




Regional Border Coordination Summit Report 2009



Cover Designed By:

Megan Wheeler
Volunteer to the All Hazards Consortium



Table of Contents

Executive Overview.....	4
Background.....	4
Common Themes.....	5
Next Steps	5
About the AHC	7
Summit Concept and Approach	8
Functional Round Table Summary.....	10
Commodities	10
Communications	11
Credentialing/Access	13
Law Enforcement	13
Mass Care/Sheltering.....	15
Public Health	16
Transportation	16
Cross Functional Round Tables	19
Next Steps.....	21
Functional Discussions:	21
Wrap Up Session	22
Acknowledgements	23
Facilitators.....	23
Sponsors.....	25
Appendices	26
Credentialing Presentation.....	26
Read Ahead	29
Attendees	31



Executive Overview

The Regional Border Coordination Summit Meeting was an effort supported by several states, DHS/FEMA, and the private sector held in October 2008. This meeting focused on how the states and their multiple agencies would coordinate at their borders during a planned or unplanned regional catastrophic evacuation of the public.

This report and the summit meeting were outcomes of the Regional Catastrophic Event Preparedness Workshop held in February 2008 during which the states discovered there was a need for improved coordination of resources at the state borders during a mass movement of citizens. The states agreed to take an incremental approach to address this topic by focusing on the following first steps:

- Conduct a small multi-state summit meeting to allow for discussion between the states.
- Develop an initial evacuation border coordination report that begins to identify top themes and issues.
- Conduct a broader multi-state study to provide an information framework that can be used by all to educate and support regional coordination efforts.
- Gain agreement on next steps.

The AHC acknowledges the member states and jurisdictions, their local stakeholders, and supporting federal, private, and academic partners who all share a sincere desire to protect residents and communities while working in concert with their respective neighbors.

Background

Through the collaboration efforts of the states, it was discovered that evacuation routes in one state aren't always considered evacuation routes in adjoining states. This discussion led to the organizing of a multi-state meeting, the Border Coordination Summit Meeting, that would focus on the various coordination efforts needed at state borders during a catastrophic evacuation.

The states decided to focus this effort on the multi-state coordination efforts at state borders in the following areas:

- 1) Commodities (food, water and fuel)
- 2) Communications
- 3) Credentialing
- 4) Law Enforcement
- 5) Mass Care/Sheltering
- 6) Public Health
- 7) Transportation

This report represents the meeting summaries and frames the major themes and work areas to be addressed in the near future.



Report on the All Hazards Consortium Border Coordination Summit

Following this report, a more in depth regional study will be conducted to research what people, efforts and projects are already in place to support this effort in each state and identify additional gaps for further exploration.

Common Themes

Over 100 people from various state, federal and private organizations jointly discussed many topics at this two (2) day meeting. The common regional themes were as follows:

1. Governance
 - a. The need for an overall regional governance structure prior to an event and a coordinated regional incident command and control structure during an event.
2. Planning
 - a. The ongoing need for regional planning and collaboration between homeland security, emergency management, transportation, law enforcement, public health, the private sector and other related organizations.
 - b. The coordination of partners (e.g. states, counties, cities, tribes, federal agencies, non-profits, etc.).
3. Resources
 - a. The need to know what resources are available and from whom before an event.
 - b. A way to coordinate resources at the state borders from state to state.
 - c. Knowledge of what resources the private sector can bring to bear.
4. Partners
 - a. The appropriate role of private sector owner/operators in the process.
 - b. The role of all federal government agencies in the process.
 - c. The role of the media in the process.
5. Funding/Sustainability
 - a. A regional funding and sustainability strategy from all participating agencies and organizations.
 - b. Ways to engage the private sector owner/operators in the process to sustain the efforts.
6. Education
 - a. Common regional definitions and lexicon.
 - b. The states need to know the best practices and lessons learned in the private sector, federal government, and other states.
 - c. The need for continued collaboration and exercises

All agreed this major undertaking needed to be started. Manageable first steps would be needed to provide focus and ensure results.

Next Steps

Multi-state border coordination is a long-term, complex topic involving many stakeholders and issues. Several possible next steps were discussed at the meeting. The AHC states agreed to focus on the following:



Report on the All Hazards Consortium Border Coordination Summit

- Completion of an After Conference Report.
- Conducting a broader regional study to determine what is already in place to support this effort in each state and identify possible gaps for further exploration.
- Conduct a follow on meeting to explore outcomes of the study, prioritize needs, and decide on next steps.



About the AHC

The All Hazards Consortium (AHC) is a 501c3 non-profit guided by the regional states of North Carolina, District of Columbia, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, Delaware, Pennsylvania, New Jersey and New York. Our mission is to convene, facilitate, and document a sustained process of interactions between states to help create new resources and funding opportunities for the states to address key and timely multi-state issues. Formed in 2005, the AHC continues to build a network of people and organizations from government, private sector, higher education and non-profit/volunteer organizations that work together on common problems facing the multi-state region.

The All Hazards Consortium's role is to:

- **Create and facilitate a multi-state network** of people (from state/local/federal government, private sector, universities, research centers and non-profit organizations) that can focus on specific homeland security, emergency management and related issues that are common to all.
- **Create and manage a sustainable, ongoing collaboration process** between the states (e.g. regional workshops, meetings and conference calls).
- **Work to gain common agreement** between the states on issues, findings, and possible recommendations/solutions.
- **Document** the issues and the recommendations in regional consensus white papers.
- **Develop ideas** for multi-state research, projects, policy and efforts to address these recommendations.
- **Raise awareness and resources** to support the states efforts to produce tangible, measurable results.

For more information about AHC activities and events, please visit www.ahcusa.org.

A copy of the most recent AHC annual report can be downloaded at:
http://www.ahcusa.org/documents/2008_AHC_Annual_Report.pdf



Summit Concept and Approach

Due to the geographical context and population of the East Coast region, it is critical that evacuation planning be conducted with a multi-state regional approach, and a key issue that requires further development is the concept of cross-jurisdictional state border coordination. An example of this would be where a major evacuation route in one state crosses into another state where it is not considered an evacuation route. To achieve the long-term vision of a coordinated plan, a network of people and an informational framework needs to be constructed by all states involved.

The AHC facilitated a multi-state Border Coordination Summit Meeting to help coordinate catastrophic evacuation planning efforts and issues as a follow on to the Catastrophic Event Preparedness Workshop held in February 2008. The meeting was underwritten by several states in the AHC and hosted by the state of Pennsylvania in Gettysburg on October 22 and 23, 2008. The purpose of this first meeting was to;

1. begin to identify the top issues
2. identify any existing single state or multi-state efforts already underway and
3. link them together while identifying gaps to be addressed going forward. Future meetings will address more details within states and discipline.

