

**JOINT CONSORTIA MEETING
FEMA Headquarters
Lobby Conference Room
500 C Street SW
Washington, DC
March 18, 2005**

MINUTES

Present: * WSSPC Board member

*Rick Allis

David Applegate, USGS

Roy Breckenridge, Ex-Officio

Michael Brown, DHS/FEMA

Mike Buckley, DHS/FEMA

Cathleen Carlisle, DHS/FEMA

*Ed Deal

*Rich Eisner, proxy for Henry Renteria

Ed Laatsch, DHS/FEMA

Elizabeth Lemersal, DHS/FEMA

*Dave Liebersbach

*Ken Murphy

Shyam Sunder, NIST

Patti Sutch, WSSPC

*Ron Teissere

Anita Vollmer, DHS/FEMA

Craig Weaver, USGS

Jim Wilkinson, CUSEC

Bob Freitag, CREW, on speakerphone

Bob Zimmerman, CREW, on speakerphone

Call to Order and Introductions – Ron Teissere

The meeting was called to order by Ron Teissere at 8:30 a.m. All those participating introduced themselves.

USGS Briefing – David Applegate, Senior Science Advisor

David asked for our perspectives on the USGS Hazards Initiative for FY'07. He explained that earthquakes, volcanoes, landslides, floods, wildfire, hurricanes, and tsunamis are all a part of the initiative. A stakeholder workshop last fall gathered input on the initiative, and another workshop will be held this spring. Rather than being an internal program, it has a strong partnership component to it.

(Ed Laatsch joined the meeting).

Ron Teissere gave an example of a mapping product his agency has proposed and that is desired by local agencies, but isn't funded. There is no state grant process to get the work done. He gave the example of Clark County in Washington State, where local building officials could use a map of IBC soils site conditions at a 1:2000 scale to determine the site conditions for building. Many other places similarly don't have the needed data with the same amount of detail. He has asked the Washington legislature to fund soils mapping for the State to the tune of \$2 M, but hasn't been successful. This type of product is "mitigation on the ground". His opinion was that other State projects that aren't mitigation are being funded.

Craig Weaver added that evacuation routes haven't been tested with the soils maps. He promoted a Federal-state partnership to get this done.

Rich Eisner said one issue is a better understanding of the site conditions that would lead to better estimates of ground motions that could be used in HAZUS, and if there are ways near-real-time information could be delivered for landslides, water, etc. in a single GIS display format.

Rick Allis suggested that in rapid growth areas in the west, all-hazards maps for planners are needed at a scale of 1:24,000. The mapping should be focused on urbanizing areas where growth can be controlled and planned for on the basis of hazards.

County-scale maps need to be out there and available to decision-makers. In some cases cities are already built-out over faults and other hazards.

(Shyam Sunder arrived).

Jim Wilkinson wanted more of ATC-35 in the central US.

Is INSAR for land subsidence available? David replied that the USGS is third in line for satellite imagery that monitors land movement.

Ed Deal mentioned that the National Association of Home Builders talks about having a "level playing field". That means having the right scale information.

NASA's Earth Science Enterprise program is using HAZUS, giving them hands-on ground truthing of the imagery.

The scale of hazards maps needs to be 1:24,000 or 1:10,000. Even larger scale maps (1:12,000 or 1:6000) are useful.

The Digital Elevation Model is most useful with 2- and 5-foot contours. Mapping from LIDAR using greater contour intervals than that doesn't transfer well or match the interface with the bathymetry.

(Bob Zimmerman joined the meeting).

NIST Briefing – Shyam Sunder, Acting Deputy Director of NIST

This was Shyam's first meeting with the consortia. Since October 25, 2004, NIST has been struggling to figure out the NEHRP lead agency role. Congress gave them the authority, but not the resources to lead. Out of NEHRP's total funding of \$77 M, NIST received just \$1 M of new money for one specific project.

NIST didn't ask for the lead role. They got a call from a NIST Congressional representative that Congress asked them to take over the lead.

In the appropriations process, NIST and NSF do not have a line item for NEHRP. The USGS does, and FEMA gets their \$21M NEHRP funding through DHS EP&R.

