

**U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Homeland Security Advisory Council
Public Conference Call
June 27, 2011
Meeting Minutes**

Attendees: Judge William Webster – Chair
Bill Bratton – Vice Chair
Martin O’Malley
Ruth David
Jeff Moss
Norman Augustine
Leroy Baca
Mohamed Elibiary
Clark Ervin
Lydia Thomas
Becca Sharp
Mike Miron
John Minnick

WILLIAM WEBSTER: Good afternoon. This is William Webster, Chairman of the Homeland Advisory Council and I hereby convene this meeting. This is a public meeting of the Council and we appreciate those members of the public, the government and the media who have joined us today.

I would also like to welcome the members of the Homeland Security Advisory Council and members of the Community Resilience Task Force (CRTF) who are on the call today.

Our purpose at this meeting is to review and approve the final draft of the CRTF report. First off, I would like to thank the members of the HSAC's Community Resilience Task Force for their efforts in putting forth these findings and recommendations.

Thank you to the HSAC staff and Assistant Secretary for Policy, David Heyman, for their support. I'd also like to thank the Chair of the Task Force, Governor Martin O'Malley, and Dr. Ruth David and Jeff Moss who served as Vice Chairs of the task force. HSAC member Mohamed Elibiary also served on the Task Force. At this time, I would like to turn it over to Governor O'Malley. The Governor is the Chair of the Community Resilience Task Force and the floor is yours, sir.

MARTIN O'MALLEY: Judge, thanks very, very much. And I want to thank everyone for joining us on this call today, for your interest, for members of the public on the call and hopefully also thank you in advance for what I hope will become your engagement in this effort that ultimately has to be the responsibility of every citizen, every level of our government, and the public and private sector. This is to ensure that our nation is not only prepared, but that we are resilient, that we can take a hit, and that we can recover and keep moving forward.

Judge Webster, it's been a great honor to serve with you as the Chair of the Homeland Security Advisory Council's Community Resilience Task Force. I want to thank my Vice Chairs for their outstanding work, in particular, Dr. Ruth David who really took the lead on this quite honestly, and her fine work in pulling this together.

It is a very good report that the HSAC is about to be briefed on. And I thank both her and also Jeff Moss for their leadership throughout this process. I want to underscore also, Judge, that it was a very - it was a better process than any of them to date. And it involved a lot of collaboration, a lot of - a lot of input and several exchanges of drafts to get to this point. I am very pleased with the work that has been done. I hope that the recommendations will be useful to Secretary Napolitano and I hope that they can be implemented to move our country's important work on this critical issue forward.

By way of background, Secretary Napolitano charged the Homeland Security Advisory Council with researching and providing recommendations to her on implementing pragmatic, comprehensive, measurable and proven means to advance our national resilience. Specifically, the Secretary asked us to look at three issues. Number one, how can we increase individual and community engagement in building resilience? Number two, how can we incorporate security and resilience into urban planning across the board? And Number three, how can we better manage resource acquisition across the Federal Government to support resilience?

During the course of our efforts we were fortunate to hear from a diverse and outstanding group of subject matter experts and practitioners from across our country. We've discussed the need to develop an operational definition of resilience. In other words, making it real and explaining what it looks like in practice. We have strived to develop some highly actionable recommendations that reflect that endeavor and the Department of Homeland Security can implement.

The names of the contributors are also included in our report. I urge the Secretary to fully leverage their perspectives, talents, and experience and call on us in crafting the Department's resilience policies and programs in order to execute on these recommendations. The Task Force is unanimous in its

agreement that the recommendations are applicable to the full spectrum of American life; from individual citizens to those responsible for operating and maintaining critical infrastructure to businesses, communities, states, counties, nation itself.

We are confident that implementing these recommendations will help all Americans better anticipate, understand and successfully deal with a full range of challenges that the future will bring.

Now I would like to turn the call over to our Vice Chair who again has done just some outstanding work. And I want to thank her for her tremendous leadership in pulling this report together, Dr. Ruth David.

