Appendix 1: Federal Emergency Management

The U.S. FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY was created in 1979 to provide a single point of accountability for all federal activities related to disaster mitigation and emergency preparedness, response, and recovery. Analysis reveals that original objectives, organizational make-up and missions of FEMA are imbued with a variety of significant political factors.

Early administrative history reveals that disaster assistance and relief activities moved from the Housing and Home Finance Administration in 1951 to Federal Civil Defense Administration in 1953 to the Office of Civil Defense and Mobilization in 1958 to the Office of Emergency Planning (later renamed the Office of Emergency Preparedness) in 1961. Finally in 1973, disaster relief was divided amongst three agencies, the Federal Disaster Assistance Administration, the Defense Civil Preparedness Agency, and the Federal Preparedness Agency.

In August of 1977, President Carter asked the reorganization staff at the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to make a comprehensive review of the matter. The reorganization team concluded that:

"...the present Federal structure for preparing for, responding to, and recovering from the effects of major emergencies is in disarray. The study group identified many serious deficiencies: low visibility for emergency planning; duplication of programs and contracts at the state and local level; confusion over jurisdiction and responsibilities; lack of accountability below the Presidential level for policymaking and needed management improvements" ("Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1978," the Committee on Government Operations, Washington D.C., 1978).

FEMA was established in response to these findings and recommendations. Federal disaster assistance programs were to be unified and refashioned through Reorganization Plan No. 3. Executive Order 12148 (1979), issued by President Carter following congressional acceptance of Reorganization Plan No. 3, delegated most of the authority granted to the president under the Disaster Relief Act of 1974 to the Director of FEMA. The following functions were transferred to FEMA: CIVIL DEFENSE, certain elements of NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS, FIRE PREVENTION & ASSISTANCE, DISASTER RELIEF, FLOOD
INSURANCE, EMERGENCY BROADCAST & WARNING, EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION and DAM SAFETY. Some functions, however, were not transferred to FEMA, most notably the DISASTER LOAN PROGRAMS operated by the Small Business Administration (SBA) and the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s (USDA) Farmers Home Administration.

The four principal objectives that were identified by President Carter in a message accompanying Reorganization Plan No. 3 were the:

1. Establishment of a SINGLE ENTITY (FEMA), headed by an official directly responsible to the president, that would serve as the sole federal agency responsible for anticipating, preparing for and responding to major civil emergencies;

2. Development of an effective CIVIL DEFENSE system, integrated into the programs and operations of nonfederal entities, to improve communications, evacuations, warnings, evacuations, and public education efforts to prepare citizens for a possible nuclear attack as well as for natural and accidental disasters (an ALL HAZARDS approach);

3. Reliance of federal agencies to undertake emergency management responsibilities as extensions of their regular missions and on FEMA to coordinate these resources; and

4. Inclusion of federal HAZARD MITIGATION activities, linked with state and local activities, with decision-making about preparedness and response functions.

Examination of the initial functions transferred to FEMA and the original objectives placed on the agency reveals the origin of a number of political issues and debates that continue today. First, the establishment of FEMA did not fully consolidate all disaster and emergency functions and programs residing at the federal level. As mentioned above, certain functions, such as the disaster loan programs of the SBA and the USDA, were not transferred to FEMA. Consequently, some competition between federal agencies with disaster and emergency jurisdiction continues to this day.

The formation of FEMA also spotlighted the significance of HAZARD MITIGATION & PREPAREDNESS and gave impetus to a PROACTIVE, rather than a REACTIVE, approach to
emergency management. Instead of merely doing disaster recovery work, emphasis was placed on keeping people out of hazard-prone, high-risk areas through instruments such as zoning laws, building codes, and land-use regulations. In effect, FEMA was challenged to encourage or induce local officials and individuals to adopt mitigative policies. Mitigation work opened up a perennial, highly political issue between FEMA and local officials, developers, and citizens. While federal officials and FEMA attempt to get communities to proactively protect themselves through hazard mitigation activities, local officials, developers and citizens often try to circumvent measures they consider restrictive and financially burdensome.

FEMA MISSIONS

The following Executive Orders (E.O.) and laws provide both the statutory foundation for FEMA and are largely responsible for its organization and structure.

- E.O. 12148, Federal Emergency Management
- E.O. 12656, Assignment of Emergency Preparedness Responsibilities
- E.O. 12919, National Defense Industrial Resources Preparedness
- National Security Act of 1947
- Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended
- Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, as amended

FEMA is a rather small independent agency with a full-time workforce of about 2600, but with a capability to mobilize personnel from a disaster reserve force in times of emergency. FEMA promotes disaster mitigation, preparedness, response and recovery activities through its work with state and local emergency managers. The agency also advances comprehensive, all-hazards emergency management activities.

