National Capital Region Summary Session
May 19, 2006

Introduction:

- Thank you for your involvement; it has been a tremendous effort on everyone's part.
- CAOs / Senior Policy Group and Working Groups have been working hard to pull all of the information together.
    - It has taken 3,000 -5,000 man hours of effort to get to this point, as a part of the assessment of projects targeted for DHS grant program.
    - The most recent ranking was Monday.
- May 31,2006, is the date for DHS to announce the grant funding.
    - The application is currently for $188 million.
- The process started with projects totaling $350 million, and that total has been reduced to the current $245-250 million.
- Each of the investments will have 12 min to speak.
    - During this time they will explain their group's priorities and answer questions.
- Those involved in the past sessions will remember that we have tried to balance the desired outcomes.
- The goal is to refine/analyze the projects collaboratively to make the best list of products/projects to satisfy the strategic plan.
- Ground rules:
    - Adhere to the same methodology/goals.
    - All information will be completed before ranking commences.
        - Information session for SPGs/CAOs.
        - Packets list all of the information to this point.
        - Presentations will explain the reasoning,
            - The reasoning comes from input from ESFs and RPWGs, as well as past sessions.
    - The criteria will be agreed upon by SPGs/CAOs.
        - The criteria proposed were used in past sessions.
    - Once the criteria are determined, then the process will be followed by all.
        - If there is an exception found, it will require a unanimous agreement for a change to take place.
    - Majority rules
    - We will pursue the agenda order, unless a representative is not present.
        - In which case, we will move on.
- Comments:
    - This process is superior to past processes. April 10th was the deadline (we moved it from the original date of the 26th back), and we have granted approximately one month that ends today for further work to be completed. There may still be more work to do. We will hopefully determine that in our discussions.

Interoperable Communications:

- Are the priorities and projects in a different order in your discussion than what is on the sheets? (presentation handout was provided)
    - This is what was negotiated to speak since Monday.
    - Priorities are in order of Monday for record (on the big sheet).
        - Presentation reflects:
            - Their priorities as a group.
            - Giving information on the projects as a whole.
    - Number one top priority is NCRIP program (as a group).
    - Priorities are exactly right as of the big sheet.
    - This was not a pitch on priority; it was only to give information.
- Do we have a mass notification alert system already?
    - Voice piece is not in place, text piece is.
    - It is available in some areas; all areas have different levels of capability.
- $59-60 million as total package of the possible projects; the group is recommending $40 million.
- Anticipated outcomes:
    - Tough Target Capabilities:
        - Create a basic infrastructure as a whole.
        - In the past all areas have had their own system.
        - Create a secure robust system for all first responders to be equally participatory.
- What are the metrics to be sure something is accomplished, and to show progress?
    - They are currently deploying demonstrations.
    - These systems are behind the scenes, underground.
    - This will have an impact on the people using it; we are working on ways to make this visible now.
- NCRIP:
    - $25 million is in this project; that is a significant amount.
    - There needs to be more research into what is actually included in that figure.

Intelligence and Information Sharing:

- There is a fourth project on the sheet that was not listed before.
    - It was proposed in '05, but it was recommended to be a regional project.
    - There is no ranking for it; the paper was received one week ago.
- "Mobile Access to Tactical Response Data Project:"
    - Have we addressed the maintenance cost and any underlying costs?
        - The maintenance costs will be discussed at 12pm to determine the costs of ongoing and continuance projects.
    - Did we finish the full implementation of these projects?
    - Were the national fusion center guidelines, a national consortium of DHS, part of the criteria?
        - There are not any fusion centers listed as a part of this project.
        - Apparently that was a large hole in the Group's deliberations.
            - There is nothing listed in this project that relates to those guidelines; somewhere else there is a related project, but not in this case.

- There will be a discussion for law enforcement later in the morning.
- There is currently a large hole in our offerings that hinges on a national priority for information in fusion centers.
  - There is a Dec '05 draft at: www.it.ojp.gov.
    - "Fusion Center Guidelines."
- When will we receive visibility on project #4, the added project, for $6-7 million?
  - It will be reviewed during the decision-making later this morning.
  - Has there been research completed to see if the requirement can be fulfilled by CAPWIN?
    - There are no projects on police side of CAPWIN.
    - We will discuss the fourth project this afternoon.
- What would be the outcome of the "NCRWARN?"
  - Currently they can't share resources across boundaries.
  - Labs projects are especially limited.
  - Would this be similar to a mutual aid relationship?
    - With this they could get staffing from surrounding areas?
      - Yes, power resources have this in place already.
    - COG just adopted a policy to share resources regionally, but water can't use that policy because they are not governmental entity.
      - They do not fall under that jurisdiction.