RUTH DAVID:

Thank you, Governor. I really do want to thank you for your leadership of the CRTF. I would also like to thank all of the members of the CRTF who actually contributed the intellect and substance of this report. I will take the blame for the typos but the credit for substance certainly goes to the team. I won't name them all, but they are listed as you mentioned in "Appendix B" of the report.

You've all received a copy, so what I would like to do is take a few minutes this afternoon to go through some of the key points. The CRTF felt that before even getting started on specific findings and recommendations, it was important to establish a context or a frame of reference for talking about resilience. In doing so, we need to describe how resilience relates to other terms like "preparedness" and "risk management." We believe as a group that these terms are quite interdependent. As a result, we developed a conceptual framework to try to show these various relationships.

We used the Department's own definitions in doing so and tried to really draw it as a graphic so that people could understand how these terms relate to each other. At a very high level, we can think about three phases relative to an event; the before, during, and after. And that can be any kind of event from a natural disaster, to an attack, or even a catastrophic accident.

If you think about it, preparedness as defined by the Department is about building and sustaining capabilities that are needed for those three phases. So in the before phase, the focus of preparedness is around building capabilities that may prevent something bad from happening or may protect key assets from serious damage in the event of a disaster. If you think about this from a risk management perspective, the objective is to reduce the risk of failure. But from a resilience perspective, the desired outcome is to resist harm. But unfortunately as we've all learned, prevention and protection strategies in isolation are brittle and at some point they will fail.

Therefore, the second necessary and very important part of preparedness is about building capabilities to enable communities to respond to a disaster by reducing the consequences from a risk management perspective. From a resilience perspective this means that the community is better equipped to absorb a blow.

Finally, in the aftermath of an event, preparedness capabilities center on recovery or on referring operations, and actually very often circle back to improving the capacity to mitigate future disasters. Hopefully we learn when things go poorly. A very important measure here is the time that's required to recover. From a resilience viewpoint, the desired outcome is either full recovery to the prior condition or potentially adapt to some new norm.

As an example of this, we looked very briefly at what happened in Greensburg, Kansas, which was basically leveled by a tornado a few years ago. Greensburg citizens chose not to rebuild Greensburg as it had been, but rather to build green communities, something that had not previously existed but would become their new norm. This example is actually illustrative of some of the challenges that we face both in terms of investing in recovery and also linking those investments to building something even better in a sustainable sense. That is something I will circle back to.

Conceptually, preparedness focuses on capability building. Risk management sets the priorities for those capabilities given that we have limited resources. And resilience is a means to describe the outcomes you're trying to achieve with the capabilities you are building. We feel that this is a fairly simple conceptual framework, but it does allow us to put into context not only the need to invest in preparedness “the what” but also “the why”, the motivation why it's important to make those investments.

We think that this basic understanding will go a long way toward motivating additional action. And that actually leads me to our first finding, the fact that resilience is not yet commonly understood by the stakeholders upon whom progress depends. Therefore, our first recommendation, as the Governor mentioned, is that the Department should really take the lead in building a set of examples of stories that show resilience in action, that illustrate to our citizens and our communities what it means to be resilient. Having that in hand, our next finding really stems from our beliefs that current policies, programs, and investments don't really motivate building and sustaining resilience.

Now we hasten to admit a lot of the activities underway will help build resilience, but this explicit linkage is not made. We talk about capability building, we talk about preparedness; we do not typically refer specifically to how capability building builds resilience. Our next recommendation is that the

Department of Homeland Security (DHS) align its policies, programs, and investments to explicitly motivate and operationalize resilience.

Our third finding is basically an organizational one. I will say that we, as CRTF members, were very reluctant to make an organizational recommendation. But in the end we felt it important that some entity needs to be designated to drive progress through the Department. This is not about owning the entirety of building resilience, because that is not possible. But it is rather about bringing coherence to the issue and building a unified strategy for building and sustaining resilience. We therefore recommended the creation of a National Resilience Office, charged with building the foundation for resilience, basically maturing the rhetoric into a meaningful goal from a departmental and a mission perspective.

That of course leads to our fourth recommendation which is that we do not yet as a nation have the knowledge base to fully understand what this needs to look like a decade or two decades from now. We need to build that base both in terms of educational curriculum and in terms of people, talent.