Prior to the summit, the AHC conducted regional conference calls with participating state representatives within the identified disciplines (transportation, public health, law enforcement, mass care, credentialing, communications, food/water/fuel, etc.), and compiled the findings to share with summit meeting attendees. Those findings are included in the appendix. Participants were asked the following questions during the conference calls:

- What are the top three things you need to know in the event of an evacuation in a notice/no-notice event?
- Describe any cross border/multi-state planning initiatives you are currently working on.
- Describe any cross border/multi-state training and/or exercises that you participate in.
- Do you have any formal agreements in place with other agencies to assist in a cross border / multi-state response to an evacuation?
- What are your biggest challenges as they relate to multi-state initiatives?
- How do you engage private sector in your planning / training / exercises?

Based on preliminary feedback from the states, the primary messages were:

- Regional planning is a necessity.
- Planning efforts are not funded in a sustainable manner.
- Planning and exercises are most often locally based.

The objectives of the summit meeting then were formulated to:

- Bring together the state Homeland Security and Emergency Management leadership from nine states and FEMA headquarters/regions.
- Identify the state representatives within each discipline who will participate in future efforts.



Report on the All Hazards Consortium Border Coordination Summit

- Determine other federal agencies with whom to partner (DoT, Commerce, DHS S&T, etc.).
- Define private sector stakeholders, roles and participation.
- Explore future multi-state related projects, funding options and grant initiatives.

In the morning session at the summit, attendees were organized into functional roundtables according to discipline. Each group was provided a facilitator and focused on discussing the following three (3) items:

Functional Round Table Discussion Topics

- 1) Three top issues as they relate to cross border evacuation**
- 2) Overview of current cross border efforts**
- 3) Gaps to be addressed**

During the afternoon session, the groups were reorganized so that each table had a representative from each functional area. Attendees were presented with a scenario and asked to formulate what would be needed from each others functional area in that scenario



Functional Round Table Summary

In the morning session, groups were organized by discipline. The major points of conversation from each functional round table are enumerated below. ***Due to the make-up of the groups, some groups were able to address all the three discussion topic areas. Other groups were only able to address the top issues. The listings of current initiatives in each functional area are not meant to be exhaustive. The follow on Border Report will capture additional initiatives. If the reader is aware of additional studies or initiatives involving multi-state evacuation, please contact the AHC at jennifer.nugent@ahcusa.org.***

Commodities

The commodities functional group formulated the following top issues as they relate to cross border evacuation.

Top Issues:

- Planning – Coordination and prioritization of commodity distribution along the evacuation route at the point of reception and the point of return must be addressed on a regional basis.
- Payment – When a state provides commodities for those from another area, who is responsible for the immediate funding necessary to provide those services?
- Private Sector Coordination – The coordination between private sector and public sector needs to improve. States must include the private sector and local community in planning efforts.
- Behavior – There is a need to better understand the behavior of the consumer.
- Public Information – The public must be notified as to what they can expect along the way as well as expectations for when they return.

Current Initiatives

- There are three (3) projects within FEMA Region III's Regional Catastrophic Planning Grant Program (RCPGP) that involve commodities. Two (2) of the projects deal with Resource Management in the region. The first project deals with the development of critical core partnerships for regional resource management and assesses how they need to work together. The second resource project deals with the regional database sharing of key evacuation resources. The third project is a modeling and simulation project that will address what commodities / resources a state has on hand in an evacuation and the consequences of using those resources.
- The State of NJ is working with the National Food Council to develop a state and private sector interface to allow business to get back to business by identifying critical life line support priorities for the food sector to move up operational ability and eliminate the need for federal aid distribution earlier in the response/recovery period.



Gaps

- More education is needed to understand the regional people, efforts and organizations that can support this topic.
- More work is needed on regionally predicting public behavior for evacuation scenarios.
- There is a need for states/disciplines to coordinate across borders on resourcing issues.
- Coordinated public information efforts are needed. Efforts should engage private sector employers/operators in the process.
- There is a need to connect private sector donations/assets to government needs.
- Need for an ongoing integrated planning platform to bring together state/local/federal government and private sector owner/operators.

Communications

The communications functional group formulated the following top issues as they relate to cross border evacuation.

Top Issues:

- Leadership and Governance:
 - While state communications interoperability plans (SCIPs) exist for all states, few if any SCIPs address cross-state interoperability issues; nor are SCIPs coordinated with bordering states before final publication.
 - As a result, there is no common regional vision for communications interoperability among FEMA Region III states, or within the expanded NCR UASI region.
 - There is no mechanism for institutionalizing lessons learned and best practices relating to cross-boundary communications issues.
 - There is a recognized common need for decision support capabilities that focus on the needs of the emergency management/first responder communities – currently, data is aggregated in situational displays, but desk officers are often overwhelmed by information. What is needed is a knowledge management system that is able to highlight decision-critical information and “push” this information to the right decision maker at the appropriate time in the emergency response decision cycle.
 - There needs to be a regional Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for interoperable communications with the DoD and with National Guard resources.
- Funding:
 - There needs to be a consistent, sustainable funding stream to support (primarily operations, maintenance, and training) communications systems once procured and fielded.
 - Be cautious toward driving the Federal government to establish overly prescriptive standards, since these very standards often generate “unfunded mandates.” An example might include changes in spectrum designations that then lead to a requirement to physically “re-band” land mobile radios.
- Technical Interoperability:
 - Before pursuing interoperability, there needs to be basic operability. Issues of legacy systems, “sunk costs,” and basic RF connectivity should be resolved first.



Report on the All Hazards Consortium Border Coordination Summit

For example, there are regions within NCR member states that are RF “quiet” or restricted zones due to research and national security restrictions. These need to be addressed, each in turn, and resolved with appropriate “work-arounds” as a precondition to establishing interoperability.

- Increasingly, police/fire/rescue rely on data and imagery to perform their respective mission, in addition to traditional voice. Most of the current communications interoperability focus is on voice solutions. Data and video needs to be comprehensively factored in as well.
- Generational Transition:
 - There needs to be a new paradigm for communications in support of emergency/disaster response and recovery that leverages emerging collaborative technologies associated with “web 2.0” including knowledge and content management systems, and information dissemination systems (e.g., wiki, twitter, facebook, myspace, folksonomies, etc.)
 - The central issue is how does one leverage the collaborative power of these new tools, and the talents of the next generation of users, while remaining compliant with requirements for information security and information privacy?