FEMA is headed by a Director appointed by the president and the agency reports directly to that office. At this writing, FEMA's director is James Lee Witt. He sits on the Cabinet and enjoys easy access to President Clinton. As a result of his many years working in state and local emergency management, Witt was well aware of the agency's strengths and weaknesses before he was appointed Director. Witt testified that it was his aim to renew and reinvent FEMA at his Senate confirmation hearings on April 6, 1993. His first step in renewing FEMA was to give it a clearer mission statement:

FEMA's specific MISSION GOALS are to:

1. Create an emergency management partnership with other federal agencies, state and local governments, volunteer organizations, and the private sector to better serve customers;

2. Establish, in concert with FEMA's partners, a national emergency management system that is comprehensive, risk-based, and all-hazards in approach;

3. Make hazard mitigation the foundation of the national emergency management system;

4. Provide a rapid and effective response to, and recovery from, disaster; and

5. Strengthen state and local emergency management.

As a consequence of its legislated mission, FEMA is tasked with responding to any accidental, natural, or conflict induced hazard or threat which causes or may cause substantial injury or harm to the population or substantial damage to, or loss of, property. In effect, it embodies an ALL-HAZARDS APPROACH to emergency management.

By early 1995, Witt's vision for FEMA was to strive for a "Partnership for a Safer Future for America." That partnership was to include the universe of FEMA stakeholders. The vision called for an informed public dedicated to protecting their families, homes, workplaces, communities and livelihoods from the impacts of disasters. Builders and developers would construct hazard-resistant structures located out of harm's way. Governments and private organizations would set forth plans, compile necessary resources, and rigorously train and exercise for disaster responses. Communities would prepare and plan for recovery and reconstruction BEFORE disaster strikes.
Central to Witt’s vision was an increased emphasis placed on MITIGATION ACTIVITIES. FEMA had housed a collection of modest mitigation programs prior to Witt’s regime, but Witt made mitigation the foundation of emergency management and the primary goal of the agency. The reasoning is that mitigation activities and strategies may substantially reduce the impact of disasters and, in some cases, prevent disasters altogether. FEMA now allocates up to 15 percent of all disaster assistance funds in a declared disaster to state and local long-term mitigation efforts. FEMA officials have gone on record as saying:

"Mitigation must become a recognized national priority. Although mitigation makes good sense, often it is not a priority for communities. Establishing mitigation as a primary foundation for emergency management will decrease demands for response to disasters. Buildings, homes, and infrastructure that are built better, withstand hazards better. This means less destruction, less loss of life, less personal and economic hardship. This also means a reduction in outlays for disaster assistance by federal, state, and local governments for rebuilding communities and businesses." [U.S. Federal Emergency Management Agency, National Performance Review Report, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, September 1993.] Regardless of the statement, there is irrefutable evidence that the costs of disasters since 1989 have risen dramatically. Moreover, "the jury is still out" on whether mitigation will decrease demands for federal response to disasters.

Through highlighting mitigation efforts and securing more program resources, FEMA can substantially enhance its capacity and presence in intergovernmental relations on a continuous basis, rather than merely after a disaster. Whether such invigorated FEMA mitigation efforts will produce adequate state and local responses, however, is a highly charged political issue. Local officials sometimes rationalize that they have little to gain from mitigation efforts if in the event of a disaster, the state and federal governments will pay for a the lion’s share of their local disaster losses. Moreover, mitigation efforts have to compete with the far more alluring concerns of economic growth and development on the local level. With local officials, developers, and citizens often viewing mitigation efforts as restrictions on personal freedom and financially costly, mitigation efforts are bound to remain a politically charged issue.

FEMA ORGANIZATION
For the most part, FEMA is organized functionally on the four phases of emergency management: mitigation, preparedness, response and recovery. Specifically, FEMA comprises five directorates: MITIGATION; PREPAREDNESS, TRAINING AND EXERCISES; RESPONSE AND RECOVERY; OPERATIONS SUPPORT; and INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICES. It also includes the U.S. Fire Administration and the Federal Insurance Administration.

FEMA is geographically divided into 10 standard Federal Regions and each Regional Office of FEMA is directed by a politically appointed Regional Director. FEMA's jurisdiction covers all 50 states and the District of Columbia. Other jurisdictions eligible to request presidential declarations of major disaster and emergency are: the trust territories of American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands; and, the commonwealths of Northern Mariana Islands and Puerto Rico. Under a Compact of Free Association (1995), the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands now function as independent nations and may no longer apply for presidential disaster declarations, as they were allowed to do (and did) from 1953 to 1995. Also noteworthy is the 1994 decision of the Republic of Palau, which also won presidential disaster declarations in the past. It agreed, in exchange for a $15 million grant from the U.S., to end its eligibility to request presidential disaster declarations. (Source: phone interview with Roy Kite, FEMA EMI, July 31, 1997.)