Medical Response and Support (Surge):

- "Gap Analysis for Health and Medical Readiness-Part 2, A Continuation Project:"
  - Was this project proposed in '05, to be completed last year?
  - There are currently no known benchmarks for health and medical area.
    - This project would allow us to understand benchmarks.
  - "I have dramatic questions about all of this, and am not happy with the progress made so far."
    - 2 years ago there was significant work to put together a document that is similar to this.
    - Israelis are using mobile units to respond (ICUs/respirators).
      - Why are we not moving in this direction?
    - From a planning standpoint:
      - There has been a significant amount of money distributed to the states for medical surge projects.
        - Have similar projects been funded?
      - Pandemic flu:
        - Virginia distributed $2.2 million to 35 entities.
        - $43,000 went to Arlington.
        - Most localities have not been able to focus on Pandemic flu.
        - Many funds have been re-routed.
        - Projects have increased significantly, and this project would allow for a more strategic, overall effort.
- CATI:

- o Ready to expand and determine true cost.
- o Can be used to respond to disease outbreak and biological weapons.
- o There are not proposals for the entire thing.
- o Determined it was feasible in one county.
  - ▪ Software has been located to make this feasible.
- o Will the project be implemented now?
  - ▪ This is a demonstration project in Montgomery County.
  - ▪ The expectation is to expand to the entire region.
  - ▪ Assuming the project works as well as in Canada, it will be expanded.
- o This project seems to be at a reasonable cost, but why is training is low on the list?
  - ▪ Priorities are a part of this process.
  - ▪ Providing more personnel was determined to be the most important.

Mass Care:

- These projects seem more resource-focused, rather than actually purchasing tangible items.
  - o There seems to be a bigger gap on the logistics side.
- Were you bounded by what you believe can be reasonably addressed with regards to funding?
  - o Past requests have been higher, but we understood that the set amount we could propose was $5 million.
    - ▪ We were instructed to build in pets and special needs, as well as the baseline needs.
    - ▪ We did our best to include all requested groups along with every possible need.
- Mass Care Bundle:
  - o How heavy is the project in planning/training, and how much will go to supplies?
    - ▪ $3.9 million in supplies will be purchased.
    - ▪ A detailed budget can be provided.
  - o Who would manage the project? Who would be the project managers?
    - ▪ This would be a big region-wide effort.
    - ▪ ARC has expressed interest.
    - ▪ Intent is to ensure space for NRC supplies.
    - ▪ ARC was approached about warehousing.
      - • Would the supplies be housed in the warehouse?
      - • ARC National resources are being used to place warehouses in region.
      - • Will there be a leveraging of resources between national initiatives by ARC?
      - • Leveraging resources where possible.
      - • It is important to have readily accessible supplies.
        - o Have spoken with ARC about this.
        - o National doesn't have the capability.

WMD/HAZMAT:

- The Fire Chiefs completed the priorities?
    - Yes, and R-ESF 4.
    - There seems to have been a flip in the priorities from what the R-ESF reported.
        - Priorities have changed across the process:
            - We were told to focus on:
                - Multi-year projects.
                - The need to determine maintenance costs.
        - Observations that as projects have matured and evolved over time, perspectives have changed.
        - The group wanted to be reflective of process used to score the projects.
- Are the projects equipment heavy?
    - Will the localities have the ability to absorb maintenance costs?
        - The funds may not always be available.
        - There is always ongoing maintenance with equipment.
        - Most fire departments have expected to have to absorb some costs.
- "WMD Operations (Offensive) Training"
    - It would be an ODP certified course.
    - It would follow an awareness course.
    - It would take place at regional fire academies.
    - There are a host of agencies to reach out to.
        - If agencies have ODP training courses, could deliver to the same audience?
            - Yes.
- "Metro Subway Security Strategic Iniative"
    - There was a project in FY '05 for mobile devices for subway,
        - Portable tracks which received a report from delegations.
        - Possible precursor to this project?
        - This project has newer capabilities, which we learned from the London incidents.
    - Carts would be staged in the metro.
        - Rapid access trucks, could be carried on response apparatus.
    - Tough Target Capability:
        - 24/7 HAZMAT response; are we able to achieve that?
            - WMD training would ensure that hazmat teams in all areas would be able to operate each others equipment.
                - The equipment is not standardized now, but we hope to move towards that in the future.
        - Was the similar WMATA project a part of planning?
            - Yes.
    - Should this project be a higher priority?
        - Training is very important.
        - This project is scalable.
            - Could be completed for a lesser amount than $5 million.
            - Do we have a threshold amount for metro project?
                - The group has not drilled down that far.
                - $3 million would give room for success.

Explosive Device Response Operations Program Summary:

- "Debris Removal Crane-Bodied Grapple Trucks"
  - Why is this project more efficient than contracting?
  - The current challenge is to spread the resources.
    - Refer to R-ESF 3.
    - Wasn't the Guard employed in debris removal during Hurricane Isabel?
      - Counties issued requests and could not locate National Guard resources.
        - There is a need.
      - Guard was tasked with debris removal in Tidewater region.
    - Debris removal typically falls to local governments, except in large scale incidents.
      - In those cases only, would debris removal go to federal contracts.
      - FEMA has stated they would prefer more local capability.
      - The Guard does not have equipment that is overly sophisticated.
        - They have access to 5-ton trucks, but only when the Governor mobilizes.
        - They also do not have organic equipment
        - They rely heavily on man power resources.
          - ACTION ITEM: The group will find out National Guard capabilities and report.
  - Day-to-day use?
    - Remove organic debris.
- Equipment breakdown:
  - Equipment to qualify for type one team.
  - Request includes specific equipment for bomb squads.
    - This will elevate everyone up to the same standard.
  - Just bombs squads in NRC?
    - Yes.
  - Running into difficulty in MD.
    - There are 7 teams, and the FBI will not certify new teams.
    - Choosing to equip current teams.
      - Standardization of current capability.