Current Initiatives:

- All represented states (MD, VA, WV, PA and NJ) were currently in the process of fielding new or upgrading existing radio communications systems. All of these initiatives are state-focused, with cross-border interoperability issues being addressed (as they arise either in planning or in practice) at county and municipal levels.
- DoJ’s National Institute of Justice is collaborating with WV to discern a set of existing communications agreements and identify gaps and overlaps that may currently exist.
- A multi-state regional baseline assessment for the AHC states is currently under development.

Gaps:

- Mechanisms for synchronizing privacy/information sharing (particularly cross-domain) are inconsistent, ambiguous, or undefined.
- There is no regional communications strategy for AHC member states; nor is there a common multi-jurisdictional political vision for regional communications and interoperability.
- Communications interoperability across borders, where it does exist, is ad hoc and tactically (operationally) focused.
- Existing systems development and procurement processes (and bureaucracies) are out of synch with the pace of technology evolution. There needs to be a general recognition (by political leaders, as well as practitioners) that in this environment, no “optimal” communications systems will ever be achieved. Instead, agile, spiral-based, procurements should be undertaken to field incremental capabilities improvements (rather than comprehensive new-system fieldings) that integrate legacy investments and capabilities.
- More regional exercises are needed along evacuation routes that engage state and local government



Credentialing/Access

The credentialing/access functional group formulated the following top issues as they relate to cross border evacuation.

Top Issues:

- Credentialing versus Access Rights – Credentialing doesn't mean access rights. Both must be addressed.
- Personnel Flow – There are people who need to come in as people are leaving. There are unique issues associated with both populations leaving and accessing (as well as staying). Is the same system adequate for all and are they compatible?
 - People leaving - Scenario dependent and depends on age and physical capabilities (Katrina) primary concern travel routes and safety.
 - People entering – There are certain necessary skills needed that must be allowed back into dangerous zone.
 - People staying - There is a need for a process for surveillance and checking on people who stay because they can't or won't leave. This includes special needs as well as quarantined individuals.
- Resources – How do vehicles and resources get credentialed and/or given access rights?
- Funding – Requires upfront investment to reduce response time and long-term costs.

Current Initiatives:

- Virginia and West Virginia are collaborating on the First Responder Authentication Credential (FRAC) electronic identity trust model. A goal in this collaborative effort is to enhance and expedite onsite incident command coordination functions involving multi-jurisdiction disparate organizations supporting response and recovery efforts. This will be accomplished by ensuring interoperability with federal standards such as those demonstrated during Operation Rendezvous and other DHS exercises.
- The All Hazards Consortium states are working together with DHS Office of Infrastructure Protection to gain common agreement on Access Control Guidelines for CI/KR Resources.
- The Corporate Emergency Access System (CEAS) is a credentialing program which assists private organizations and businesses in gaining access to their business facilities within restricted areas during public emergencies. Companies that participate in the program within a sponsoring municipality may apply for CEAS "access cards" for their critical employees. Local law enforcement agencies in participating jurisdictions are trained to recognize the CEAS cardholder as critical to business recovery efforts. CEAS was developed by the not-for-profit Business Network of Emergency Resources, Inc. (BNET), who has partnered with cities and counties across the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic to address the ever present concerns regarding business resiliency following a disaster.



Gaps:

- There are many federal agency guidelines and mandates that may compete with each other.
- A common, uniform framework needs to be developed for multi-state credentialing and access that is supported by the appropriate disciplines at the state level

Law Enforcement

The law enforcement functional group formulated the following top issues as they relate to cross border evacuation.

Top Issues:

- Command and Control for a large geographic incident (such as evacuation)
 - Coordination for complex, multi-jurisdictional, multi-disciplinary incidents presents many challenges, including the ability to identify appropriate leadership and coordinating structures to meet the demands of the incidents.
 - Plans – state-to-state plans have not been developed, nor have region-wide efforts to integrate current state-level evacuation plans been addressed with the exception of some sub-regional efforts involving Maryland, Delaware, Virginia and the NCR. Accordingly, implementing multi-state evacuation plans will place great stress on local, state and federal officials to coordinate efforts during any such incident.
 - Resources – resource management for multi-state incidents remains a significant challenge as no known efforts have been made to integrate existing Emergency Management Operations Centers (EOCs) across state lines or to create “Regional EOCS” necessary to manage resources (people and things).
- Interoperability: The law enforcement group participants recognize that interoperability includes much more than the ability to deploy and utilize radio communications.
 - Radio/voice/data = Information (Situational Awareness): The integration of reliable, redundant communication systems is vital to address large-scale incidents of any type. In addition, the ability to maintain and report accurate situational awareness is equally vital as it provides incident commanders the “nature and pulse of the incident” from which incident objectives are developed, resource needs are determined, and incident evaluation and management can occur.
 - Plans and Political Authority (and Political Will): Currently, no state-to-state agreements exist to enable states to establish coordination structures to manage multi-state incidents.
 - Mutual aid/EMAC: It is recommended that the Consortium states examine the feasibility of identifying the Governors to enter into necessary pre-incident agreements to share jurisdiction and delegate authority to personnel to assist with multi-state incidents where shared management interests are apparent.
 - Concept of Operations: A Concept of Operations for multi-state incidents should be developed to address the full range of responsibilities and resources that will be needed to manage such incidents.
- Regional All-Hazards Evacuation Planning



Report on the All Hazards Consortium Border Coordination Summit

- Although evacuation planning is underway it is not region-wide¹.
- Designated regional evacuation routes (cross state) are needed.
- There is a need to de-conflict plans.
- Emergency Public Information Warning
 - Joint Information System/Joint Information Center JIC/JIS plans are essential to organize Public Information personnel from jurisdictions across state lines. Again, pre-incident planning should be initiated as a critical next step.
 - Maximize available technology to ensure that critical information can be provided to citizens impacted by the incident using all available means.

Current Initiatives:

- Preparedness planning, including plans for evacuation, is ongoing throughout the Consortium states including sub-regional efforts involving Maryland, Delaware, Virginia and the NCR at the local and state level.
- NJ and NYC are also involved in similar efforts

Gaps:

- More exercises are needed to drive out cross border issues/coordination.
- There is a need for continued awareness, collaboration and sharing of various regional projects/efforts at federal and state levels.
- There is a need for more integrated planning with law enforcement efforts and other disciplines and private sector owner/operators.

Mass Care/Sheltering

The mass care functional group formulated the following top issues as they relate to cross border evacuation.