State officials count on the FEMA regional office in their area to support on-going federal-state emergency management projects, and FEMA regional personnel are made available to help in damage assessment after a disaster. Ordinarily, states and localities are expected to perform a pre-assessment of damage before the state asks FEMA's regional director to undertake with them a PRELIMINARY DAMAGE ASSESSMENT (PDA). PDAs are comprised of federal, state, and local officials with a designated federal leader. Once all parties come to agreement on the PDA, it is submitted to the FEMA region office.

Thus, the regional offices play a crucial role in federal/state emergency management relations. In addition to engaging in routine operations, FEMA regional directors upon receipt of a governor’s request and upon completion of a damage assessment, prepare a REGIONAL SUMMARY, REGIONAL ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATION. The regional summary contains only factual information while the regional analysis and recommendation contains opinions and recommendations for the president.
Examination of FEMA's missions and organization reveal that a significant amount of
coordination is required for effective emergency management. FEMA's COORDINATING
ROLE refers to its relations with different levels of government and various agencies in
conducting emergency management. FEMA's primary purpose is to provide assistance to state
and local governments in saving lives and protecting property and public health and safety for all
types of emergencies. It also, however, directs or coordinates federal agency disaster response.

Currently, FEMA provides funding, guidance and training to state and local emergency
management organizations through its regional structure. Its central relationship with states and
localities is primarily through the medium of PERFORMANCE PARTNERSHIP
AGREEMENTS (PPA)/COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS (CA) with state Offices of
Emergency Management. The PPA/CA provides a means to pass funds through to state Offices
of Emergency Management and from them funds go to local Offices of Emergency
Management. PPA/CAs are analogous to contracts. The PPA is a partnership document of both
FEMA and the states regarding goals and objectives. States use the partnership to develop their
own objectives and in turn, many of these objectives may come to shape FEMA's own goals and
objectives. For example, PPA/CAs can emphasize mitigation efforts. State and FEMA officials
come to mutual agreement regarding expected state level outcomes given FEMA funding
support.

FEMA's success or failure in meeting its duties rests largely and directly on its ability to
coordinate and harmonize the disaster-related work of other federal agencies. Although FEMA
possesses authority, funding and limited assets that enable it to do some work independently, it
must depend on other federal departments and agencies to provide additional resources to ensure
a complete federal response. In the event of a presidentially declared disaster, a MISSION
ASSIGNMENT may be issued to a federal agency by the FEMA Director, Associate Director, or
Regional Director.

A MISSION ASSIGNMENT is a work order given to a particular agency that directs
completion by that agency of a specified task and cites funding, other managerial controls, and
guidance. In effect, these assignments represent FEMA's role in coordinating a complete federal
response to a disaster. This term is also significant because it denotes how other federal
agencies, besides FEMA, engage in disaster recovery work through drawing from the President's
Disaster Relief Fund.
As both the PPA/CA's and MISSION ASSIGNMENTS indicate, a web of well-maintained political and administrative relations with customers, state and local emergency managers, and federal agency partners is essential to the attainment of FEMA's goals and objectives. An excellent example of this is FEMA's governmental and interagency coordination work through the Federal Response Plan.

Federal Response Plan

The FEDERAL RESPONSE PLAN (FRP) demonstrates much about the political and administrative environment of U.S. disaster management. It manifests the framework for planning and conducting interagency response, recovery and mitigation activities in presidentially declared disasters. The FRP's purpose is to integrate capabilities of federal departments and agencies for a coordinated federal response to disaster, so as to provide emergency assistance to save lives and protect property and public health and safety for all types of emergencies.

Hurricane Hugo in 1989 revealed the need for such a comprehensive federal response program. Criticism of disaster relief efforts in response to Hurricane Hugo gave impetus to the creation of the Federal Response Plan of 1992, which is now the basis of federal mobilization aimed at helping states and localities respond to all types of disasters. The Federal Response Plan of 1992 represented a cooperative agreement between 26 federal agencies and the American Red Cross. The Federal Response Plan:

1. Serves as a blueprint to coordinate and mobilize resources in disaster and emergency circumstances;

2. Provides greater detail concerning the roles and activities of different federal agencies during large-scale natural disasters;

3. Groups together the different types of emergency assistance available to public organization and private citizens and identifies a lead agency for each of these types of assistance;

4. Specifies a process in which the resources of the federal government can be deployed more quickly and efficiently.
The Federal Response Plan takes effect when states and local governments are overwhelmed by a disaster and the state governor requests, and the president determines that "an emergency exists for which the primary responsibility for response rests with the United States."