We believe this should become a component of the Homeland Security training and education program. But we also observe that resilience is by no means limited to this field. In fact, there are things to be learned from related programs that focus on topics such as enterprise risk management and sustainability.

If I were to give you a brief version of our first four recommendations, these are the overarching recommendations. They are first, to define resilience in context and in a way that is meaningful to those who need to implement resilience. Second, to align policies and programs so that they explicitly enable building of resilience. Third, to organize for effective execution. And fourth, to continue building the knowledge and talent base needed to build and sustain resilience over time.

In addition to these overarching recommendations, we also had two sets of recommendations, the first being specific to the people's side of resilience and the second focusing on the built environment aspects. The report contains a fair amount of detail on these areas. I'll just touch the top-level recommendations for each.

If we focus back on the people, our first recommendation really focused very specifically on the "Ready.gov" program. Here this is a part of the messaging issue. We felt it important not only to talk to people about what they should do, the what, but also the why. In other words, link resilience to being ready. We had a number of specific recommendations in that regard. We also believe that a more robust array of communication strategies is needed. Many

of the task force members observed that the internet will not reach all of the stakeholders. So we need a diverse array of communication strategies and mechanisms.

Lastly, the area we discussed at length, the issue of complacency. How do we keep citizens motivated over time to maintain a state of being ready to achieve true national resilience? Here we recommend that DHS adapt and adopt incentive and award programs that have worked in other fields. We believe there are a lot of good models available and plenty of opportunity to celebrate individual contributions in ways that could motivate others.

Our final section of the report focused on resilience of the built environment of communities. These are the man-made surroundings that support daily life; from buildings, to schools, to roads, and so forth. This is where we really saw an opportunity to make a link between resilience and sustainability from a strategic perspective, since a lot of urban planners and developers are placing a very high priority on sustainable development.

Our broad - first broad recommendation in this area was that DHS work with General Services Administration (GSA) to more effectively leverage federal assets in enabling community resilience - realizing that the Federal Government is a fairly large land owner in many communities throughout the nation and there is an opportunity to make federally owned buildings and facilities more readily available for use as safe havens in times of disaster.

Our next recommendation again centers specifically on grant programs, which we believe tend to be too functionally stovepiped both within DHS and actually across the Federal Government. We recommend a complete scrub, a complete review and alignment of grant programs relating to infrastructure or capacity building so that they more explicitly promote and enable resilience initiatives.

Similarly, we believe that the sector-focused approach that dominates critical infrastructure planning at the federal level falls short in helping communities build and sustain resilience. We observed that communities live at the intersection of multiple critical infrastructures and therefore a more holistic approach is needed to help them build resilient infrastructures that effectively support community resilience. Therefore, we believe the DHS should help communities by transforming its own approach to support this bottoms-up community resilience as well as the top-down sector focused resilience.

Finally, we realized that communities throughout the nation are always, unfortunately, at the mercy of forces outside their control whether it's from cascading infrastructure failures or from disasters of a magnitude that would overwhelm an entire region thus limiting the ability of an individual

community to receive prompt assistance. We therefore recommend that DHS coordinate development of an all hazards resilience assessment methodology supported by a toolkit that would enable its use by local officials.

As we developed these findings and recommendations, we tried to identify real examples not only to help clarify the issue, but also to help chart a path forward. The CRTF members observed that there are a lot of very good initiatives already underway throughout the nation and that DHS has an opportunity to identify and share those activities more broadly. We believe this alone could help accelerate the Department's efforts in building national resilience.

With that, I'd like to turn it to Jeff Moss for additional comments and then Jeff will turn it back to Judge Webster.

JEFF MOSS:

Thank you Ruth. While I was a fellow co-Chair here, Ruth was really the true core effort once drafting began on this final report. I was very impressed and learned quite a lot from her vast experience that she is quite a force of nature, so to speak. So I would like to echo a lot of what Ruth has said and then draw your attention to a few items.

When drafting any recommendations we always try to focus on actionable items that the Secretary can act on - in areas DHS can actually take the lead and not be in conflict and come up with timely recommendations. I feel that we have satisfied all three of these categories. And it was something we were cognizant about while we were having discussions and while we were drafting. I also want to thank DHS for making their staff available and also for coordinating a lot of subject matter experts that came in and briefed us on a regular basis. If we had any questions, they did not hesitate to try to get us the correct person.