Top Issues:

- Communication - Lack of formalized communication among states. Before an event, ESF 6's must communicate.
- Tracking – There are requirements for tracking systems for misplaced citizens.
 - Developing a tracking system for people as they cross borders and leave their homes so they can be accounted for both by officials and eventually their families or other relatives on databases.
 - Address public resistance to tracking – fear of the government.
 - Explaining the benefits of a tracking system.
 - Coordination with Red Cross and faith based organizations.
- Relationships – The relationships of those who require sheltering or mass care in the event of an evacuation with the local community is an issue.

¹ Since the Border Summit, efforts have begun on the Regional Catastrophic Planning Grant Program (RCPGP).



Report on the All Hazards Consortium Border Coordination Summit

- Need for sharing of best practices.

Current Initiatives:

- The FEMA Region III states have undertaken a Mass Care project as part of the Regional Catastrophic Planning Grant Program (RCPGP). The desired outcomes of this project are to develop a common definition of regional shelter standards and special needs populations, and to identify shelter locations with supporting data such as capacity, ADA compliance and pet arrangements that would be needed in a protective action in the multi-state region.

Gaps:

- The management of shelters across borders will have multiple financial and legal impacts that need to be addressed.
- The management of moving people from acute care facilities to facilities across borders is another gap that needs to be addressed.
- The management of moving incarcerated people to facilities across state borders needs to be addressed.
- Coordination of the regional states' variations of styles is needed in the event of protective actions, be it shelter-in-place or evacuation, to ensure consistent information dissemination

Public Health

The public health functional group formulated the following top issues as they relate to cross border evacuation.

Top Issues:

- Medical Surge Capacity – Need information on patient tracking, pandemic planning and hospital bed capacity.
 - Information requirement for not only capacity but also specialty.
 - Requirement to identify different information sources and how to share that information across states.
- Stockpile Management – Need to address missing or duplication of distribution to populations.
- Collaboration – Need better collaboration with federal government as it relates to gaps.

Current Initiatives:

- There are current programs that should be leveraged including coordination between states and active county to county, cross-border mutual aid initiatives.
- EMAC has governance and policy guidance that needs to be followed.

Gaps:



Report on the All Hazards Consortium Border Coordination Summit

- There is a need for more collaboration and coordination with federal, state and local authorities.
- Improved communications and coordination across the region is needed.
- Regional planning is needed that integrates transportation, law enforcement, emergency management and private sector with public health efforts.
- More work is needed to drive out public health issues in a cross border environment.

Transportation

The transportation functional group formulated the following top issues as they relate to cross border evacuation.

Top Issues:

- Sharing of plans and basic issues is essential. Each entity needs to know what's coming at them including:
 - Timelines of plans
 - People flows – how many and where are they going
 - Situational awareness
 - Operations (real-time and day to day)
- There is a significant need for breaking down communications barriers
 - Relationships between agencies
 - Interoperable platforms
 - Tying together EOC's/TMC's
 - Understanding role of private sector
- Must integrate all modes in planning and operations (air, rail, ferries, roads)
 - Specific needs, specific transport
 - Public & private sector providers
- There is a need to address institutional barriers
 - Transport for PD and FD
 - Addressing silos

Current Initiatives:

- New York and New Jersey have put in place the Trans-Hudson Plan which is an emergency transportation plan aimed at returning NJ residents working in NY City and NY residents working in NJ to their resident state using ferry and bus operations when existing rail-based commuting options are rendered inoperable. The plan includes the use of private sector transportation resources.
- The Northern NJ UASI region is also working on a regional mass evacuation plan that will adapt the Trans-Hudson plan to make it a more flexible component of incident response to a wider range of disaster scenarios. This planning initiative also included a behavior analysis study which found that a significant number of NJ evacuees are likely to cross state lines to reach their evacuation destinations. This data will be incorporated in an evacuation transportation planning model being developed to support the initiative.
- The NY City/Northern NJ UASI RCPGP is underway with an initial focus on plan synchronization and coordinating evacuation decision-making through an executive level Regional Evacuation Liaison Team. This initiative, which also includes Connecticut and



Report on the All Hazards Consortium Border Coordination Summit

Pennsylvania, will address cross-border transportation operations and regional sheltering.

- The Southeastern Pennsylvania Regional Task Force, which consists of the City of Philadelphia and Bucks, Chester, Delaware and Montgomery counties in Pennsylvania, in conjunction with the Pennsylvania Emergency Management Agency (PEMA) and the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC), has undertaken creation of the Southeastern Pennsylvania Emergency Transportation Plan. This planning effort is intended to ensure an appropriate and consistent response to events impacting the five county area. The task force is working closely with five southern New Jersey counties to address the potential flow of evacuees across the Delaware River.
- The RCPGP initiative within FEMA Region II (DC, DE, MD, PA, WV and VA) also includes a transportation component involving the mapping of evacuation routes within the six-state region.
- The I-95 Corridor Coalition conducted a best practices study of regional incident management information sharing systems and applications in use throughout the I-95 Corridor. The study focused on answered the question, “Could there be one incident management system for the entire corridor, but customized for each region?” The main objectives of the project included technology transfer, to determine the potential for tying regional systems together and to provide information needed to determine how the Information Sharing Network (ISN) could be designed and deployed while, in the meantime, leveraging current system information sharing capabilities to improve operations.
- The DelMarVa Emergency Taskforce and Maryland, Virginia and Delaware are working together on an East Coast Hurricane Evacuation Plan. This includes the development and coordination of detailed evacuation routes with the State Highway planners.
- The American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) is working to develop and publish a guide for multi-state transportation operations programs (MSTOP) that is suitable for adoption, recognizing that MSTOPs will have significant state, regional and national benefits.
- The I-95 Corridor Coalition developed the Integrated Corridor Analysis Tool (ICAT), as well as other planning and modeling tools for multi-state evacuations. Currently, the Coalition is beginning the process of developing and pilot testing a multi-state evacuation/emergency planning tool for two or three states that uses ICAT as the basis for the planning network.

Gaps:

- The establishment of command and control among the varying transportation entities, e.g., ports, tunnels, roadways, and the sharing of plans between those entities.
- Coordination of contracting arrangements between state and private sector. For example, private sector may have a contractual arrangement with a ferry operator for their employees while the state may also be relying on those assets
- Continued exercises are needed.
- More knowledge is needed with respect to the various efforts going on within the region



Cross Functional Round Tables

In the afternoon session, round tables were organized so that each group had representatives from multiple disciplines. All groups were given the following scenario and asked, "What information would you need from others seated at your table to respond to this scenario?" The information from the summary of that session is detailed below.

