRETARY RIDGE:** If I would, first of all, once again, thank the Coast Guard for taking the initiative. I'm proud to be the Secretary, but the notion that we would have, you know, our school within the Department of Homeland Security, the Coast Guard Academy, and this extraordinary organization saying, you know, you have this proliferation of curricula that's developing.

Part of our mission is to not only oversee our curricula at the Academy, but they have a leadership curriculum, and this is an organization that really focuses in on what's the mission and how do you train to accomplish the mission.

So number one, the notion that we have a conference to start discussing these issues, I thank you for that initiative and would be interested to see how my colleagues here on the board respond to it, leading, hopefully, to some kind of DHS certification process so that if you're going to offer a program at a college or a university of any kind, you may get an imprimatur from a lot of people, but you're going to set some high standards when you get it from DHS.

So again, I thank you for that initiative, and I'll let our colleagues modify it and make some suggestions, but we'll leave it there.

Finally, I have to go to another conference right now to talk about Homeland Security issues. I thank my colleagues in service here. Thank you for your time. We've covered a lot of ground today in this public meeting. If there was a public meeting that we wanted them to discuss and televise, this is probably more substantive results-oriented with the Lexicon, with the award program, with the private sector and the academic policy report, and whatever else you've gotten -- the state and local report from Governor Romney.

So it's been very productive. I wish you the very best over the next couple of weeks. We look forward to seeing you in June, but we'll probably be talking to most of you

independently before that time. So again, thanks for your service to the Department. But more importantly, thanks for your service to our country.

**MR. COHON:** Joe, I just wanted to emphasize that on behalf of the Academe and Policy Research SAC, I wanted to say that we found this to be well-conceived and timely, and echoing the Secretary's words, we think the Coast Guard Academy is just the right organization to take the lead on putting this conference together, and we would urge the HSAC to endorse it.

**DEPUTY SECRETARY LOY:** Just a couple of comments: One, the parallels where this has occurred in the Department of Defense over years and years and years have displayed the rightness of this time and time again. Whether you're talking about service-sponsored schools like the Naval War College or the Army War College or the Air War College down in Montgomery, or whether you're talking about those where they recognize the need for, after Goldwater-Nickles, for joining us, to come together, whether it's the National Defense University or the National War College or the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, this has bred a

We have in the Coast Guard, in this particular department, an organization that has had the opportunity to tag along with that experience, in one way or the other, for years and years and years. There are Coast Guard students every year in all those things I just mentioned, and literally, many, many others.

There's a parallel group associated with the think tanks of the world, if you will. If you think from Brookings on one end to Heritage on the other and everything in between, with, you know, CSIS or the Lexington Institute or the Potomac Institute, all of those offer annual experiential sponsorships of one kind or another, where I can attest that Coast Guard officers that have gone to those common kind of experiences brought back to the service enormous value that helped us become better at what we did for this country as a Coast Guard.

That's the parallelism that I think is already very, very evident in the Secretary's mind with this quick adaptation to joining you to kick it off with a conference that offers a wide capture of everyone to come together to think our way through this is, I think, is of great, great value. I can remember where this small thousand-person organization known as the Coast Guard Academy up on the banks of the Thames River sponsored its first diversity conference and went very wide in its capture of players. And I, as a commandant, was told to be very concerned as to whether or not we ought to be doing this in quite as wide a spectrum at a military academy. It has become the best anywhere in the country over the years, because we started wide with an appetite that would yield real good progress for where we needed to do.

So Mr. Chairman, despite the fact that I remember Joe Vorbach when he was about this high -- his dad was teaching me what I ought to be learning on a Coast Guard cutter. These are kernels of truth that really we need to nurture big-time.

**MR. GRANO:** Well, question I have. Is there any assistance you need from the HSAC?

**COMMANDER VORBACH:** Well, sir, a lot of what Pat described at the end are things that have happened rapidly in the last month, including the conversation with the folks in the Human Capital office of -- Mr. James' office in the department. Your endorsement, I think, would speak strongly to the need for the event. Things are continuing to evolve, in terms of we're going to pull it together, I think, as Pat described. And we haven't completed, really, the full sense of what the resource situation will be like. We're hopeful that that will come together as we go further along.

**MR. GRANO:** I certainly would endorse what the Secretary was alluding to, that this is perhaps only the beginning, a genesis of where you want to get to, which is a school for DHS.

One of the questions I had when he said that, because there are a lot of opportunists out there who are going to figure out a way economically to take advantage of the situation -- has somebody thought about copyrighting the name, Department of Homeland Security? Because a lot of people out there using DHS for economic purposes.

**MR. CILLUFFO:** Mr. Chairman, I certainly second that proposal. But I think it's also important to recognize that others are trying to get their arms around this. I know I'm a member of the National Academy of Sciences. They're putting on an event -- I can't remember the date. I was actually supposed to be on travel. Maybe now I'll try to stay in town. But I think you should be aware of bringing together all the universities that have degree programs, academic degree programs in place or considering putting those in place. So I think that you should latch up there and connect there.

I think that we also need to recognize the international dimension. One of the challenges of Homeland Security policy is you can't put it in a little black box that says, "Break glass when something bad happens." Rather, it's that cross-cutting nature. You can't separate Homeland Security policy from economic policy, from foreign policy, from military policy, from science policy, technology policy, health policy and on and on the list goes. That's what makes these people's jobs so difficult but also so rewarding.

So I just caution that you make sure that you look at it through that not prism, but a lens that reflects all of those views. And I will get you the information on the National Academy of Sciences, if you like. And I think we should formally second that?

**DEPUTY SECRETARY LOY:** Mr. Chairman, I should not fail to recognize that the Chief of Staff of the Coast Guard, third-ranking officer in the Coast Guard is with us. Admiral Allen, thanks very much for joining and coming and supporting what we're doing.

**ADMIRAL ALLEN:** You do need a face in Washington to pull this all together, and I think at this point, the last couple of weeks, we have pulled the information together. I'm

meeting with Ron James, Human Capital officer, on Monday to discuss executive training and education and kind of expand this discussion.

I think putting this in within a programmatic structure inside both the Coast Guard and the Department is the next step for us to be able to articulate to you resource requirements, policies and so forth.

**MR. GRANO:** I think we have a unanimous call. We support your effort. And we are here to assist you in any way we can. Feel free to come back to the HSAC for any input that you need. And we'd gladly put anything on the agenda that you might want in order to get this done, okay? So you have our support.

**DR. THOMAS:** I think we also owe a vote of thanks to Jerry and Ruth for enabling this presentation this morning and giving all of us the opportunity to hear about this excellent thing.

**MR. GRANO:** You should know, they were very quick to ask to have this presentation on the agenda and Chris and I responded in kind. So thanks again, gentlemen, and thank you, too.

Well, that actually brings our session to a close, the public component of it. We will be having lunch and then we're going to get a tour of the building. For logistical and security reasons, the public is not invited to that. We apologize for that.

I'd like to thank the men and women of the Secret Service for hosting us today, in particular, their Director, Mr. Basham. And as I suggested at the beginning, if you would like to provide any type of commentary to HSAC, our address is Homeland Security Advisory Council, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Washington, D.C., 20528.

Again, minutes of this meeting and previous meetings can be found on the website, [www.dhs.gov](http://www.dhs.gov). Just put the DHS component link and you'll find our minutes there. I think you very much, ladies and gentlemen.

###