

**MS. KRIS EIDE**

**Director, Minnesota Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management**

**STATEMENT FOR THE RECORD  
On behalf of the  
Governors Homeland Security Advisors Council  
and the  
National Emergency Management Association**

**Submitted to the House Homeland Security Committee  
Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response and Communications  
United States House of Representatives**

*Stakeholder Assessments of the Administration's  
National Preparedness Grant Program Proposal*

**April 29, 2014**

Thank you Chairman Brooks, Ranking Member Payne and members of the Subcommittee for holding this hearing. I am Kris Eide, director of the Homeland Security and Emergency Management Division of the Minnesota Department of Public Safety and Homeland Security Advisor to Governor Mark Dayton.

I am here today representing the National Governors Association (NGA) Governors Homeland Security Advisors Council (GHSAC) and the National Emergency Management Association (NEMA). I currently serve as chair of the GHSAC Grants Committee and as Vice Chair of NEMA's Preparedness Committee.

I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you to discuss how comprehensive reform of federal preparedness grant programs will better serve state and local efforts to build and sustain capabilities to address the various threats and hazards they face. My testimony will discuss: 1) the continuing benefit of federal investments in state and local preparedness; 2) the enduring need for grant reform; 3) the importance of a strong state role in grants administration; and 4) the value of intergovernmental partnerships.

### **Federal Support Remains Essential**

Federal funds continue to provide critical support to state and local efforts to prevent, prepare for and respond to terrorist attacks, natural disasters and man-made events. As discussed in the Department of Homeland Security's annual National Preparedness Report, our nation's level of preparedness has vastly improved since September 11, 2001, and Hurricane Katrina in 2005. This is the result of increased focus on building community resiliency, improved coordination and engagement among all levels of government and more than a decade's worth of federal investments in training, equipment and personnel at the state and local level.

Since 2003, federal grant funds have supplemented billions of dollars in state and local investments to build and sustain capabilities including interoperable communications, training of personnel, enhancing information sharing and community preparedness, and hazardous materials response. In recent years, strategic planning efforts such as the State Preparedness Report (SPR) and Threat Hazard Identification Risk Assessment (THIRA) process have facilitated intergovernmental coordination and helped align state and local investments into capabilities that also meet national and regional needs. These capabilities include special response teams in the areas of weapon of mass destruction, urban search and rescue and veterinary rapid response teams in addition to agricultural warning systems. Federal grant funds support standardized training for mass casualty incidents, the national network of fusion centers and citizen and community preparedness initiatives nationwide.

In Minnesota, federal preparedness grants have funded a number of critical projects and supported key investments that serve the entire state. Some key examples include:

- **Cybersecurity monitoring** for detection of network cyber-attacks and breaches. To date, the state's executive branch agencies and 15 of the 87 counties have this detection and deterrence capability.

- **Capabilities for medical surge** through funding Ambulance Strike Teams and Mobile Medical Teams. These assets were used for two separate disasters to help with the evacuation of medical and long term care facilities.
- **Improvements to situational awareness and coordination of emergency response** through the purchase and sustainment of statewide video-teleconferencing and incident management software systems. It has been estimated that the purchase of the video-teleconferencing equipment has resulted in a 3 year return on investment in time management and resource identification and deployment.

Minnesota also has the largest land-mobile public safety interoperable radio network in the country. Federal preparedness funds have been used to augment the \$240 million of state funds spent to build the infrastructure and purchase equipment allowing for public safety responders across the state to talk to each other. This system was first used successfully following the collapse of the I-35W bridge in 2007. Since then it has been used for special events, hostage situations and disaster response. The state and local governments continue to spend approximately \$11 million each year to maintain this capability. Without federal preparedness funds being used for those items not eligible for state funding, the state would be nowhere near the current 95% completion for the project.

### **Grant Reform Will Improve Effectiveness**

Federal funding for homeland security grant programs has decreased by more than 75 percent since the program's inception in 2003, yet the structure remains unchanged. Congress has recognized this continuing disconnect and included language in annual appropriations bills as recently as Fiscal Year 2012 to push for "long-overdue" and "bold" reform of the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) administration of its State and Local Programs.<sup>1</sup> Important improvements have been made to processes for assessing risk and strategic planning, but the current grant program design can no longer achieve the type of accountability Congress demands and support the preparedness capabilities our communities need.