CBRNE Detection:

- How transportable is the Regional Emergency Mobile Lab?
  - Referred to water representative.
  - Within 8 hours of indication this project will allow a determination of whether the tested water is safe to drink.
  - Equipment takes up less room than a truck body.
- The equipment would be housed DC, MD, and VA (3 locations).
- Could we combine equipment for chemical/biological/explosive to make it respond to all types?
  - HAZMAT teams have certain capabilities, could we combine all types of equipment, expanding the view to sample air / plume?

- - Due to the equipment currently available, we would rely on agencies with special capabilities.
- Utilities would run the equipment weekly for training, and maintenance.
- Did you consult CST teams in Virginia/Maryland?
  - CSTs would be one of the groups mentioned to bring more specialty capabilities.
    - ACTION ITEM: Please consult those teams for homework.
- Transit Baltimore has mentioned that WMATA has done groundbreaking work with respect to this.
- Does this figure into the PROTECT system?
  - Fire is already well connected to the PROTECT system.
    - They have computers that plug in and have been trained.
- This project is in the pilot or deployment stage?
  - Biological is still in development.
    - Biological technology is not to the necessary level yet.
  - Chemical is a fully working program.
    - ACTION ITEM: Please find out where that project is and more specifics for homework.
- Radiological Truck Cargo Screening Feasibility Study
  - DNDO, a new federal office, is considering a pilot program.
    - They may have just completed something in MD: have you spoken with them?
      - No.
  - This project came to the table as a full blown idea, and, after questions were raised as to the capabilities available, it was backed off to a feasibility study.
    - The project came through R-ESF 1.
    - There is nothing in the region currently similar to this.
    - DHS and this team should meet to find out if pilot will fulfill needs.
  - There needs to be a broader-base look at where the NCR is weak with respect to chemical/bio/air.
    - What was the context where capabilities considered?
    - Detection is where we are lacking.
    - Other than RAD, the technologies for biological, chemical, and especially explosive, are not up to the group's standards.
    - The projects proposed were more important.
    - All chemical testing is point to point technology.
      - Standoff tech is only available to the military.
    - Biological test equipment is handheld as well.

Citizen Preparedness and Citizen Protection:
- Please change the "Campaign Bundle," priority 2, from $900,000 to $1.4 million.
- Campaign bundle:
  - The objective is to notify citizens of the system.
  - Maintenance costs?
  - Funding has been completely expended due to success.
    - $5 million spent so far.
  - Plan to de-centralize the campaign.

- - - The project has only raised preparedness to 43 percent.
    - How enhance the alert systems?
      - Would promote the systems use.
        - Citizens need to sign up.
        - Some people qualify for more than one system
      - Would be worked into a campaign to assure access to information.
- Where does the outdoor warning pilot system factor in?
  - Already funded and in process.
- "Ensure Plans, Procedures and IT Systems for coordination between Emergency Management and 211 for Emergency Information and Referral:"
  - This will create a regional system?
    - Will this expedite the process? There is a goal in NOVA due to the number of people and the complexity goal is 2007.
    - The research has brought together lead planners from Virginia and Maryland.
- Regional Evacuation Traffic Monitoring and Management Tool:
  - Virginia has traffic management center; would this project be duplication?
    - Would be an upgrade and linking.
    - How does Regional Real Time Transit Customer Information System fit in?
      - Evacuation would be multi-mobile
      - ACTION ITEM: This project needs more research, especially into how it would integrate.
        - This project would use similar technology.
- With respect to the public education arena, do these projects take into account the non-English speaking?
  - There need to be ways to reach those in hotels.
  - There was recently a write-up on the areas that were not reached.
    - Included tourists or non-English/multi-lingual
    - Did not have targeting with first project.
- "Special Needs Bundle:" Special needs and evacuation plans.
  - Seems to be reason for the New Orleans crisis.
  - Reflects rankings of those present in the group.
  - Special Needs ranked at #4, fairly high out of 14 projects.
  - The "Campaign Bundle" also addresses special needs.
- Proposal in Medical Surge:
  - To expand medical and health resources, especially recruitments.
  - Why spend in both areas; wouldn't that be a duplication?
  - Can't accomplish mass prophylactics without the medical corps.
    - The med corps is an entity in and of itself.
- Is the UASI NCR Family Center a physical place?
  - No.
  - It is a continuation of regional plan to open assistance centers.
    - It establishes how to open a center from a regional perspective when needed.
- Does it appear that some projects do not follow strategic plan?
  - It is possible that some areas were missed.
    - Special needs does hit, family assistance center may show a gap.