NEHRP authorizing language says that NIST is to increase their R&D program to close the practice gap. NIST is to set up an Interagency Coordinating Committee (ICC) that consists of OSTP and OMB plus Directors of NIST, USGS, FEMA and NSF. They are required to meet 3 times a year, have a strategic plan, their first meeting within 6 months, and develop and implement a management plan.

NIST is to provide guidance to the other agencies in preparing their budgets, and to develop and submit a coordinated budget each year. They are to transmit an annual program report each year in January to the President.

A review of agency budgets will occur with a centralized level of reporting to account for how the money is spent, so that money spent on non-NEHRP projects isn't counted under NEHRP. In the past, NIST used to include fires under NEHRP; now multi-hazards will be included where it makes sense and applies to earthquakes.

NIST must establish an advisory committee of at least 11 people. (They will put a notice in the Federal Register). The Committee will be selected by and report to the NIST Director. The Chair of Scientific Earthquake Studies Advisory Committee (SESAC) will probably be invited to sit on the NIST advisory committee.

Within the Fire and Building Research Lab, the plan is to create a NEHRP office at the level of a NIST division, led by a full time director at the Senior Executive Service-equivalent level at 6% more than GS-15 level. Nine people total including the director would staff the office, including a committee secretariat responsible for the ICC, another for the Advisory Committee, a liaison with the USGS advisory committee, and a liaison to **ICCSC Integrated Committee on Seismic Safety ?**

NIST would also establish five program coordinators:

1. EQ Risk Mitigation – The subject of greatest concern to Congress; includes lifelines, codes and standards, interactions with other groups.
2. EQ Sciences – NSF, USGS, ANSS post-EQ investigations (led by USGS for NEHRP)

3. EQ Engineering – Involving NEES and Performance-Based Design from NSF and NIST-centered with FEMA
4. Emergency Management and Social Sciences – Includes the Consortia, EQ preparedness and loss estimation.
5. Program planning evaluation and budget.

NEHRP agencies have been good at operating in parallel, but integration has not occurred. Program coordinators will help integrate policy and agencies.

\$10M is authorized to do all of this.

In the FY'05 budget there is no money for the lead agency function. For FY'06, NIST requested an amendment for additional funding. They wanted new money rather than re-programming existing money. The Department of Commerce could not submit the request because it was past the deadline.

NIST also requested a supplemental from Congress for the tsunami which was not successful.

Sunder briefed OSTP on the funding issue. His opinion is that for the transition until October 2006 NIST should “tax” all of the agencies 1.5% of their total NEHRP budget. OSTP offered to go to OMB about it. Out of a total budget of \$125 M, a tax would net them \$1.9 M for leadership which would take NIST through the next 18 months. After that, NIST would go to Congress and ask for additional appropriations.

Sunder also met with the NEHRP Coalition a few weeks ago.

Craig Weaver said that money would be taken out of the state programs if the “tax” were enacted.

Mike Buckley of FEMA, David Maurstad's Deputy, introduced himself and gave Maurstad's regrets for not being able to attend today's meeting. He said that FEMA is well into its FY'05 spending and it would be difficult to come up with more money. John Marburger (Office of Science and Technology Policy, Executive Office of the President and Science Adviser to the President) was going to meet with OMB to make that decision.

Ron Teissere thanked Shyam for the briefing.

FEMA Briefing – Ed Laatsch, Section Chief, Multi-Hazard Engineering Services

FEMA's programs and activities were described yesterday. Ed thanked the consortia for fulfilling their role as NEHRP partners. FEMA supports the consortia and will keep the focus on the mission. In terms of funding, FEMA is making an attempt to “hold harmless” the consortia and have dropped support for other programs.

Jim Wilkinson asked how, given the value of the consortia in fulfilling NEHRP's role, one of the consortia could be appointed to the advisory committee on a rotating basis. Sunder replied that advisory committee members do not represent the agencies – they represent themselves. They also are not reimbursed for their time. Interests of customers are key, but he can't guarantee consortia inclusion on the committee.

NEP is unworkable and is not a part of the new plan.