In presumed disaster or emergency circumstances, the governor of the affected state must determine whether the magnitude of devastation warrants the request of a presidential disaster declaration. The president, advised by FEMA, must be convinced by evidence that the event warrants federal assistance. This help supplements the efforts and available resources of the affected state(s), local governments, and disaster relief organizations in alleviating the damage, loss, hardship, or suffering. The Federal Response Plan establishes the basis by which federal resources will be organized and employed to support impacted state and local jurisdictions.

Currently, the FRP includes 28 departments/agencies and the American Red Cross, each of which are assigned primary and support roles to provide federal resources to augment the efforts of local and state governments in responding to a disaster or emergency. The FRP incorporates the Incident Command System (ICS) approach to organizing the federal interagency response teams. The FRP can be viewed as an action plan to support this organizational structure.

The FRP also is linked to other major federal emergency plans to ensure a consistent and coordinated response to any event which necessitates federal disaster or emergency assistance. A single Federal Coordinating Officer (FCO) is assigned to direct federal response to the disaster. The FCO is appointed by the president and reports to the president through the director of FEMA.

The FEMA Regional Office dispatches an Emergency Response Team (ERT) and establishes a Federal Disaster Office.

The FRP is organized into 12 Emergency Support Functions with a lead agency responsible for each:

1. Transportation---------------- DOT
2. Communications-------------- NCS
3. Public Works and Engineering-- DOD
4. Fire fighting-------------- USDA
5. Information and Planning——FEMA

6. Mass Care------------------Red Cross

7. Resource Support----------GSA

8. Health and Medical Services----HHS

9. Urban Search and Rescue-----DOD


11. Food----------------------USDA

12. Energy---------------------DOE

Supporting Functions:
   o Financial Management
   o Public Information
   o Congressional Relations

The Emergency Support Functions in the Federal Response Plan describe essential resources which departments and agencies can provide to augment local and state emergency response. These resources are provided under statutory authority or by mission assignment from FEMA.

To facilitate obtaining resources through an Emergency Support Function, FEMA coordinates with the primary agency to validate the requirement and provide the needed resource. Support agencies may also provide resources under mission assignment. FEMA may also mission assign any agency to provide a unique or specialized resource.

When is the response plan implemented?:

(1) In anticipation of a significant event (such as a hurricane) judged likely to result in a need for federal assistance.

(2) In response to an actual event, such as an earthquake, which requires federal disaster or emergency assistance.

(3) In response to a request by a Governor to the President for Federal assistance to his/her state.

(4) As the result of a major disaster or emergency declaration by the President.
After a Presidential Disaster Declaration has been issued several types of federal disaster assistance become available. Under disaster or emergency circumstances, states receive from FEMA a match supported subsidy (75/25) to provide supplemental assistance to individuals and families adversely affected. This is defined as Individual Assistance. Some forms of individual assistance are managed exclusively by FEMA. Others, such as loans to businesses, are managed by the Small Business Administration, or farm loans by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

INDIVIDUAL ASSISTANCE

- Temporary Housing
- Grants
- Small Business and Farm Loans
- Disaster unemployment and job placement assistance
- Social Security, Veterans and Tax assistance
- Crisis Counseling

Types of aid customarily available are:

- Rental payments for temporary housing for those whose homes are unlivable. Assistance is available for up to 18 months depending on need. (FEMA funded and administered program.)

- Grants for making minor repairs to primary residences that are habitable or to make them habitable (FEMA funded and administered).

- Grants ranging from several thousand dollars to a maximum of $12,900 to help meet serious disaster-related needs not covered by insurance or other Federal, State, or charitable aid programs. (FEMA funded at 75 percent of total eligible costs, State administered.)

- Low-interest loans at 4-8 percent to cover uninsured private and business property losses. Loans are available up to $200,000 for primary residence; $40,000 for personal property, including renter losses; and $1.5 million for businesses. (Fund and administered by the U.S. Small Business Administration [SBA].)

- Loans up to $1.5 million for small businesses that have suffered disaster-related cash flow problems and need funds for working capital to recover from the disaster’s adverse economic impact. This loan, in combination with a property loss loan, cannot exceed $1.5 million. (Funded and administered by the SBA.)

- Loans up to $500,000 for farmers, ranchers and aquaculture operators to cover
production and property losses, excluding primary residence. (Funded and administered by the Farmers Home Administration, U.S. Department of Agriculture.)