- There could be a need to re-visit the plan.
    - o As the projects were transferred from place to place they may have lost some of there notes.
        - Their connection the strategic plan was a part of documentation.
        - All projects listed have a connection to the strategic plan.

Critical Infrastructure Protection:

- Critical Information Protection Program.
    - o The protection of the information.
        - NPD submitted through R-ESF-13
        - Proposes to use contractors to assess infrastructure for NCR, and to have a secure database for law enforcement, fire, and health to access.
        - DC-specific portion of the program, it was a district-specific request.
        - Critical Infrastructure Monitoring and Protection:
            - $3 million goes towards CCTD (hardware) to do detection.
        - Critical Transportation Infrastructure Protection:
            - $1 million is a continuance of funding for a FHWA assessment of critical infrastructure on what is out there.
- Which projects are requests for which areas?
    - o NCRCIRP: NRC, Region
    - o WMATA Alternate Operations Control Center: Region
    - o Expansion, Establishment and Operation of the Water Security Monitoring Network in the NCR: WSSC, Region
    - o Rapid Response Mobile Transformer: PEPCO, mobile transformer can go anywhere in region.
        - Understand infrastructure to be able to plug in anywhere in the region, know where to do so.
- Does the group recommend a threshold?
    - o The first four impact us the most, but within those there is scalability.
        - Which ones are scaleable?
            - Expansion, Establishment and Operation of the Water Security Monitoring Network in the NCR
            - Multifunctional Evacuation Dynamic Message Signs
            - WMATA Alternate Operations Control Center
                - o How far are we in this project?
                    - Have we determined locations, or started construction?
                    - The location has been identified.
                    - The project has used all of the '05 funding.
                    - The project is delay-able; not necessarily scaleable.
                    - With use of the transit money it could be ready by 2008.
                    - This is the highest priority.

- The project will eventually completed, it is a matter of time, and how long the region is exposed to this risk.
- It is also the top priority of transit.
- The voids in the strategic plan column came from the transfer of projects from one investment to another.
  - All projects hit at least once on strategic plan.
- NOVA Transportation Management project:
  - Seems similar to CAPCOMM.
    - What are the differences?
    - Why is it only in NOVA?
    - The group asked those questions of ESF; the project ended the sessions at the priority position the Group felt appropriate.
- The working group is approaching the determination for dual-use of alternate centers for the EOC?
  - Are you determining redundancies?
    - Yes, we are looking at that.
    - NCRCIRP addresses this concern.
  - The original concept paper:
    - Intended to make the facility the primary.
    - Maintains the current center as the back-up.
    - Plan to make the center available to other entities.

Law Enforcement:

- Would ROMA integrate with LINX?
  - ROMA is analyst-supported; it takes information from other sources, mostly intelligence-based sources.
    - DOD/CIA use ROMA for classified information.
    - That is the focus this project would take.
    - How integrated it becomes with other applications and internally would depend on level of information provided.
- LINX and AFIS would be completed by this funding?
  - Mobile AFIS could be expanded after assessments.
  - Expansion could fall on to localities.
  - This amount would complete the basic level.
  - Current signatories for LINX could request future expansion.
- Would this project integrate with Richmond/DC/Maryland?
  - AFIS would integrate with fingerprinting system.
  - LINX can integrate with other LINX systems, ex: Tidewater.
  - NCIS would be the primary sponsor.
  - LINX would be expanded by other groups; NCIS could not expand the project.
  - The project provides linkage between NCR and the broader state.
    - LINX may not be the mechanism for this.
    - That linkage is important.
- Standardized Training in Terrorism Prevention, Detection, and Interdiction for Law Enforcement Entry Level and In Service Programs:

- o Would there be specialized trainers on terrorism? Or would it be held in one location for attendees?
  - ▪ It would be similar to the firefighters' training:
    - • Regional academy or as an addition to existing OPD programs.
  - ▪ Add to existing training programs, or it could be provided by assets and existing programs.
  - ▪ Training the trainers.
    - • Training is an ongoing entity; there will always need to be training.
    - • Already have trainers that can provide teaching at little or no cost.
    - • This project was $ 4 million, and has been scaled to $3 million.
- CIS user pool of LINX federal agencies are not part of this funding; they must seek own funding.
  - o There are a lot of other agencies that are interested.
  - o These resources are only meant for the region.
    - ▪ It is possible to drive back issues to DHS or other agencies that might be interested.
    - ▪ Some include: DOJ/DOD/Attorney General's Office.
    - ▪ The Attorney General's Office is making the decision on an adopted integration tool for the federal government.
- Some projects may belong in different categories.
  - o "Intelligence Analysts" in Intelligence and Information Sharing.
  - o "Maritime Awareness NCR" in Critical Infrastructure.
    - ▪ Strategic analysis center has earmarked as important.
      - • The infrastructure along the Potomac is extensive.
      - • No knowledge of project.
      - • It was submitted under the Maryland Maritime Steering Committee.
        - o The group doesn't interact with NRC steering committee.
        - o This project needs to be moved to another category.
      - • Law enforcement doesn't see the risk to waterfront property?
        - o Non-committal.
      - • This project seems similar to highway watch.
        - o See if there is anything abnormal and report it.
        - o Critical infrastructure on waterways, ex: new bridge.
        - o Regional Transit Security Group:
          - ▪ Recommended the placement
          - ▪ Coast Guard is concerned.
          - ▪ "Very surprised, this is information from fusion center that it is very important."
          - ▪ ACTION ITEM: More research in to the project.
            - • What is included in the $6.6 million?
            - • Port for NRC?
            - • Gapping hole that we don't know about this?