Given these ongoing challenges and the current fiscal environment, the need for reform of these preparedness grant programs has never been more urgent. In the Fiscal Year 2013 budget, FEMA provided a proposal to consolidate grant programs into a new National Preparedness Grant Program (NPGP). Over the last two years, FEMA's NPGP proposal has helped foster a dialogue on states' enduring challenges with the current suite of 16 separate preparedness grant programs.

Although we continue working on clarifying and understanding the finer points and their potential impacts on states, we remain encouraged to see legislative language for NPGP accompany the President's Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 budget request. This is an important "next step" for continuing engagement efforts with Congress and stakeholders to find common ground

---

<sup>1</sup> House Report [112-91](#) accompanying the Fiscal Year 2012 Homeland Security Appropriations bill ([H.R. 2017](#)), part of [Public Law 112-33](#); September 30, 2011.

on a grants framework that reflects both today's fiscal realities and its dynamic threat environment.

Since 2003, the grant programs have allocated more than \$40 billion to state and local governments to build and sustain preparedness capabilities. The successful outcomes supported by this investment must be acknowledged. At the same time, the need to better align these grant programs with today's fiscal realities and operational challenges must also be recognized. At their inception, the grant programs were required to address an unknown threat environment after September 11, 2001. More than \$4 billion in funding was made available through state and local preparedness grants in Fiscal Year 2003 alone. In addition to fiscal changes, the environment now incorporates the new "all-hazards" focus stemming from lessons learned after Hurricane Katrina in 2005 and subsequent multi-state disasters. A key lesson from those events is the importance of intergovernmental collaboration and integrating preparedness planning and response activities to ensure unity of effort. Declining budgets at all levels of government have increased the need to leverage resources and facilitate cross-jurisdictional coordination. We can no longer afford to operate in separate silos.

Unfortunately, the current suite of grant programs perpetuates such separations and no longer reflects ongoing efforts to align state and local capabilities with national preparedness objectives. Today's dynamic threat environment requires a grants program that prioritizes investments based on risk while maintaining state and local ability to sustain prior investments that support national goals. Grant programs must be flexible and agile to address changing hazards and ensure local investments synchronize with statewide and regional priorities.

Duplicative reporting requirements and increased administrative burden under the current framework also diminish return on investment (ROI) as more time and money must be spent on grants administration and management. Comprehensive reform would better facilitate maximum efficiency of taxpayer dollars and better enable accurate measure of ROI over time. This flexibility with accountability can represent the face of these reformed grant programs. For only through comprehensive changes to the existing structures can we achieve a more effective preparedness program for states and locals.

### **State Oversight Serves National Needs**

In addition to improving program effectiveness, comprehensive grant reform also can facilitate improved accountability and transparency. The SPR and THIRA should align preparedness investments with current risk and identified capability gaps. Simply placing that process atop the current grants structure fails to fully integrate all grantees under the state THIRA or provide adequate visibility on funding allocations across jurisdictions within the state.

A strong state role in the management of grant funds will better ensure transparency, coordination and the effective use of funds. States are best positioned to achieve economies of scale, avoid duplication of effort, leverage available assets and avoid gaps in critical capabilities. An enhanced state role would also better reflect governors' constitutional emergency authorities.

As FEMA Administrator Craig Fugate pointed out in recent testimony before this subcommittee, governors have unique emergency authorities, including the ability to deploy the National Guard.<sup>2</sup> To properly use these authorities to save lives and protect property, governors and their homeland security advisors, emergency management directors and adjutants general, must have knowledge of capabilities, assets and resources throughout the state. By serving as the central point of coordination among multiple jurisdictions and functional areas, states play a key role in ensuring that scarce resources are used effectively to meet identified national priorities that are tailored for regional needs.

States currently employ a variety of governance structures to administer and manage the grant programs, but remain in the best position to oversee and coordinate all homeland security and emergency preparedness activities within their boundaries. Currently, states have no role in the use of port and transit security grants which limits visibility on the use of funds within the state or the projects receiving grant dollars. These funds could be used by a local area to implement proprietary communications systems that are not interoperable with surrounding areas or the statewide system. These challenges make it difficult to ensure coordination among all levels of government and ensure investments are aligned with city, state and regional preparedness goals.