Abbreviated Scenario

WAHC news has learned that officials in four states and the District of Columbia are investigating reports that water supplies -- including three major rivers that provide drinking water for much of the population of the region -- have been contaminated. The precise source and nature of this contamination has not been determined, but reports began surfacing several hours ago that hospital emergency rooms in several states had seen a significant up tick in visits and admissions.

The reports appearing from various sources on the internet connect these illnesses to the consumption of public drinking water from the Susquehanna, Shenandoah and Potomac Rivers. None of the state, county or local governments in the effected areas have confirmed this incident or its source, nor have any banned the use of public water supplies. No evacuations have yet been ordered.

General Discussion:

- Within the confines of the scenario, the most pressing issue was to identify the nature of the contaminating agent or agents; fix its location(s), and determine its propagation behavior.
- River contamination implies multi-jurisdictional impacts, therefore the need for a multi-jurisdictional communications strategy and response - in particular, a Joint Information Center (JIC).
- For state Fusion Centers, there is still not a common CONOPS for information sharing in the case of cross-border emergencies. Strong bi-lateral relationships exist at the tactical and operational levels, but plans and protocols need to be formalized, harmonized, and exercised.
- From FEMA's perspective, the Federal government needs to know what the state and local resource gaps are (e.g., food, water, shelter, security, communications, etc.)

Top Issues:

- Planning and Information Sharing – AHC member states do not have integrated JIC planning, nor do they exercise the plans and/or agreements that they in some cases do have.



Report on the All Hazards Consortium Border Coordination Summit

- Command and Control – Multi-state command and control will need to be organized.
- Public Perception - The “tipping point” at which governments will begin to lose control of the emergency is represented by the level of “panic” the public experiences that causes them to act either unilaterally (e.g., self-evacuate) or in opposition to government direction.
- Public Messaging - Coordinated, consistent, timely public messaging is critical to pushing back in time that tipping point. Effective messaging must include:
 - JIC coordinated press releases.
 - Credible communication sources.
 - Leverage, in a consistent way, all available communications channels (e.g., high emergency advisory systems, cell phones, email, twitters, text messages, radio broadcast).
 - Don't forget special needs populations, non-ambulatory groups, and others who do not normally use (or comprehend) ordinary communications channels. There is a need to develop and practice notifications using non-traditional communications channels including volunteer organizations (e.g., meals on wheels, home care providers, and home medical service providers including nursing, oxygen, physical therapy, etc.).
- Transportation - Will be asked to determine multi-state traffic flow issues based upon traffic monitoring and reporting systems.
- Interdependencies - There needs to be a regional approach to identifying and making explicit critical interdependencies, that (if unmitigated), will lead cascading response/recovery systems failures. Supporting this, there should be a risk-based system for prioritizing these critical interdependencies that is then used to inform policy, planning, and investment decisions at a regional level.

Further Discussion on Interdependency Issues:

This is perhaps the least examined area of concern relating to cross-boundary coordination. Among the various functions (law enforcement, communications, mass care, medical, transportation, credentialing etc.) there is no integrated set of priorities as to which functions have primacy over others for purposes of support. For example, if the planned solution for mass care (e.g., shelter) is to rely on the private sector for building materials (tents, plywood, tarps), then it must be recognized beforehand that suppliers like Wal-Mart and Home Depot generally use just-in-time inventory systems. For these private sector providers to be effective in disaster response, they will need communications and power to coordinate their supply chains and will need free access (credentials) and freedom of movement (transportation and security) to move their goods. If the output of the mass care support function is shelter food and water, the necessary inputs will be power, communications, road access, and security. Similarly, law enforcement will need communications, road access, and power to perform its emergency support functions; however, demands on law enforcement services will greatly exceed law enforcement response capacity during times of emergency, and so on.



Next Steps

This section will detail next steps that were discussed in the individual functional groups.

Functional Discussions:

- Command and Control
 - Multi-state EOC/Fusion/TOC: Incident Management responsibility for managing state-level evacuations will rest largely with state EOCs through the impacted multi-state area. Accordingly, it is critical that planning occur between those entities toward “Regional EOCs” to ensure the alignment of existing plans, particularly at border locations and where main transportation systems/corridors cross state lines.
 - Virtual EOCs: States can establish “virtual EOCs” using available technology without the investment in “bricks and mortar” to establish dedicated facilities. As stated above, pre-incident agreements will be required with accompanying plans. Training and exercises for virtual EOCs is necessary to test and evaluate the ability of these EOCs to perform.
 - Area Command - Multi-Agency Coordination Groups (MAC), Incident Complex, etc: The law enforcement group recommends the use of Incident Command System structures where appropriate to address multi-state coordination.
 - Examine Command and Control options and the authority to implement as stated above.
 - Plan – Organize – Train – Exercise – Evaluate.
- Interoperability
 - Radio - state-to-state interoperability planning is needed.
 - Multi-state planning must be expanded while intra-state efforts mature.
- Evacuation Planning
 - Enlist major metropolitan areas to:
 - Compare plans.
 - Amend as needed.
 - Train and exercise.
- Emergency Public Information and Warning
 - Apply JIC plans (local and intra-state) and concepts to state-to-state incident plans.
 - Expand efforts (DoT) to connect camera and traffic monitoring systems.



Wrap Up Session

The All Hazards Consortium has been funded to produce a Border Coordination Report that will identify existing catastrophic planning organizations, task forces and efforts (plans, SOPs, guidance, etc.) as they relate to multi-state border coordination issues.

As part of this effort, an inventory will be developed of the current areas of coordination between the states. This would include review of such areas as:

- State Police
- Homeland Security
- Emergency Management
- Department of Transportation
- Department of Health

Estimated completion date is Spring, 2010.



Acknowledgements

Facilitators

The Consortium would like to thank the following individuals for serving as moderators and facilitators of the Border Coordination Summit meeting.

Steve Davis

Steve Davis is President of All Hands Consulting and currently serves as Project Manager for the Southeast Florida Urban Area Security Initiative. Steve has over 35 years of experience in a variety of public service fields. He served in uniform for 16 years as a Firefighter, Paramedic, and Command Officer until moving into public administration. Steve then served as Executive Director for the Montgomery County Maryland Fire and Rescue Commission, was Administrator of the County Health Department, and completed his public sector career as a Manager in the Office of Management and Budget.