- The facilities along the water; where the NRC has jurisdiction.

Critical Resource Logistics and Distribution:

- The "Warehousing Bundle:"
  - FEMA has been doing this type of thing; did we check with them for innovations/thoughts on what works and what doesn't?
  - Spoken with pre-position people, FEMA seems to have been dropping those programs.
    - The desire was to pick up those people and those locations if FEMA had dropped them.
  - Spoken with several entities, but there are no locations locally owned, or state-owned or FEMA-owned that are available to us.
  - Materials in warehouse:
    - The supplies will cover the first 72 hours?
      - That is COG's objective.
      - There is not a good estimate of the population that will be impacted.
      - $34 million does cover a portion, lowering the figure would obviously lower the coverage amount.
      - Specifics were included in original paper.
  - What are the assumptions used to cost the warehouse space? Are the materials here a duplicate?
  - Sheltering:
    - Cots/blankets/MREs/water were included in the first paper; they were bundled in with other things to share the overhead, and the funding requested did not increase.
    - No medical supplies were included.
    - There was not any warehousing in the Mass Care proposal.
    - Are the materials in both proposals (Mass Care and Warehouse)?
      - Yes.
      - Are both interdependent?
      - Yes.
    - What are the distribution assumptions?
      - How does the project propose to trigger the use of the materials?
        - How does it propose to distribute the materials?
        - The original paper had staff and equipment included.
        - Jurisdictions should write an SNS model into their emergency plans.
        - Trucks were removed from the Mass Care proposal to get to the $5 million.
    - How much of the $34 million is one-time (materials), and how much is leasing?
    - Would it be possible to contract with Wal-Mart/Safeway/etc. to pay a stipend to maintain an agreement that they will provide these materials if needed?

- Virginia already does this.
- There was a need cited for a minimal amount of dedicated resources for quick moves.
  - Would then bring in the Guard and other entities.
- Minimal supplies.
  - If remove the supplies, it could be reduced to $9 million.
- Most of the supplies are in the Mass Care proposal.
- Have held meetings to determine what is required to cover the need.
  - Have shelties, cots, and blankets built into mass care.
  - Do believe duplications.
  - Want to meet with Emergency Managers.
  - Need more information on overlapping stock.
- Surprised to see law enforcement personnel here, thought that had already been funded?
  - Personal Protective Equipment:
    - Recognize re-supplying each officer was not feasible.
    - This project would create cache of 1000 for a backlog in the case of contamination.
    - Some filters have expired.

Incident Planning and Response:
- This is the second time we've heard incident command training with respect to hospitals, is this related to the Medical Surge projects?
  - The group attempted not to put bodies in place with this funding.
    - There seem to be a series of proposals with relation to people.
    - What is the total people added to organizations?
      - Out-sourced vs. placed?
  - A significant amount of funds is earmarked for contractors.
  - Most of the support spoken of is contractors, which exempts from the line in the regulations.
    - There is a definite distinction between full-time contract or short-term contract.
  - ETOP Bundles:
    - Is this proposing planners to do exercises or the development of curriculum?
      - Contract support is included to plan and develop a program.
    - "NCR Exercises and Training" is completed; they are instructing.
    - "Strategic Planning for a Health and Medical Core Curriculum" needs both.
    - This project would create a training cadre.
      - Look at programs that will support themselves.
      - Noticed Ready's failure, and learned.
  - Regional Public/Private Bus Evacuation Coordination Planning:
    - Looks similar to the evacuation project in Citizen Preparedness.
    - There doesn't seem to be a clean process, especially with respect to the bus issue.
    - Why is it ranked at that position?
    - Should it be linked with the other proposal?
    - Would love to have it linked with the other project; R-ESF would like that was well.

- - - R-ESF 1 sees this project as their second priority.
      - There is reason to ensure that there haven't been duplicated efforts in the region.
- NCR Emergency Operations and Coordination Planning:
  - RACP needs to be re-visited.
  - That is the major deliverable.

Session 2:

At the end of the morning session it was determined by the majority that the afternoon session should be open to relevant subject matter experts. This decision was based on the amount of questions that were raised and left unanswered from the morning session.

The group agreed on the following decision making methodology:

      1) One member shared a straw man proposal of projects to fund.
      2) All group members added any additions to that list.
      3) The group went through this aggregate list looking for projects that can be scaled back and/or eliminated after discussion.

The group decided that the projects eliminated today could be revisited only if there was a good reason, i.e., more information presented.

The Table below identifies all projects that will be discussed when the funding limit is announced. This table includes the investment category, project title, proposed cost, suggested funding level, discussion highlights, and ESF/RWG homework.