- Income tax assistance for filing casualty losses. (Administered by the U.S. Internal Revenue Service.)

- Advisory assistance for legal, veterans’ benefits, and social security matters.

FEMA also provides PUBLIC ASSISTANCE to state and local governments or certain private, not-for-profit organizations, on a 75/25 cost sharing basis, to help restore public services and to provide infrastructure support.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

- Debris Clearance

- Repair, restoration or replacement of:
  -- water control facilities
  -- roads, streets, bridges
  -- public buildings and equipment
  -- public utilities
  -- communications systems
  -- recreational facilities, equipment and parks

- Direct costs of local government disaster response

Types of Public Assistance include:

- Costs associated with Debris Clearance.

- The repair, restoration or replacement of water control facilities (such as dams, levees, drainage channels, shore protection devices, and pumping stations).

- The repair of non-federally supported roads, highways and bridges.

- The repair or restoration of public buildings and equipment (such as fire stations and fire fighting equipment).

- The repair or restoration of public utilities (such as electric, gas, or water utilities).

- The repair or restoration of parks, and recreational facilities and equipment (such as playground equipment, swimming pools, boat docks and piers, bath houses, tennis courts, picnic tables, golf courses, and some tree and landscape features).

FEMA also is empowered to fund the Hazard Mitigation Assistance program. A state is
allowed to receive a sum equal to 15% of its federally declared disaster's public assistance costs. This helps state, local and other eligible parties lessen or avert the threat of future disasters through funding projects aimed at reducing or eliminating future disaster vulnerability.
Appendix 2: States & Territories and Disaster

While everyone is aware that the U.S. has fifty state governments, many are unaware that other jurisdictions are assumed to have state status for official purposes. The District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, all engage in emergency management and are eligible to apply for federal disaster relief under conditions which apply to states. Until 1995, the Republic of Palau, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Republic of the Marshall Island were also eligible to apply for and did in fact receive presidential declarations of major disaster or emergency. The (Panama) Canal Zone was until the late 1970s a U.S. territory, though it never received a presidential declaration of major disaster or emergency.

Each of the 50 states and each American trust or commonwealth territory has a state emergency management organization. The table below lists the names of all 50 state emergency management organizations as they were in 1996.

In some states, emergency management is conducted by an independent agency reporting directly to the governor’s office. In other states, the agency or organization may be located in the military department, the adjutant general’s office, the department of public safety, or in some other office. Some emergency management offices are located within the management structure of the governor’s staff offices.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Emergency Management Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Emergency Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Division of Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Division of Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Office of Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Office of Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Division of Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Office of Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Emergency Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Division of Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Emergency Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>State Civil Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Bureau of Disaster Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Emergency Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Emergency Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Division of Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Division of Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Disaster and Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Office of Emergency Preparedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Emergency Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Emergency Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Emergency Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Division of Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Division of Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Emergency Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>State Emergency Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Disaster &amp; Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>State Civil Defense Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Division of Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>Governor’s Office of Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Office of Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Division of Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>State Emergency Management Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Division of Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Division of Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Emergency Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Department of Civil Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>State Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Emergency Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Emergency Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Emergency Preparedness Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>Division of Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Emergency Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Division of Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Agency/Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Comprehensive Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Division of Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Department of Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>State Emergency Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Office of Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Division of Emergency Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>Emergency Management Agency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How a state emergency management agency is organized and where it sits within the bureaucratic hierarchy of state organization, is significant. Many studies of state organization have concluded that "stand-alone" agencies, independent of broad holding company-type departments, usually have more political clout and a stronger professional identity. Another important indicator of agency political power is support of, and access to, the governor. Clearly, state agencies with close organizational links to the Office of the Governor usually have greater capacity to help marshal and coordinate state emergency and disaster assistance. Their proximity to the governor, a critical seat of state political and managerial power, affords a high organizational profile.

In general, state emergency agencies, like their local counterparts, are expected to be organized effectively, and should possess well-maintained emergency plans, facilities, and equipment. To become and remain eligible for federal financial assistance, each state must manage a state emergency management program that complements and promotes local emergency management.

**Emergency Roles of Governors**

Governors, as executives, possess emergency powers applicable to disasters or emergencies within their respective states. They have at their disposal state emergency management agencies, other state agency assistance, and their state's National Guard (along with reserve and active duty forces made available by the president, if needed).