Steve now consults on continuity of operations, disaster recovery, command center operations, emergency management, and homeland security. Steve developed All Hands Consulting, a unique consortium of emergency management and business continuity practitioners in early 2000. All Hands clientele include federal, state, and local governments as well as Fortune 500 and smaller companies representing a diverse array of industries.

Steve is a well-known expert in the field, he has published two books, provided over 100 presentations, and published over twenty articles on emergency management, emergency operation center operations, continuity programs, and related topics.

Steve holds a Bachelor Degree in Fire Service Management and a Masters Degree in Public Policy from the University of Maryland, College Park.

Dr. Michael French

Dr. French currently serves as a Senior Principal Systems Engineer and Department Head for Critical Infrastructure Protection in MITRE's newly formed Homeland Security Center. He previously served as a Homeland Security portfolio manager with the MITRE's Center for Enterprise Modernization, focusing on homeland security strategy and emergency preparedness and response matters.

Before joining MITRE, Dr. French served as the Assistant Director for Management and Deputy Assistant Director for Mission Support and Information Technology with ICE's Office of Detention and Removal Operations (DRO). Dr. French is a retired Army Lieutenant Colonel of 22 years, having served in a variety of law enforcement, criminal investigations, operations research and teaching assignments including tours as a Provost Marshal, criminal investigations district commander, and senior operations research analyst with the Office of the Army Chief of Staff, Pentagon. He holds a Bachelor of Arts degree in Criminology from the University of Maryland, a Master of Science degree from Boston University, an MBA from Jacksonville State University (operations research focus), and a Doctorate in Business Administration in International Management from Nova Southeastern University. He has taught at the graduate level and is academically and professionally published on the topics of computer crime, workload planning, police intelligence-sharing, enterprise systems engineering, and international market theory. His professional associations include the Military Operations Research Society (MORS),



Report on the All Hazards Consortium Border Coordination Summit

Academy of International Business (AIB), International Association of Emergency Managers (IAEM), and the Project Management Institute (PMI).

M. Michael McHargue

Mike is an independent management and security consultant supporting a wide variety of Homeland Security projects in Florida and the Southeast United States.

Mike retired from the Florida Department of Law Enforcement with 32 years experience in a several senior management positions. Mike served as the Director of Public Affairs, Director of the Florida Criminal Justice Executive Institute, Inspector General, Director of Executive Investigations, and Director of Investigations and Forensic Sciences. Mike was the Homeland Security Advisor for Florida and served as Chair of the State Working Group on Domestic Preparedness until his retirement in January 2005.

Mike has been involved in major event planning and disaster response and management since 1975, including the coordination of state law enforcement resources during the Florida's record setting hurricane seasons in 2004 and 2005. Mike has continued to support Florida's domestic security and all hazards planning through the writing of emergency plans for specialized law enforcement response teams, emergency management operations centers and state agencies. Mike has evaluated and moderated the 2005, 2006 and 2007 Governor's Executive Table Top Exercise and compiled the After-Action reports for each. The Governor's TTX is the largest executive level exercise conducted annually in Florida.

Mike has also written, conducted and evaluated many multi-agency exercises for local, regional and state response elements and is a certified Incident Command System (ICS) Instructor.

Bradley Westpfahl

Brad is responsible for operations and planning for the IBM team focused on serving the US Federal Government. He is accountable to the Managing Director of IBM US Federal for the business strategy, investment allocation and tactical operations of IBM's extensive relationships with the Federal Government.

Prior to accepting this position in January, 2008, Brad served for six years as the Director of Global Government Programs and was focused on the emerging needs of IBM's clients in government worldwide. He led IBM's assessment of and response to government trends including: the role of organizational culture in shaping Information Technology (IT) project success, safety and security solutions, identity management and the government IT implications of globalization.

Since joining IBM in 1978, Brad has held professional, managerial and executive positions in sales, marketing, business practices, strategy and finance. He is active in the community and is a past president of Leadership Montgomery, a not-for-profit organization dedicated to the development of effective community leaders in Montgomery County, Maryland.



Sponsors

The Consortium would like to thank the following sponsors of the Border Coordination Summit.

BAE Systems – “First Intercomm”

www.baesystems.com Terry Croutharmel at terry.croutharmel@baesystems.com, (904) 264-8527

BAE Systems is a global company engaged in the development, delivery and support of advanced defense and aerospace systems in the air, on land and at sea. Through innovative technology development efforts, BAE delivers solutions to government around the world. One of their newest solutions addresses a key issue facing states in a multi-state, multi-radio system environment where public safety communications interoperability plays an important role in the first responder community.

How are they relevant? Developed for the military, BAE’s “First Intercomm” is a mobile based communications system that can be delivered to a scene and quickly link separate radio systems together. This is an important bridging technology that can support multiple state agencies using multiple radio systems during a regional evacuation where coordination and communications across the borders is required to save lives.

Michael Baker, Jr.

www.mbakercorp.com John Porco at jporco@mbakercorp.com, (970) 264-2171



Baker provides professional engineering and consulting expertise for public and private sector clients worldwide in the areas of aviation, defense, environmental, facilities, geospatial information technologies, homeland security, municipal & civil, pipelines & utilities, transportation, and water. Their services span the complete life cycle of infrastructure and managed asset projects including planning, design, construction services, asset management, and asset renewal. Baker is consistently ranked by Engineering News Record among the top 10% of the 500 largest U.S. design firms.

How are they relevant? Michael Baker provides services that assist state/local governments with their planning and coordination needs for a multi-state evacuation effort. They are currently providing these services to many states/local clients. Their diverse staff of emergency planning and response specialists, planners, engineers, and architects supports a broad range of multi-discipline projects.

CoreStreet

www.corestreet.com Paul DeCrisantis at pdecrisantis@corestreet.com, (860) 478.6284



CoreStreet produces technology that government and commercial enterprises rely on to authorize credentials and access to critical events, ranging from signed communications and transactions to physical access to a secure location, logging onto a network with smart credentials, or checking digitally signed email.

How are they relevant? Multi-state evacuations will place a significant demand on the need to manage and identify people on the move to provide support. Access to an area, building, or scene will be complicated by multiple states/locals/agencies trying to coordinate and assist in the efforts. Their FIPS201 compliant solutions will allow improved access/credentialing management and increase the speed at which first responders and emergency personnel can get to their destinations and perform their duties.

Fisher Safety

www.fishersafety.com Robert Sterner at Robert.Sterner@fishersci.com, (412) 498-5608



Fisher Safety is a global \$9 billion corporation that manufactures and distributes more than 600,000 products and services to more than 350,000 customers including state and local law enforcement, first responders, state governments, universities, labs, private companies, K-12 schools, etc.