Something that we've talked about is we tried to infuse this report with real world examples relating to past experiences or past news items to try to help the public understand how we would tie the ideas of resilience and risk management into a real world situation. One of the acknowledgements that I found refreshing was that everybody understood that we as a country would suffer future catastrophes, and that it wasn't enough to just try to stop them all, prevent everything from ever happening with the top-down approach.

Once we had made that acknowledgement that it would have to be kind of a ground-up, all-hazards, all-hands approach, it really allowed us to move forward on our recommendations. If you notice, say for example in Section Two, in the community section that you are familiar with, we quickly realized that there are many things that DHS could do to help individuals and communities be more resilient. But when we boiled it all down, the underlying

factors were mostly communications based in helping to create a vetted, trusted knowledge base of information that then individuals and communities could then build off of.

I am proud of this effort and would like to thank the Judge and the Governor, and more specifically Ruth, for their time. I would also like to thank all of the members.

We had a number of teleconferences and in person meetings. And we did not all see eye-to-eye 100% of the time. But we all understood the goal. And this is - the report is the output of quite a number of months of effort. With that said, I would like to pass it back to the Judge.

WILLIAM WEBSTER: Thank you very much, Jeff. We appreciate all that you've done, and especially thanks to Dr. David for all the work that she put into this with you, and producing an exemplary report, very thoughtful and very helpful as we build on it.

This is a public meeting and our deliberations are public. We now have time to allow for deliberations over the recommendations. Does any HSAC member have any comments on the recommendations before we proceed? And if so, please identify yourself prior to your comments. The floor is open for such deliberations.

**NORMAN
AUGUSTINE:**

Bill, hearing silence - this is Norm Augustine. I am sure the views that have been expressed, this is I think going to be a very useful, purely thoughtful and substantive report. Secondly, the Governor in his opening remarks alluded to the individual as part of this task. And although the task statement, the title the workgroup was community resilience, I was very pleased to see that most everywhere the word "community" was used, it also said "individual and community." I continue to believe as I have for a long time that there's enormous leverage to be had through actions that individuals could take. And I want to first commend the task group for pointing out that nexus.

Finally, just to offer as a thought, at some future workgroup or some future effort to the Advisory Council, we might want to address more specifically what are some of the things that individuals could do, because they could make an enormous difference.

That's all I had Bill.

WILLIAM WEBSTER: I think that's very well taken. And thank you very much Norm. Does any other member of the HSAC have a comment or a suggestion?

LYDIA THOMAS: First, I would like to commend the task force, especially the Governor, Ruth, and Jeff for their extraordinary leadership on a document that I hope is going to be very important to the Secretary and will be the beginning of the foundation for an effort that I think many of us have been waiting for for a very long time. It's really a tremendous report. I'm very pleased to have had the opportunity to look it over.

When Ruth was giving her comments this morning, she did mention the grant programs as well as perhaps prizes. This caused me to think about the fact that, I believe it was last year, somewhere in the early spring, maybe March, that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) suggested that the agencies make more use of grand challenges. I was wondering whether or not the task force thought that perhaps having the Department offer a grand challenge in this arena or possibly in various aspects of community resilience would bring in innovators, entrepreneurs, and individuals who may not have previously thought about this area as a very fertile ground to think about new technologies and ways in which we could improve our resilience nationally.

WILLIAM WEBSTER: That was Dr. Lydia Thomas, a trustee of Noblis, Inc. and a very active member of our Advisory Council. Dr. David, Ruth, do you have any response to this at this point? Or is there...

RUTH DAVID: We should have put you on the Task Force. We did not discuss the notion specifically of a grand challenge. That's very intriguing and something that certainly we should offer at least informally to the Department as something to consider.

LYDIA THOMAS: Thanks. It just struck me as, you know, this may be an opportunity to attract individuals who do not normally respond to grants and that sort of thing.

WILLIAM WEBSTER: So if I understand, the response that this is a possibility within the contemplation of the broader recommendations is there. It is not precluded.