A recent survey conducted by the National Emergency Management Association [NEMA] revealed that in virtually all states "the governor is the responsible authority for issuing a state disaster declaration or initiating a state response" (NEMA, 1996). In most states, a declaration of emergency or disaster by the Governor is sufficient to trigger state expenditures for disaster relief and emergency assistance. In many states this declaration activates the state emergency response plan.
The NEMA survey claimed, "The Governor's pivotal role during disasters has an impact on the location and direction of the state emergency management function. A 1995 policy paper issued by the National Governors' Association, recommends that the individual responsible for the state's emergency management program have direct access to the Governor" (National Governors' Association, *HR-30 Emergency Management* (1995), section 30.2, p. 12). A review of the structure and location of state emergency management agencies revealed that in 44 states the director of emergency management is appointed by the Governor. Although placement of the agency varies by state, the emergency management director reports to the Governor in 19 states, the adjutant general in 19 states, and the secretary for public safety in six states.

In most states, the governor and the state emergency management director rarely work face-to-face. Usually someone on the governor's staff acts as a go-between. However, that staffer often has many responsibilities besides emergency management. This sometimes makes it difficult for state emergency management directors to influence or advise their governors on matters of policy affecting disaster management.

**General Powers of Governors**

The authority which a governor has is defined by the state constitution, and state constitutions vary considerably both in substance, specificity, and length. A Governor, or Acting Governor, is the chief executive of the state.

1. Most governors have considerable powers of appointment, both in appointments to executive agencies and to judicial positions.

2. Some, but not all, governors have powers of executive reorganization.

3. Many governors can veto entire bills passed by the state legislature, or they can use an "item veto" to invalidate only those provisions of bills which they do not want enacted into law. A few governors possess amendatory veto powers which enable them, in certain circumstances, to re-write passages in legislation before signing them into law.

4. Most governors prepare executive budgets which are submitted to the state legislature for review and approval.

5. Most governors are restricted to two successive terms of office.

In the case of appointive powers, it is highly probable that governor's who appoint their state emergency management directors are likely to work more closely with them before, during and
after disasters. If emergency management directors are appointed by others (state adjutant general, the state legislature), they may not have a good working relationship with the governor and they may not feel accountable to the governor.

Powers of reorganization and veto powers are relevant to emergency management in the sense that these are instruments which governors may use to emphasize or de-emphasize state emergency management. Veto powers, especially over budget legislation, may be used by governors to influence the flow and amount of resources a state dedicates to emergency management activity. When governors prepare executive budgets, they are indicating programs and purposes they want to assign priority. This too has a major impact on state emergency management. Decisions a governor makes about state emergency management often involve political factors (i.e., jurisdictions and areas to be provided public works disaster mitigation projects, areas to receive state funds for infrastructure replacement, urban-suburban-rural distinctions in apportioning emergency management training and education resources, etc.)

If governors do not face state term limits, they may come to amass tremendous political power. Whenever a governor faces a term limit and is in his or her final term of office, they tend to lose a degree of political power. This is sometimes consequential in state emergency management. Strong governors are able to fend off state legislative interference and may be able to more easily assume temporary emergency powers. Weak governors may discover that their political rivals are trying to arrest emergency managerial control from them.

Governors and Declarations

Governors also play a key role in the presidential declaration process. When a disaster strikes, local authorities and individuals request help from private relief organizations and the from state government. If assistance is beyond their capability, the governor requests a Presidential Declaration of Major Disaster or Emergency. The governor submits an official request to the president through the FEMA Regional Director asking for federal assistance under the Stafford Act.

Usually a governor will first consult with the state Office of Emergency Management. Then, if state personnel were not involved in the local damage assessment, the governor will initiate a state-level damage assessment. Or, if it appears that the problem is beyond state and local
response capacity, the governor can ask FEMA to join state and local personnel in conducting a Preliminary Damage Assessment.

If warranted, the governor will then issue a State Declaration of Disaster, typically through an executive order or proclamation. The order usually describes the nature of the emergency, where it occurred, and the authority under which the governor makes the declaration.

If the governor decides that the disaster is overwhelming state response capability, then he or she may request a Presidential Declaration of Major Disaster or Emergency.

State legislatures are also participants in emergency management, though their roles are seldom examined or understood.

First and foremost, state legislatures propose, enact, and amend state laws which intrinsically involve matters of emergency management. State lawmakers empower state administrative agencies to undertake emergency management functions and to implement emergency management-related programs. As elected political representatives, state lawmakers have every incentive to meet the needs of their constituents and the needs of the interests which helped them win office. State legislators may hold state emergency managers accountable for their actions. Legislative hearings are often a means by which state lawmakers investigate administrative activity, supervise and oversee agency operation, seek information on agency budget requests, conduct audit functions of state programs, and publicize mismanagement or highlight the need for reform. Political issues permeate many of these proceedings and much state legislative activity.