How are they relevant? Fisher Safety’s “Quartermaster” program provides states with a creative solution for supplying and distributing approved products and services using homeland security grant funds, and eliminates the need for government agencies to fund purchases and request reimbursement. This program also supports grants management, asset tracking, e-procurement and reporting/accountability services. Fisher Safety also provides radiation detection capabilities to the state(s) and port authority(ies). They were instrumental in the Katrina response in delivering and distributing goods by leveraging their national distribution system to focus on the gulf region. As the states explore ways to distribute supplies and equipment during a multi-state evacuation, Fisher Safety offers a unique, flexible and scalable distribution tool to the states.



Appendices

Credentialing Presentation

A credentialing demonstration and presentation was included as part of the summit's agenda. The presentation was made by Craig Wilson, H.R. 1 Coordinator, FEMA. Below are the slides as presented by Mr. Wilson.





Report on the All Hazards Consortium Border Coordination Summit

Electronic Registration Process / Timeline

Process

- Participants will possess either a valid FIPS 201-interoperable credential or valid State-issued driver's license (DL)
- Relying parties will be public safety & security officials trained to operate the handheld devices to make informed decisions for emergency access control
- DL participants will have their barcode electronically scanned for verification of the scanned data against the printed data and photo
- FIPS 201 participants will have their chip electronically challenged requiring the entry of their personal identification number (PIN) into handhelds as requested by relying parties for robust identity validation

Timeline (23 Oct 08)

- 6:30 - 7:00 Relying party handheld training (Majestic Theater)
- 7:15 - 8:30 Electronic registration and breakfast
- 9:00 - 9:30 Electronic manifest feed to ICAV
- 12:30 - 1:30 Geospatial display available
- 1:00 - 1:30 Credentialing demonstration debrief

For Official Use Only (FOUO) 5

Scenario Overviews & Objectives (all scenarios are simulated)

Scenario One: Federal & Mutual Aid Disaster Response
There is an explosion in Gettysburg, PA requiring a staging area (Majestic Theater) for the ingress of Federal and Mutual Aid Emergency Response Officials (FEROs) for consequent response and recovery efforts

Objective: FIPS 201-interoperable electronic validation of out-of-area FEROs to include 2 or more factor robust authentication (PIN, electronic facial biometric, and/or finger biometric)

Scenario Two: Post-hurricane Citizen Re-entry
Residents are permitted to return to their homes and businesses in a controlled re-entry process after a category 3 hurricane affected their community

Objective: State-issued driver's license (DL) electronic verification of residents re-entering or transiting through the controlled zone to ensure community safety and security

Scenario Three: Shelter-in-Place
A tractor-trailer wreck outside the Majestic Theater in Gettysburg, PA, caused an airborne chemical spill that is considered harmful to human life in the immediate vicinity requiring shelter-in-place

Objective: FIPS 201 electronic validation or State-issued DL electronic verification of credentials to enable real-time accountability of personnel requiring shelter-in-place

For Official Use Only (FOUO) 6

Scenario #1: Federal & Mutual Aid Disaster Response

Standard enables process to include:

- State to State
- State to Local
- Local to Local
- Private to Government
- Private to Private
- Mission assignment

FIPS 201-interoperable electronic validation of out-of-area FEROs to include 2 or more factor robust authentication (PIN, electronic facial biometric, and/or finger biometric)

RSOI - Receiving Staging Operations Integration

Response/Recovery Location

Standardized credentialing process

Sample Data Sheet

Provides a real-time roster:
- Accountability
- Traceability
- Safety
(enables post-event reconstruction)

For Official Use Only (FOUO) 7

Scenario #2: Post-Hurricane Citizen Re-entry

State-issued driver's license (DL) electronic verification of residents re-entering or transiting through the controlled zone to ensure community safety and security

Residents

Provides a real-time roster:
- Accountability
- Traceability
- Safety

Sample Data Sheet

For Official Use Only (FOUO) 8

Scenario #3: Shelter-in-Place

FIPS 201 electronic validation or State-issued DL electronic verification of credentials to enable real-time accountability of personnel requiring shelter-in-place

Provides a real-time roster:
- Accountability
- Traceability
- Safety

Sample Data Sheet

For Official Use Only (FOUO) 9

Targeted Population / Participating Organizations

AHC Conference Attendees

- Delaware
- District of Columbia
- Maryland
- North Carolina
- New Jersey
- New York
- Pennsylvania
- Virginia
- West Virginia

Senior Proctors

James W. Spears, West Virginia Homeland Security Advisor and Cabinet Secretary Of the West Virginia Department of Military Affairs and Public Safety

Robert P. Crouch, Jr. Assistant to the Governor for the Commonwealth of Virginia Preparedness

Additional attendees may possess drivers licenses from CA, CO, CT, FL, NH, OH

For Official Use Only (FOUO) 10



Geospatial Display Locations

State / Local

- Majestic Theatre, Gettysburg, PA



City	State	Lat	Long	Altitude
110000	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110001	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110002	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110003	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110004	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110005	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110006	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110007	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110008	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110009	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110010	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110011	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110012	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110013	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110014	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110015	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110016	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110017	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110018	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110019	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110020	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110021	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110022	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110023	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110024	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110025	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110026	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110027	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110028	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110029	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110030	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110031	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110032	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110033	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110034	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110035	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110036	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110037	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110038	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110039	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110040	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110041	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110042	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110043	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110044	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110045	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110046	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110047	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110048	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110049	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110050	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110051	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110052	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110053	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110054	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110055	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110056	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110057	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110058	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110059	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110060	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110061	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110062	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110063	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110064	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110065	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110066	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110067	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110068	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110069	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110070	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110071	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110072	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110073	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110074	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110075	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110076	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110077	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110078	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110079	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110080	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110081	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110082	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110083	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110084	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110085	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110086	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110087	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110088	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110089	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110090	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110091	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110092	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110093	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110094	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110095	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110096	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110097	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110098	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110099	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100
110100	PA	40.2100	-76.9800	100

- VA, WV EOCs (TBD)

“Enables EOC Situational Awareness”



11

For Official Use Only (FOUO)

Performance Measures

1. 100% electronic validation of FIPS 201-compliant and FIPS 201-interoperable credentials for robust identity and attribute validation of F/EROs in a worst case scenario environment (no communication and no power)
2. 100% electronic verification of State-issued drivers licenses for citizens re-entering or transiting through the controlled hurricane re-entry zone
3. 100% electronic manifest of all attendees for shelter-in-place
4. 100% near real-time situational awareness geospatial display and post-event reconstruction for accountability, traceability, and liability