Craig Weaver remarked that the role of the FEMA regions with respect to the earthquake program has changed and they are passive. Ed said that headquarters has regular interaction with the regional offices and they are not affected by DHS. Mike Buckley agreed. Sunder thought FEMA headquarters should talk more to the regions. Rich Eisner said that state interaction with the FEMA regions is essentially on a courtesy basis. There is no need to interact since the money trail is no longer clear. The discussion evolved to a discussion of EMPG money, and the fact that the states don't know how much they are getting for the earthquake program. Sunder pointed out that the state emergency manager directors wanted the NEHRP money they got to be rolled into a lump sum and that if they wanted to change it back to a line item amount they could do that. He suggested the group explore this issue a little more.

(Elizabeth Lemersal joined the meeting).

BREAK 10:10 - 10:20 a.m.

CUSEC – Jim Wilkinson, Executive Director

CUSEC is the largest of the consortia in terms of staff and funding, reflecting, in Jim's opinion, the single seismic hazard which the CUSEC states and the four FEMA regions share. CUSEC interacts with four FEMA regions and has a strong relationship with the USGS. Despite the differences in consortia focus, it is imperative that the consortia find ways to work more closely together.

CREW – Bob Zimmerman, President

Bob feels good about CREW and its accomplishments and activities over the past few years and thinks CREW is at its peak. CREW brings the private and public sectors, science, and emergency management to the table to facilitate earthquake mitigation in communities. Private sector participation is important since much of the infrastructure is owned by the private sector. Modestly funded, CREW's significant accomplishment is the working group and the products they produce. They have a large, 19-member board from a wide range of disciplines. They had a Cascadia scenario rollout April 20 (a 4-year project) and soon will have the Seattle fault scenario rollout.

(Cathleen Carlisle joined the meeting).

CREW can put together a multi-disciplinary team to put on community presentations. Bob Freitag discussed other CREW products, their online contingency planning product, report on hospital delivery of just-in-time drugs, and the business tool kit.

Elizabeth Lemersal noted that much of the funding for these projects comes from FEMA.

WSSPC – Ron Teissere

WSSPC is a state government-based emergency management and geoscience non-profit. The Board composition covers earthquake preparedness, mitigation and response. Many members participated in the preparation of the CREW scenarios. WSSPC has taken the lead in putting together conferences – the National Earthquake Conference is the most recent example.

Patti asked Roy Breckenridge, as an original founding member of WSSPC, to comment. Roy said WSSPC has gone through changes to become a more effective organization. WSSPC provides value to the state agencies.

Rick Allis added that WSSPC provides a facilitating role at the state level to improve mitigation and a mechanism to exchange ideas between the states.

Dave Liebersbach said the consortia provide through their differences in a collaborative way a focus to find out what can be done, exchange information, focus on bigger programs, and provides an opportunity for federal agencies to work regionally. What's lacking is a local government tie-in.

Bob Zimmerman said one can't undervalue the meetings WSSPC puts on. Meetings facilitate relationships and set up dialogues for influencing and engaging in a multi-disciplinary activity. The consortia have established relationships with each other that are useful.

DHS/FEMA Briefing – Michael Brown, Undersecretary of DHS EP&R

Michael Brown joined the meeting and expressed his appreciation for the job that the consortia are doing to push forward as hard as possible on earthquake mitigation. Although DHS is facing a huge challenge in terms of homeland security, DHS leaders he has talked to like Michael P. Jackson, Deputy Secretary of DHS, recognize the importance of an all-hazards approach. Jackson was invited on the South Asia trip after the tsunami and was mildly encouraged about starting to make inroads on the importance of mitigation planning. An earthquake like Banda Aceh in the U.S. would have a devastating effect. He encouraged the consortia to "keep up the good work."

Dave Liebersbach said the issue is that we don't lose what funding we have. We have programs that we would like to speed up.

Ron Teissere said all of the programs – at both the state and federal levels – are evolving. Earthquake projects drain money from state and local programs and the effectiveness at the local level. We shouldn't get in a rut that this is what is due.

Jim Wilkinson complemented FEMA's Earthquake Program staff, but said that earthquakes need to be a higher priority. Brown said that means a lot – FEMA folks are worn out and tired.