RUTH DAVID: I think that's exactly right, Judge, because our broad recommendation was to look at proven incentive and award programs. That certainly is one type of program that would fit that category. It is not specifically called out in the report.

WILLIAM WEBSTER: Good. Anybody else? I thought I heard someone who wanted to talk.

CLARK ERVIN: Thank you, Judge. Likewise I want to commend the Governor, Ruth, and Jeff. I just had a further thought about one recommendation in particular. It seems to me to be implicit in it. But I just thought perhaps we should talk about making it explicit. And that is Recommendation 2.2 on building public awareness.

Seems to me that it would be very helpful to engage the media not just as part of a promotional campaign to raise individual and community awareness of the importance of resilience and what individuals and communities could do, but also enlisting the media itself to help the public understand the limits of what the government can do. I think part of the problem is the media leads to the expectation, on the part of the average citizen, the government can prevent every terror attack. If the media could be persuaded by their interaction with DHS that despite the best efforts of the government, it may well be that there will be an attack at some point and that as a consequence we have got to recognize that and be prepared to withstand it, which is what resilience is all about. I think that would help to lower public expectations.

RUTH DAVID: This is Ruth David. I could not agree more Clark. And I would - again, we may quibble over the words, but one of the reasons we chose to focus on the sort of the before, during, and after phase was to get at exactly the issue that thinking about only prevention is insufficient and that is what resilience is all about. Our intent was really to say risk communication has to encompass all three phases. They can't simply focus on whether it is the government or anyone else's ability to stop every bad thing from ever happening.

CLARK ERVIN: Right. Thank you.

WILLIAM WEBSTER: All right. And that suggestion that Dr. David responded to came from Clark Kent Erwin, who is the Director of Homeland Security Program of the Aspen Institute for those on the outside who may be listening. Are there any other suggestions or comments?

LEROY BACA: Judge Webster, this is Sheriff Baca from Los Angeles. How are you today?

WILLIAM WEBSTER: Fine, thank you. Nice to have you talk.

LEROY BACA: All of the reports that we heard from the key players are excellent. Thank you all for your great dedication and helpfulness. There's a lot of food for thought regarding operationalizing the report. I think that it would probably be wise to advise the Secretary for her or this committee, either way, to send out the report to key parts of America that have had experiences with a variety of disasters that include resilience within their model.

It is an amazing phenomenon that first responders, in every incident that we've been involved in here in Los Angeles, with fires and earthquakes and train wrecks, have been the average citizen who was not prepared but knew instinctively that they could do something to help. So there's that X factor and I am sure that occurred in 9/11 as well as the Tuscaloosa emergency.

So if you think that the match up to how to get the functionality of resilience on the table from the local level, if we sent the report out and asked a few questions of the emergency planners in these communities as to how effective was the resilience participation, say at the hurricane in Tuscaloosa or Katrina or fires here in LA. I think that would kind of fill out what we're saying now in our limited time. Thank you.

WILLIAM WEBSTER: Thank you Sheriff. Appreciate it. I think we are - if there are no other comments, and don't feel that I'm cutting you off, if there are no other comments, I think we're ready to go to the next step. I'll ask once again. Are there any further comments?

Very well. Then I think it is time for us to take a vote of members of HSAC, whether to approve community resilience report for delivery to the Secretary of Homeland Security.

Will all members in favor of adopting the report please say aye?

ALL MEMBERS: Aye.

WILLIAM WEBSTER: All members opposed, please say "No." [silence] Very well, by voice vote, I declare that it is unanimously adopted.

Now we're going to bring this public session to a close. Members of the public who would like to provide comment, and that includes the media, can provide their own comment to Homeland Security may do so in writing by writing to the "Homeland Security Advisory Council, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 1100 Hampton Park Boulevard, Mail Stop 0850, Capital Heights, Maryland 20743" or by way of email to "hsac@dhs.gov", that's "G-O-V."

Those comments are appreciated and will be reflected in the meeting minutes. And so with appreciation to all who participated today, I declare this June 27, 2011 meeting of the Homeland Security Advisory Council adjourned. Thank you all for joining us.