We are encouraged that the NPGP proposal recognizes the importance of state oversight and are committed to working with this committee to explain how states are working with local stakeholders to ensure active engagement throughout the grants process.

### **Partnership is Key to Community Preparedness**

Intergovernmental and public-private collaboration and communication are key elements in achieving a “whole community” approach to national preparedness. These concepts were recently demonstrated in a number of ways, including the improved preparation and response to Hurricane Sandy; the support provided by state and local fusion centers on numerous successful criminal and terrorism investigations, such as the Boston Marathon bombing; the ongoing implementation of a nationwide public safety broadband network; the use of National Guard dual-status commanders to coordinate state and federal military forces during an emergency; and the development and implementation of the National Preparedness System. The grants process, including reform efforts, must include input from a variety of stakeholders, and states are committed to working with our partners in local and tribal governments as well as the first responder community.

States use a variety of mechanisms to develop and implement homeland security strategies and plans on an ongoing basis. Integral to all state efforts is the involvement of a multitude of state, local and tribal stakeholders throughout the process. Most states have regional councils or committees that are used to ensure coordination with local officials, including police, fire,

---

<sup>2</sup> Testimony of FEMA Administrator Craig Fugate, House Homeland Security Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications Hearing: *The Federal Emergency Management Agency's FY2015 Budget Request: Ensuring Effective Preparedness, Response, and Communications*; March 25, 2014; <http://homeland.house.gov/hearing/subcommittee-hearing-federal-emergency-management-agency-s-fy2015-budget-request-ensuring>.

emergency medical services, public health, county and city management officials, non-profit organizations and the private sector. These regional committees provide for a transparent process that fosters collaboration and partnership and aids in the distribution of the currently required 80 percent “pass-through” of funds to localities.

Active federal, state and local engagement is critical to addressing emerging national security challenges and to sustaining our current state of preparedness. No level of government can address any of these issues independently. In an era of constrained budgets, we all must learn to do more with less while ensuring the preparedness priorities of states receive the necessary attention they require. Effective partnerships are imperative to meet both the needs of our communities and the National Preparedness Goal of “a more secure and resilient nation.”

### **States are Partners in Reform Efforts**

As Congress and this Committee consider the NPGP proposal and engage with stakeholders, NEMA and the GHSAC have offered several documents outlining states’ priorities and principles to inform grant program reform. The documents are attached to this statement and submitted for the record. Furthermore, we offer several recommendations to ensure federal investments in state and local preparedness remain aligned with national preparedness goals and provide a clear value to both communities and the taxpayer.

1. **Value local decision-making and national assessment:** An examination of preparedness must not consist solely of broad goals and priorities, but also must form the basis for action. FEMA should continue to improve the SPR and THIRA process to ensure they provide value to states and local governments. The THIRA should support state efforts to integrate core capabilities thoughtfully and systematically into their planning, analysis and assessment processes.
2. **Assess risk continuously across all levels of government:** Threat assessment, such as THIRA, must be conducted independent of funding allocations in order to adequately assess the current risk and hazards of a locality, state and region. This must be a continuous process and not a yearly snapshot simply for reporting purposes.
3. **Encourage strategic plans versus spending plans:** The planning process must focus on setting and achieving strategic goals under changing and uncertain conditions. This is unlike the current system where funding allocations are determined prior to planning.
4. **Allocate funds based on priority needs:** Funding allocations should prioritize investments to address the most pressing capability gaps identified in the state and regional THIRA and SPR.
5. **Measure progress to fill capability gaps:** The above steps allow for an effective and meaningful measurement process. As priorities in the state plans are funded, measureable gaps can be identified, addressed and reported to FEMA and Congress.

6. **Provide consistency and support long-term planning:** Grant reform should support FEMA's ability to provide states and subgrantees consistent grant guidance and policy, ensure realistic timelines and foster a culture of collaboration among states, local governments and other subgrantees. States are working with FEMA to integrate the THIRA and SPR processes into state emergency planning, and it should remain part of broader restructuring and reform of FEMA grant programs.

Confronting today's dynamic threats requires an approach to emergency planning that unifies homeland security partners and remains flexible to changing priorities. The nation must effectively build and strengthen capabilities against a range of threats and reduce the consequences of many hazards to reduce the risks to our communities. These goals can only be accomplished, however, when the barriers and stovepipes limiting flexibility and innovation are removed.