David Applegate said the all-hazards message is making inroads – what can we do to support that.

Ron Teissere said he too thinks we are making some progress. General Timothy Lowenburg, an all-hazards supporter, was Washington's new governor's first re-appointment.

Ken Murphy said the reorganization in homeland security has an all-hazards focus, and mitigation and preparedness are the messages.

Ron Teissere summarized that, at least for WSSPC, agencies involved in the NEHRP reorganization see us as a resource. We can carry the message to a diverse audience and make it functional for everyone. Michael Brown said to keep pushing the message, and left the meeting.

Future Projects and Collaboration – Ron Teissere Conferences and Workshops

Future projects for WSSPC are its 2005 annual conference in Boise, Idaho September 11-14, and co-sponsorship of the EERI/SSA/OES 100th Anniversary Earthquake Conference April 18-22, 2006 in San Francisco. The consortia plan to have a joint meeting at that venue.

The National Earthquake Program Managers meeting will be held in August of 2005 in Indianapolis, Indiana. That can feed into the next National Conference. For the next National Conference, 2007 is too soon after the Anniversary Conference, and therefore 2008 is more realistic and an opportunity for considerable collaboration. In 2008, states will have experience with IBC 2003 so there will be examples with performance-based design and building instrumentation.

Building Codes – Cathleen Carlisle

Cathleen teamed with John Ingargiola on a building code project working at the local level. They are putting together a user friendly database by the end of this year that will download and merge data from ICC and ISO on code adoption and modifications made to the codes. Dennis Gage from ISO has partnered with FEMA to provide information on the Building Code Effectiveness Grading Standard (BCEGS), how it is adopted and how it is enforced.

Ron said WSSPC would like to play more of a role in this process and asked if we could get access to the grade? Cathleen replied that the community rating number was proprietary number. Publishing data is an incentive to be more professional. However, communities rated No. 1 would most likely be willing to reveal their score. There are

four No. 1s, including Fremont, CA and Orem, UT. If a community is rated No. 1, a 22% discount is recommended for the earthquake rider.

Participation in BCEGS is voluntary, but the majority of states participate. When states were evaluated on seismic hazards, seismic provisions in code, and whether a seismic code was adopted and when, there was a 4-5 point drop in the rating.

Obstacles to overcome are the small number of structural engineers who can perform performance-based design, and building officials who are qualified to evaluate their work, have seismic codes, and also work with prescriptive codes.

How do you evaluate the ICC in this context? Ed Laatsch said perhaps ISO could answer that; a performance metric is included in the strategic plan.

Earthquake Program Managers Meeting – Jim Wilkinson

The consortia directors are collaborating on the planning for the August Earthquake Program Managers meeting. A minimal fee of \$70 will be charged. The meeting is intended to be an annual event with the lead rotated among the various consortia.

Consortia Future – Ron Teissere, WSSPC Board Chair

FEMA's financial support keeps all of the consortia afloat. The challenge is to continue to think about other ways to organize to maintain activity around these issues. Ed Laatsch said to the extent there is control, there will be support.

Bob Zimmerman expressed concern about the lack of planning for multi-state responses for an event like Cascadia with a combined earthquake and tsunami. Jim Wilkinson said FEMA HQ will be signing a contract to address a multi-state response for a catastrophic planning initiative – one in the CUSEC states and another at the national level for a New Madrid event. Rich Eisner suggested that what is needed is an enhanced multi-hazard scenario that would impact response in 5 Pacific states. David Applegate said that would be an opportunity to plan for a tsunami too.

David said, to follow up on how Mike Brown put it, “carry on the message.” Dave Liebersbach said there is an opportunity to act before the new director of homeland security takes over. Mitigation and preparedness need to stay with response and recovery activities. The language is changing from prevention to deterrence and consequence management. Craig Weaver noted that corporate partners at CREW do not want to be tied to investigative and intelligence aspects of homeland security. Dave said NEMA and IAEM are working to get some time with Chertoff and Dave will mention WSSPC and the consortia.

Adjournment – Ron Teissere

Ron Teissere concluded the meeting at 11:55 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia L. Sutch
WSSPC Executive Director