Projects highlighted in orange were bundled under other projects and their cost was absorbed. Projects highlighted in yellow were not chosen to be funded at this time, but were the focus of discussion.

NCR Projects In the Running For Grant Funding

Investment Justification	Concept Paper	Cost	May 19th funding suggestion	Cut Funds	May 19, 2006 Discussion Highlights	ESF/RWG Homework
CBRNE Total	Cap: $5,250,000	None	None	None	CBRNE projects were removed.	
CIP 1	National Capital Region Critical Infrastructure Resiliency Program (p.103)	$ 4,801,109	$ 4,801,109		The policy discussed in the rapid response mobile transformer project (formerly 4) and the deliverables produced in the increasing emergency generation reliability and capability in the NCR project (formerly 10), should be incorporated into this project.	
CIP	Rapid Response Mobile Transformer (pg. 153) (formerly priority 4)	-			.	
CIP	Increasing Emergency Generation Reliability and Capability in the National Capital Region (NCR) (pg. 145) (formerly priority 10)	-				
CIP 2	WMATA Alternate Operations Control Center (pg.114)	$ 9,000,000	$ 9,000,000			

Investment Justification	Concept Paper	Cost	May 19th funding suggestion	Cut Funds	May 19, 2006 Discussion Highlights	ESF/RWG Homework
CIP	3	Expansion, Establishment and Operation of the Water Security Monitoring Network in the National Capital Region (pg. 132)	$ 1,250,000	$ 1,250,000			
CIP	7	Critical Infrastructure Monitoring and Protection (pg.128)	$ 3,001,200	$ 3,001,200			
CIP Total		Cap: $26,250,000	$ 18,052,309	$ 18,052,309			
Citizen Preparedness/ Citizen Protection	1	Continuity of Efforts regarding Volunteer Management Across the NCR and Continuity & enhancement of Citizen Corps Council membership and Citizen Corps Core Programs and affiliated programs and activities in the NCR (p 29)	$ 5,000,000	$ 2,500,000	$ 2,500,000	Need a better understanding of what the deliverables are. How do volunteers fit into the mission?	Homework: ask ESF/RWG to report back on scalability. What are the consequences of decreased funding? What could be accomplished with decreased funding?
Citizen Preparedness/ Citizen Protection		Extend community outreach for the "Be Ready. Make a Plan." campaign					
Citizen Preparedness/ Citizen Protection		Regional Marketing Campaign for the NCR's Alert and Notification Systems					
Citizen Preparedness/ Citizen Protection	2	Public Information Dissemination Campaign to Educate the Public on Mitigating the Impacts of Energy Emergencies in the National Capital Region* (pg. 44)	$ 1,400,000	$ 1,400,000			Homework: Need clearer understanding of what is planned with the funding.

Investment Justification		Concept Paper	Cost		May 19th funding suggestion		Cut Funds	May 19, 2006 Discussion Highlights	ESF/RWG Homework
Citizen Preparedness/ Citizen Protection	3	UASI NCR Family Assistance/ Reunification Center (pg. 431)	$	2,000,000	$	2,000,000			
Citizen Preparedness/ Citizen Protection		National Capitol Region Evacuation and Shelter in Place Coordination and Outreach to Community, Business and Special Populations providers (pg. 85),	$	-					
Citizen Preparedness/ Citizen Protection		SPECIAL NEEDS POPULATIONS Emergency Response Inclusion (p 40), I	$	-					
Citizen Preparedness/ Citizen Protection		Increasing Special Needs Involvement in NCR Disaster Preparedness: building sustainable capacity for sheltering-in-place, evacuation, and mass care (pg. 59)	$	-					
Citizen Preparedness/ Citizen Protection	4	Identify and coordinate transportation requirements for the special needs population. (pg. 26)	$	4,000,000	$	4,000,000			Homework: Produce a better project plan. What are the outcomes and deliverables of this project?

Investment Justification		Concept Paper	Cost	May 19th funding suggestion	Cut Funds	May 19, 2006 Discussion Highlights	ESF/RWG Homework
Citizen Preparedness/Citizen Protection	5	Regional Evacuation Traffic Monitoring and Management Tool(s) (pg. 91)	$ 5,000,000	$ 2,000,000	$ 3,000,000	With this funding group will require integration of centers within a "virtual" monitoring center.	Homework: ask ESF/RWG to report back on scalability. What are the consequences of decreased funding? What could be accomplished with decreased funding?
		Northern Virginia Transportation Management Program: Enhancements for Incident Response and Emergency Operations Command/Control and Information Sharing (pg. 106) (Formerly CIP, 9)	-			This project (CIP 9) was bundled with Citizen Preparedness 5. The group thought that this was very well written, but redundant.	
		Multifunctional Evacuation Dynamic Message Signs (pg.125)	-			This project (CIP 6) was bundled with Citizen Preparedness 5. This is very expensive as is because of lack of coordination.	
Citizen Preparedness/Citizen Protection	6	Ensure Plans, Procedures and IT Systems for coordination between Emergency Management and 211 for Emergency Info and Referral (pg. 54)	$ 150,000	$ 150,000			