NGA and NEMA welcome the opportunity to work with this Committee as you assess the current grant programs, evaluate the NPGP proposal and consider other potential reforms. We also look forward to working with FEMA to identify and address key questions and concerns regarding their proposal and other opportunities to improve administration of federal grant programs.

Chairman Brooks and Ranking Member Payne, thank you for the opportunity to testify on this important topic. I am happy to answer any questions you or other members of the Subcommittee may have.



## Governors' Principles for Homeland Security Grant Reform

The Department of Homeland Security provides state and local governments with preparedness grant funding that provides support for developing and maintaining critical homeland security and emergency management capabilities. Over the last several years, these grant funds have been significantly reduced. With decreased funding expected for the foreseeable future, Congress and the Administration are re-examining the grant programs in order to make them more flexible and effective.

Currently, there are 18 major preparedness grant programs administered by the Department of Homeland Security. Many of these programs often overlap with others, creating unintended inefficiencies and unnecessary administrative burdens. In addition, changing program requirements often make the current structure complex and burdensome to states.

Governors are supportive of efforts to reform these programs. As reform proposals are considered by Congress and the Administration, governors offer the following principles:

### **Principles:**

- Grants should be risk-based but continue to provide each state and territory funding to support critical homeland security and emergency management capabilities, including personnel costs and the sustainment of investments.
- Funding should focus on developing, enhancing and sustaining common core capabilities.
- The federal government should work with states and territories to develop consistent methods to measure or assess progress in achieving common core capabilities.
- Grant funding should be distributed through states and territories to enhance regional response capabilities, avoid duplication of effort, and ensure awareness of gaps in capabilities.
- Consistent with current law, states should be permitted to use a portion of the grant funds for management and administration in order to coordinate the efficient and effective use of grant funds, provide necessary oversight and comply with federal reporting requirements.
- Any reform to the current grant programs should provide states with flexibility to determine which priorities should be funded and where investments should be made within their borders.
- Any grant program should allow flexibility for any state cost-share requirements.
- The federal government should provide clear, timely, and explicit guidelines for conducting threat assessments and how those assessments will be used to determine base-level funding.
- The federal government should be more transparent with states in sharing the data used to populate the funding formula/algorithm. States should be provided with a centralized point of contact and reasonable time to review and inform the data.
- The federal government should ensure that reforms eliminate inefficiencies, do not duplicate efforts, and do not place additional administrative burdens on states.
- Grants should allow for multi-year strategic planning by states and local jurisdictions.



# NEMA Proposal for a Comprehensive Preparedness Grants Structure

December 2011

## Background

This nation has made great strides in improving our safety and security. We have more comprehensive interoperable communications systems, regional response assets, a national system of intelligence fusion centers, and an unprecedented level of collaboration and teamwork among state and local responders.

Such programs as the Emergency Management Performance Grant (EMPG) Program and the Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) have done much to help public safety, law enforcement, emergency management, and a myriad of other professionals conduct a broad range of preparedness functions. From our neighborhood communities through all levels of government, we have acquired resources, achieved collaboration, and built systems to mitigate, prevent, prepare for, and respond to natural hazards and terrorist threats.

The current grants structure is complex and often contradictory. This creates unintended inefficiencies in investments and duplication of efforts. The current and continuing fiscal condition of our nation requires us to invest every dollar more wisely than ever before. We want to gain efficiencies in our grants so that we can increase the effectiveness of our mission.

We cannot continue to segregate our efforts just because we did so in the past. We must integrate our efforts so that we are agile in confronting any threat to the homeland, whether it is natural, technological or human-caused. We must build strengths and capabilities that are effective against many threats, reduce the consequences of many hazards, and thus reduce the risks to our nation. We, therefore, require a comprehensive preparedness grants system to fulfill the requirements of those professionals with critical homeland security and emergency management responsibilities.