Second, state legislatures provide the funding for state programs. A recent NEMA Report (1996) reveals that legislatures in 24 states directly appropriate funds for specific incidents after each major disaster occurs. This is an important responsibility often entailing considerable political negotiation regarding how much money will be made available and where the funds will come from to pay for the disaster. Eighteen states possess separate disaster funds (though not trust funds) and these monies are appropriated as needed to keep an adequate amount of money available at all times (i.e., this is generally referred to as a state's "RAINY DAY" fund). Only Alaska, California, and Florida (at this writing), have DISASTER TRUST FUNDS in which revenues from specified sources (i.e., a tax on insurance policies or a certain percentage of tax
receipts specified in statute) are deposited and used as needed for specified purposes. Some 12 states have more than one fund from which money may be drawn depending upon the type of disaster or emergency that has occurred. Seventeen states use other funding mechanisms for generating state funds for state programs or the non-federal share of federal programs. Some states use more than one mechanism, so the total number of states summed from each category of mechanism exceeds 50.

What is important in all this is that state legislatures are decisive in determining how prepared a state is for emergency and disaster, including how well prepared the state is to pay for disasters and emergencies. Since state legislators represent districts, rather than the entire state, they may sometimes see their areas of representation as either victims of disaster or as benefactors or donors to other areas of the state impacted by disaster. In the former instance, a legislator has every incentive to maximize state (and federal aid). The people they directly represent must be helped. In the latter instance, a legislator is pre-disposed to offer state aid (because he or she expects similar help when it is their constituents who are victims) but may do so on a cautionary basis. Needs have to be proven and justified, otherwise state resources may be redistributed unfairly or too excessively to the constituents of other legislators. Every disaster redistributes resources in some form or another, and the outcome of this redistribution is of great political importance (everyone wants to gain at someone else’s expense, no one wants to be denied aid they believe they rightly deserve).

When it comes to state level emergency management, the chief responsibilities of state governments are (See NCSL endnote 3 as well):

- Enacting emergency management legislation, codes, regulations.
- Enforcing national laws (such as Title III of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act, dealing with preparing for and responding to hazardous materials incidents).
- Applying public administration skills to state-wide planning.
- Developing and maintaining programs addressing all four phases of the disaster life cycle.
- Assisting local governments in development and maintenance of emergency management responsibilities.
- Assisting local governments in disaster response.
Each respective state emergency management organization is responsible for developing and maintaining a State Disaster Operations Plan and a State Emergency Operations Center (EOC), from which civil government officials (state, federal, municipal, and county) exercise centralized direction and control in an emergency. The EOC serves as a resource center and coordination point for additional field assistance. Officials working through an EOC provide executive directives and liaison to state and federal authorities.

The State Disaster Operations Plan is an all-hazards document specifying actions to be taken in the event of natural disasters, technological disasters, civil strife or war. It identifies authorities, relationships, and the actions to be taken by whom, what, when, and where, based on pre-determined assumptions, objectives, and existing capabilities.

Note, that under the Stafford Act, state governments, along with local government and eligible private, non-profit organizations, may submit a project application or request for direct federal assistance under the PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAM. Considerable controversy often emerges over which organization or project is eligible to receive federal "public assistance" money. Political executives at the local level often apply pressure through the president, through members of Congress (especially through members of the state's congressional delegation), or through appeals to federal administrative officials, all aimed at expediting public assistance funding in local disaster recovery.

Also, state and local governments assume major responsibilities for DAMAGE ASSESSMENT after disasters and emergencies. This is the process of determining the magnitude of damage and loss to individuals, businesses, the public sector, and the community resulting from a disaster or emergency. PRELIMINARY DAMAGE ASSESSMENT refers to the initial damage assessment performed by federal, state, and local representatives in disasters. PDAs help government officials determine the magnitude of loss and whether the need for federal disaster aid is justified.

As indicated above, governors play a key role in the DECLARATION PROCESS. When a disaster strikes, local authorities and individuals request help from private relief organizations and the state government. If assistance is beyond state capability, the governor requests a PRESIDENTIAL DECLARATION OF MAJOR DISASTER or EMERGENCY. The governor
submits an official REQUEST to the president through the FEMA Regional Director asking for federal assistance under the Stafford Act. Sometimes a governor's request is denied owing to an authorized presidential action and which is signed by the FEMA Director. This is officially referred to as a TURNDOWN.

The Bipartisan Task Force Report (1995, pp. 38-45) notes that within states, standing authority exists for the governor to take appropriate actions to ensure that a preparedness plan has been developed and that assistance is provided to stricken communities or areas. Many states have gone beyond those general statutory provisions governing emergency or disaster management to enact laws which include interstate mutual aid compacts, use of the National Guard, etc.