Investment Justification		Concept Paper	Cost	May 19th funding suggestion	Cut Funds	May 19, 2006 Discussion Highlights	ESF/RWG Homework
Citizen Preparedness/Citizen Protection	9	Emergency Transportation Annex - Testing, Exercising, and Resource Development (pg. 413)	$ 250,000	$ 250,000			
Citizen Preparedness/ Citizen Protection Total		Cap: $21,000,000	$ 17,800,000	$ 12,300,000			
Critical Resource Logistics	1	Law Enforcement Personal Protective Equipment Cache* (pg. 189)	$ 612,120	$ 612,120			
Critical Resource Logistics		Warehouse Bundle to include: National Capitol Region Critical Resources Logistics Warehouse (pg. 180);	$ -				
Critical Resource Logistics		Warehousing for a Regional Cache of Equipment (pg.191)	$ -				
Critical Resource Logistics	3	Emergency Phase Food Storage and Relief Phase Food Storage and Distribution. Space and Storage / NCR Inventory Management System (pg. 186)	$ 34,000,000	$ 11,000,000		Look more closely at commercial capability and vendor provided support as an option for this project.	Homework: Need to provide a more coordinated Project plan.
Critical Resource Logistics	4	Establishment of an Emergency Drinking Water Production and Stockpile Capability in the National Capital Region (pg. 172)	$ 695,000	$ 350,000	$ 345,000	The group was told this could be scaled down. This covers one stockpile instead of two.	
Critical Resource Logistics Total		Cap: $21,000,000	$ 35,307,120	$ 11,962,120			

Investment Justification	Concept Paper	Cost	May 19th funding suggestion	Cut Funds	May 19, 2006 Discussion Highlights	ESF/RWG Homework
Explosive Devices	1	National Capital Region Bomb Squad (Metrotech) Equipment and Regional Caches (pg. 209)	$ 8,000,000	$ 8,000,000		The group liked this proposal because it had a clear benchmark and clear deliverables.	Homework: ask ESF/RWG to report back on scalability. What are the consequences of decreased funding? What could be accomplished with decreased funding?
Explosive Devices Total	Cap: $9,450,000	$ 8,000,000	$ 8,000,000			
Intel / Info Sharing	1	NCR Medical Surge Initiative Patient Tracking System (pg. 224)	$ 3,400,000	$ 1,100,000	$ 2,300,000	Funding was reduced because: 1) as of yet, there is no outcome from the current funding; 2)need more of a game plan for completion; and 3) it is scalable	
Intel / Info Sharing	4	Mobile Access to Tactical Response Data Project	$ 6,648,152	$ 3,000,000	$ 3,648,152	DC is currently not participating. They will participate once the project is on the network. They are not comfortable with accepting data via CDs.	

Investment Justification		Concept Paper	Cost	May 19th funding suggestion	Cut Funds	May 19, 2006 Discussion Highlights	ESF/RWG Homework
Intel / Info Sharing Total		Cap: $10,059,000	$ 10,048,152	$ 4,100,000			
Interoperable Communications	1	National Capital Region Interoperability Program (NCRIP) Phase 2 (pg. 254)	$ 25,000,000	$ 20,000,000	$ 5,000,000	Funding is to expand the wireless network, reduced funding will slow down expansion.	
Interoperable Communications	2	National Capital Region Base MAP (NCRBM) – Regional GIS Base Map Development and Maintenance (pg. 263)	$ 1,000,000	$ 1,000,000			
Interoperable Communications	3	First/Critical Responder Credentialing (pg. 259)	$ 5,000,000			The group decided not to fund this. They would like to see the results of the current study before they decide how much to invest.	
Interoperable Communications	4	Reverse 911/Mass Notification (pg. 251)	$ 900,000	$ 900,000			
Interoperable Communications	7	Prince George's Co. Interoperable Radio Comm. System (pg. 272)	$ 3,000,000	$ 3,000,000		The group decided not to fund this, suggesting that the state portion be used to fund this.	
Interoperable Communications	9	WMATA Communications Upgrade (pg. 141)	$ 6,100,000	$ 6,100,000			
Interoperable Communications Total		Cap: $42,000,000	$ 41,000,000	$ 31,000,000			
Law Enforcement	1	NCR-LInX	$ 3,000,000	$ 3,000,000			