## Principles & Values

This nation – its people and their vital interests – deserves and expects an effective and efficient national preparedness system providing safety and security. Therefore, this system must:

- ***Support and enable the five mission areas of Presidential Policy Directive 8 (PPD-8):*** prevention, protection, response, recovery, and mitigation.
- ***Build a culture of collaboration enabling a posture of preparedness*** for all hazards – from nature, terrorists, or technology – capable of disrupting the social and economic equilibrium of our nation.
- ***Be agile and adaptive to confront changing hazards,*** emerging threats, and increasing risks.
- ***Be unified on goals, objectives, and strategy*** among federal, state, tribal, local, and territorial partners and with the private sector, non-governmental organizations, and the public at large.
- ***Build and sustain a skilled cadre across the nation*** that is well organized, rigorously trained, vigorously exercised, properly equipped, prepared for all hazards, focused on core capabilities, and resourced for

both the most serious and most likely threats and hazards. This cadre will be an asset to the nation through mutual aid, other assistance between states and regions, or for national teams.

- ***Build, enhance, and sustain*** capabilities, self-reliance of the public, and resilience of our communities and nation.
- ***Reflect the fiscal responsibilities and limitations*** of the present and the future. This nation deserves safety and security, but it also deserves solvency. A state and local grant system must enable investments in capabilities that are of value to communities, regions, states, and the nation.
- ***Continually encourage innovation*** and ceaselessly weed out waste and inefficiencies.
- ***Encourage states and communities to self-organize*** with their neighbors to protect vital supply lines and assets and infrastructure of mutual value and to enable swift, coordinated response.
- ***Recognize that states, tribes, territories, and local communities know their jurisdictions best.*** They must have flexibility to set priorities, design solutions, and adapt to rapidly changing conditions. This must be done with full accountability.
- ***Provide full visibility to states, tribes, territories, and local communities of all federal homeland security and emergency management activities,*** investments, and programs within their jurisdictions. This disclosure is essential for full understanding of capabilities to address threats, hazards, and risks.
- ***Reinforce the value of leveraging federal investments with contributions*** from states, tribes, territories, and local governments and demonstrate the day-to-day value to jurisdictions.
- ***Continue to encourage and enable wide participation in review of projects and investments.***
- ***Recognize the complex interdependencies of our national systems,*** particularly the movement of goods, services, and people. The vulnerabilities of a jurisdiction often lie outside its borders and outside its ability to address them.

## Purpose

We call upon Congress and the president to consider this proposal to reform state and local grants for the safety and security of our nation. To this end, we seek to:

- Encourage states, tribes, territories, and local governments to prepare and adopt comprehensive plans based upon *their* evaluation of threats, hazards, risks, and vulnerabilities facing them;
- Outline a program of grants to states, tribes, territories, and local governments or combinations of governments improving and strengthening the nation's homeland security and emergency management capabilities; and
- Encourage research, development, competition, and innovation enhancing the effectiveness and efficiency of emergency management and homeland security and the development of new methods for the prevention, preparedness, response, recovery, and mitigation of natural disasters and acts of terrorism.

This proposal presents a system enabling greater effectiveness in the mission with greater efficiency of resources. Over the past decade states, tribes, territories, and local governments have created new organizational structures, gained invaluable experience, and increased our capacity to manage multiple threats and hazards.

The high incidence of natural disasters and terrorist threats in the United States challenges the peace, security, and general welfare of the nation and its citizens. To ensure the greater safety of the people, homeland security and emergency management efforts must work together with shared responsibilities, supporting capabilities, and measurable progress towards a national goal. This unity of effort is essential to achieve the vital objectives of PPD-8 and success of the National Preparedness System.

This proposal outlines a system in which preparedness is a deterrent, prevention is achieved through collaboration, mitigation is a national value, and response and recovery encompass the “whole of community.” But the system works only where the principles guide the plans and where ideas lead to action. This reformed grant system shares control with those on the front line, enables flexibility while strengthening accountability, and ensures fiscal sustainability. State and local governments cannot do this alone.

## **A Comprehensive Preparedness Grants System**

A truly comprehensive preparedness grants system must allow for each state to determine core capabilities, set priorities in a flexible manner, and measure performance and effectiveness. This proposal recommends the creation or continuation of grants to coordinate planning, measure effectiveness, develop and sustain a skilled cadre, and invest in effective and efficient projects.

### **Planning**

- Conduct and maintain within each state a comprehensive Threat Hazard Identification Risk Assessment (THIRA) in concert with Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and state officials.
- Develop a comprehensive preparedness strategy to assess current capabilities, determine future requirements, and evaluate recent progress and initiatives.
- The strategy will focus on identified gaps and contain goals and objectives to fill those gaps. The objectives will be prioritized and funds will be prioritized to fill the most important gaps accordingly. Identifying existing additional capability that is owned and maintained by other jurisdictions and readily available for response through mutual aid should be an important planning activity.