12

For Official Use Only (FOUO)



Read Ahead

TABLE 1: Summary of Functional Area Cross Border Items

	Public Health	Law Enforcement	Credential	Mass Care	Transportation
Top Issues and/or Three top things you need to know in evacuation		<p>Can Law Enforcement support Transportation Architecture</p> <p>What issues will arise during multi-state evacuation incidents?</p>	<p>Will people have proper “credentials” to assist cross border when assistance is needed</p> <p>-Business Model needs to match credentialing process</p> <p>-Communication of Progress</p>	<p>How many people can “your” state take</p> <p>-How to get them back</p>	<p>-Where are people going</p> <p>-What is timeline</p>
Regional Planning Initiatives	<p>Localized cross border planning efforts</p> <p>Mid – Atlantic Public Health Consortium</p> <p>Cross-Border Public Health Preparedness Conference – Univ of Pitt</p> <p>Mountain Empire Planning</p>	<p>Status of State Evacuation Plans</p> <p>Background on Interstate Evacuation Coordination Initiatives</p> <p>Coordinated efforts with State Transportation and Human Services agencies</p>		<p>NCR based</p> <p>UASI based</p>	<p>-I-95 Corridor Coalition</p> <p>-MD-PA-DE-NJ initiatives</p>
Exercises	<p>-Pandemic Flu</p> <p>-Localized efforts</p>	<p>UASI based Exercises</p> <p>CWID Exercises</p>	<p>Pilot Projects</p> <p>Summer Sizzle</p>	<p>UASI based</p>	<p>-Region III exercises</p> <p>-Radiological Exercises</p>



Report on the All Hazards Consortium Border Coordination Summit

	Public Health	Law Enforcement	Credential	Mass Care	Transportation
Formal Agreements	Difficulty in State to State	Mutual Aid Plans and/or EMAC		Red Cross Salvation Army VOAD Agencies	
Best Practices	-Drinking Water Initiative Process -Health Care worker credentials -EMAC		Standards		Transportation Management Systems
Challenges	-Planning Tools are state focused -Regional Groups not funded -Planning Initiatives not sustainable – time & funding	Road Architecture Radio Communications Monitoring Traffic Flow and maintaining accurate situational awareness	Unified Approach	Planning for Spontaneous Evacuation -Payment issues -Legal issues -Funding -Staffing	-How survivable is infrastructure -Methodology for communication of information to other agencies for response -Staffing of trained people -Funding
Gaps		Emergency Notification and Public Information Systems and Processes			
Funding	HHS Preparedness Grants	SHSP UASI Transportation Grants?			
Private Sector Engagement	Hospital			Training with Private Sector	



Attendees

Last Name	First Name	Organization
Baker	Brian	DC HSEMA
Blanchard	Deborah	Verizon Business
Blanchette	Glenn	U.S. Dept. of Health & Human Services
Bolyard	Stacey	Maryland Emergency Management Agency
Breen	Michael	Pa. Department of Public Welfare
Burke	Jim	Tapestry Solutions
Bys	John	CoreStreet
Carman	Kay	County of York OEM
Carnegie	Jon	Rutgers University - Voorhees Trans. Center
Caverly	Robert	U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Clelan	Mercita	PA DoH Office of Public Health Preparedness
Clements	Janet	VDEM
Cogburn	Perry	VDOT
Cornelius	Ellen	DC HSEMA
Costin	Ted	VA Dept of Emergency Preparedness
Crawford	Karin	FEMA Region 3
Crouch	Bob	VA Governor's Office
Croutharmel	Terry	BAE Systems
Darnell	Darrell	DC HSEMA
Davis	Steve	All Hands Consulting
DeCrisantis	Paul	CoreStreet
Desourdis	Bob	SAIC
Donaldson	Gene	Delaware Dept. of Transportation
Dutko	Susan	Franklin County EMA
Eline	John	Adams County Dept. of Emergency Services
Fisher	Evalyn	PEMA
French	Mike	MITRE
Gardner	Russell	DC HSEMA
Geisler	John	Fisher Safety
Gianato	Jimmy	WV Div. of Homeland Security & Emergency
Gibb	John	Director
Greene	Michael	BAE Systems
Gulick	Brent	Unisys
Hahn	Erin	MEMA
Hartnett	Chris	New Jersey State Police
Henderson	Joey	FEMA
Hoey	Lee	JTF CAPMED
Hoge	David	WV DMAPS
Hopkins	Bruce	VDEM
Hughes	Mike	Northrop Grumman
Johnson	Benjamin	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.
Kormos	William	JTF-CAPMED
Landon	Walter	Maryland State Police
Langenbach	James	Department of Health and Senior Services
Lindstrom	Dave	Penn State University
Mauskapf	Bob	Virginia Department of Health



Report on the All Hazards Consortium Border Coordination Summit

McAllister	Mike	VA Office of Commonwealth Preparedness
McHargue	Mike	All Hands Consulting
McKinnon	Mark	DHHS/ASPR
Mertz	Bud	PA Emergency Management
Moriarty	Michael	FEMA
Morris	Christy	WVDMAPS
Murthy	Gummada	VDOT
Neil	Harold	NJ DOT/OHSP
O'Neill	Catherine	Dept. of Health & Mental Hygiene
Pena	Raymond	DHS/FEMA/ONCRC
Picciano	Joseph	NJ Office of Homeland Security
Ras	Lee	Joint Task Force National Capital Region
Reames	Jeff	FEMA
Romer	Lori	Maryland Emergency Management Agency
Sarubbi	Jonathan	FEMA Region III
Schottke	Jennifer	ESRI
Sheehan	James	Paramus Police
Sinatra	Mario	NJ
Snead	Patricia	Virginia Dept of Social Services
Spears	Jim	West Virginia HS
Spring	Pamela	Department of Human Resources
Sterner	Robert	Fisher Safety
Stonestreet	Raymond	WV State Police
Tenaglia	James Penn	DOT
Tisdale	Ian	Maryland Department of General Services
Tomizawa	Nick	NYC Office of Emergency Management
Vanderwagen	Craig	US DHHS/ASPR
Vijayakumaran	Preeti	DC HSEMA
Wasni	Jackie	Motorola
Webb	Margaret	Booz Allen Hamilton
Westpfahl	Brad	IBM
Williams	Glenn	Commonwealth of PA - DPW
Wilson	Craig	FEMA
Wrightstone	James	PA Office of Public-Safety Radio Services
Zaklukiewicz	Kenneth	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.
Zeller	John	MEMA