Investment Justification		Concept Paper	Cost	May 19th funding suggestion	Cut Funds	May 19, 2006 Discussion Highlights	ESF/RWG Homework
Law Enforcement	2	Mobile AFIS/Facial Recognition	$ 3,000,000	$ 3,000,000			
Law Enforcement	4	Intelligence Analysts	$ 1,257,675	$ 1,257,675			
Law Enforcement	7	Maritime Awareness NCR (pg. 312)	$ 6,600,000	$ 500,000	$ 6,100,000		
Law Enforcement Total		Cap: $11,550,000	$ 13,857,675	$ 7,757,675			
Mass Care	1	NCR Regional Emergency Planning for Sheltering Companion Animals (Pets) (pg. 436), National Capital Region Shelter Planning (Shelter profiles and action plans) (pg. 331), District ESF – 6 (Mass Care Needs) (pg. 335), NCR Regional ESF-6 Equipment (pg. 323)	$ 5,000,000	$ 5,000,000			
Mass Care Total		Cap: $5,000,000	$ 5,000,000	$ 5,000,000			
Medical Surge	1	Gap Analysis for Health and Medical Readiness-Part 2, A Continuation Project* (pg. 369)	$ 125,000	$ 125,000			
Medical Surge	2	Medical Prophylaxis and Surge Planning* (pg. 445)	$ 1,125,000	$ 1,125,000		This was described as a one time investment	
Medical Surge	3	Surge Capacity for Public Health: Medical Reserve Corps in the National Capitol Region (pg. 351)	$ 913,844	$ 913,844		The group was not sure what this item "bought" and why individual jurisdictions were not paying for the staff needed to manage the MRC. The item was kept in for now.	

Investment Justification		Concept Paper	Cost	May 19th funding suggestion	Cut Funds	May 19, 2006 Discussion Highlights	ESF/RWG Homework
Medical Surge	4	UASI FY 06 Medical Surge (pg. 377)	$ 4,700,000	$ 2,000,000	$ 2,700,000	This includes funding for capacity (i.e., burn center training) and equipment (i.e., beds). Funding reduced because group unclear on what current capacity is	Homework: ask ESF/RWG to report back on(for all relevant hospitals) :1) current capacity; 2) what can be achieved currently; 3) what could be achieved with the different funding levels (2 million, 3million, etc)
Medical Surge	5	National Capital Region Syndromic Surveillance Network (pg. 363)	$ 1,000,000	$ 1,000,000			
Medical Surge	8	Code Orange* (pg. 383)	$ 250,000	$ 250,000			
Medical Surge Total		Cap: $9,975,000	$ 8,113,844	$ 5,413,844			
Planning	1	Continuation of COG Professional, Technical, and Secretariat Support (pg. 398)	$ 960,000	$ 960,000			
Planning	2	National Capital Region Emergency Operations and Coordination Planning (pg. 424)	$ 5,000,000	$ 5,000,000			
Planning		HICS, and NIMS: A Forum on Hospital Incident Command* (pg. 385)	$ 75,000				
Planning		Strategic Planning for a Health and Medical Core Curriculum* (pg.	$ 150,000				

Investment Justification	Concept Paper	Cost		May 19th funding suggestion	Cut Funds	May 19, 2006 Discussion Highlights	ESF/RWG Homework
	442)						
Planning	Regional Energy Emergency Exercise and Emergency Liaison Officers Training Program* (pg. 448)	$	400,000				
Planning	National Capital Region Exercises and Training (pg. 428)	$	3,000,000				
Planning	Managing Metro Emergencies I (Awareness Level)* (pg. 159)	$	124,500				
	Regional Fire and Rescue Homeland Security Staff (pg. 416) (Formerly Critical Resources and Logistics, 2)	$	1,323,125			The Group wanted this rolled into the planning section	
Planning 3	Managing Metro Emergencies II (Operations Level)* (pg. 162)	$	210,750	$ 4,500,000			
	Standardized Training In Terrorism Prevention, Detection and Interdiction for Law Enforcement Entry Level and In Service Programs (Formerly Law Enforcement, 3)					Group requested that this project (Law Enforcement, 3) be incorporated into the ETOP products.	

Investment Justification		Concept Paper	Cost	May 19th funding suggestion	Cut Funds	May 19, 2006 Discussion Highlights	ESF/RWG Homework
Planning	4	NCR Regional ESF-14 Planning – Long Term Community Recovery and Mitigation (pg. 453)	$ 250,000	$ 250,000		Incorporate the concept in Evacuation Time Estimates project (8) and Regional public/private bus evacuation project (5) into this planning project	
Planning	5	Regional Public/Private Bus Evacuation Coordination Planning (pg. 458)	-				
Planning	8	Evacuation Time Estimates – How much time do we need? (pg. 410)					
Planning Total		Cap: $15,225,000	$ 11,493,375	$ 10,710,000			
WMD / HazMat	1	National Capital Region – Type III Incident Management Team (pg. 480)	$ 875,550	$ 875,550			
WMD / HazMat	3	Mass Decontamination Program* (pg. 468)	$ 2,008,200	$ 2,008,200			
WMD / HazMat	4	Metro Subway Security Strategic Initiative (pg. 472)	$ 5,324,860	$ 3,000,000			Homework: ask ESF/RWG to report back on scalability. What are the consequences of decreased funding? What could be accomplished with decreased funding?

Investment Justification		Concept Paper	Cost		May 19th funding suggestion		Cut Funds	May 19, 2006 Discussion Highlights	ESF/RWG Homework
WMD / HazMat	5	National Capital Region – Type III Incident Management Team (Equipment) (pg. 476)	$	800,031	$	800,031			
WMD / HazMat Total		Cap: $11,500,000	$	9,008,641	$	6,683,781			
		Grand Total	$	177,681,116	$	120,979,729			