### **A Skilled Cadre**

A skilled cadre is imperative within any comprehensive preparedness system and should be supported through a grants program. This skilled cadre includes emergency management and homeland security personnel. Since such expertise remains the backbone of any system, their responsibilities would include (but not be limited to):

- Build and support statewide emergency management and homeland security all-hazards planning.
- Provide comprehensive and appropriate levels of training and conduct exercises for state and local personnel across the full spectrum of emergency management and homeland security responsibilities.

- Support the national priorities outlined in PPD-8 and the National Preparedness Goal.
- Conduct public education and outreach to further whole of community preparedness.

Within the skilled cadre grant, the existing EMPG would continue in its present form, including allocation method, match requirement, eligibility, management, appropriate funding, and flexibility. The existing policy continues that allows emergency management to administer EMPG if not the State Administering Agency (SAA).

A similar grant program will be established for state homeland security professionals affording the same opportunity to build and sustain a skilled cadre of personnel. This grant would be modeled after EMPG which has been proven highly effective due to the flexibility it provides along with accountability. EMPG currently maintains a 50-50 match requirement. Any match on the cadre-based grant for homeland security professionals should be instituted with a soft match option, and done so gradually over time in consultation with the states and professions involved.

## **Investments and Innovation**

Many capabilities identified in the comprehensive planning system will require investment in longer-term projects and procurement to achieve needed levels of effectiveness. An investment grant program will enable decisions on priorities across the broad range of emergency management and homeland security functions. This also enables swift adjustments in priorities in light of changing threats or increasing risks.

Unlike the homeland security cadre-based grant in which the SAA determines the allocation of funds to state and local jurisdictions, the investment grant focuses on sub-grantee applications for projects and other investments based on similarly comprehensive planning efforts at the local or regional level. States should establish and maintain a multi-disciplinary review committee that advises on investments and projects.

Eligible applicants to the investment grant include all currently eligible grant recipients under HSGP, local governments or combinations of governments, urban areas, regions, or other state-level agencies conducting appropriate preparedness activities. States with urban areas currently classified as “Tier 1” by DHS will continue to receive funding specifically for those areas, upon completion of a comprehensive preparedness strategy that has been approved by the state. Funding that would have been allocated to other participants in the current UASI program should be placed into the investment grant.

Eligible expenditures for investment grants should encompass all functions of the currently separate programs and the priorities of PPD-8, including equipment purchase and transfer, construction of emergency operation centers or similar facilities, special response units, critical infrastructure and key resource protection, medical surge, protection and resilience, information sharing and intelligence, and grant management and administrative costs. Pre-disaster mitigation should be an eligible project under investment grants and due consideration given to disaster loss reduction and resilience initiatives. Substantial data exists to justify continued pre-disaster mitigation programs in determining any set of priorities, and the disaster mitigation community’s interests groups must be intimately engaged in the grant prioritization process. Flood mitigation assistance and repetitive loss grants are not included as they are funded through the National Flood Insurance Program by insurance proceeds paid by policy holders. Furthermore, to continue supporting a culture of innovation, up to five percent of the total

investment grant award may be distributed by DHS to unique and innovative programs across the nation to encourage best practices.

## **An Overview of the System**

- Each state conducts and maintains a comprehensive Threat Hazard Identification Risk Assessment (THIRA) in concert with Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and state officials.
- A comprehensive preparedness strategy is developed to assess current capabilities, determine future requirements, and evaluate recent progress and initiatives.
- The state is awarded three allocations from DHS, including one for EMPG, one for the new homeland security cadre grant, and one for the new investment and innovation grant.
- Applicants will apply for funds from the investment grant based upon completed preparedness strategies. Applications are reviewed by a multi-disciplinary advisory committee, and the SAA makes awards as appropriate.

## **Conclusion**

Our nation faces enduring hazards, pervasive threats, and ever-changing risks. Our current system lacks the agility to adapt swiftly or convert ideas into action. We need the nation to unite in a common vision of national preparedness, resilience, and self-reliance. This proposal enables states, tribes, territories, and local government to leverage their own resources with the federal investment to build this vision and be accountable for achieving it. We need all levels of government, supported by all professions and disciplines, to unite in this innovative national preparedness system.