The Report reviews "State Expenditures." It recounts that each state receives federal assistance under the Stafford Act of 1988 and must provide a 25 percent match for federal disaster aid directed to the state, its localities, or to individuals. However, since 1985, 15 major disasters had all or part of the matching requirement waived by the president. The match for individual assistance cannot be waived. Little has been published documenting how states and localities pay their share of emergency management costs (An exception is the NEMA Report).

The Bipartisan Task Force Report highlights the role of the National Guard in response to disaster. Governors frequently activate portions of their respective state National Guards to help out in natural disasters. For example, from October 1, 1992 to September 30, 1993, National Guard units were mobilized to handle 148 natural disasters.

Waugh and Sylves outline many important aspects of state emergency management and they also critique state emergency management. They allege there is a creative tension between state emergency managers and their federal and local colleagues. State emergency managers carry a special obligation to help build and cultivate local emergency management. A symbiotic and cooperative relationship between state and local emergency managers is needed both before and after disasters. This chapter also examines, among other things, the matter of federal-state cost-sharing and proposals for reform, such as state disaster funds and deductibles to be paid by states to secure federal post-disaster assistance.

Another dimension of federal-state emergency management involves the DISASTER
PREPAREDNESS IMPROVEMENT GRANT PROGRAM. Under Section 201 of the Stafford Act, the program provides annual matching awards to states in amounts not to exceed $50,000. These awards help states improve or update their disaster assistance plans and capabilities. Political officials at the state level must decide whether or not they want to apply for these awards and whether they are willing to pay the state match.

Each state maintains an EMERGENCY OPERATIONS CENTER from which civil government officials (state, federal, municipal, and county) exercise centralized direction and control in an emergency. The EOC serves as a resource center and coordination point for additional field assistance. It facilitates executive direction and liaison with state and federal officials, and considers and mandates protective actions. Each state employs an EMERGENCY OPERATIONS PLAN that is an all-hazards document specifying actions to be taken in the event of natural disasters, technological disasters, or nuclear attack. It identifies authorities, relationships, and the actions to be taken by whom, what, when, and where based on predetermined assumptions, objectives, and existing capabilities.

FEMA/STATE AGREEMENTS are formal legal documents between FEMA and each respective state. Each contains the understandings, commitments, and binding conditions for assistance applicable as the result of the major disaster or emergency declared by the president. Each is signed by the FEMA Regional Director, or designee, and the Governor of the respective state. The GOVERNOR'S AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE is the person empowered by the governor in the FEMA/State Assistance Agreement to execute, on behalf of the state, all necessary documents for disaster assistance and to evaluate and transmit local government, eligible private non-profit facility, and state agency requests for assistance to the FEMA Regional Director following a major disaster or emergency declaration.

States are integrally involved in hazard identification, hazard mitigation, and hazards analysis. States receive a variety of pre- and post- disaster grants from FEMA aimed at HAZARD MITIGATION ASSISTANCE and support of the STATE HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN.

Under disaster or emergency circumstances, states receive from FEMA a match supported subsidy to provide supplemental assistance to individuals and families adversely affected. This is defined as INDIVIDUAL ASSISTANCE. Some forms of individual assistance are managed
exclusively by FEMA. Recall that under PUBLIC ASSISTANCE mentioned above, supplementary federal assistance is provided to state and local governments or certain private, non-profit organizations, other than assistance for the direct benefit of individuals and families.

After a disaster or emergency the governor appoints a STATE COORDINATING OFFICER who acts in cooperation with the FEDERAL COORDINATING OFFICER to administer disaster recovery efforts. States also use a STATE EMERGENCY PLAN, which outlines state-level response to emergencies and disasters and sets forth actions to be taken by state and local governments, including those for implementing federal disaster assistance.

A scholarly, timely 50-state comparative study of emergency management thus far remains unwritten. The political importance of emergency management in any single state has much to do with how that state's emergency management agencies are organized, led, staffed, empowered, and funded.

A state's disaster history explains much about its current state emergency management. Also, the ability of state emergency managers to qualify for, and secure, federal program support and funding is another important factor. Finally, relationships between state emergency managers and their local counterparts are both administrative and political. These relationships help promote in a cooperative way, efforts to gain, keep and expand necessary authority and budget resources.

State emergency management offices used to get most of their funding from FEMA. Today they are expected to pay more of their share. More states have come to recognize the benefits of using state resources to promote emergency management as disasters and their associated costs become more prevalent. Moreover, the end of the Cold War and the abolition of civil defense programs has led to a dramatic reduction in "national security" backed federal funding of even dual use (civil defense and emergency management) state and local activities. Add to this gargantuan efforts of the federal government to balance its budget, and it becomes obvious that states and localities need to cover more of the costs of routine emergency management activities at their respective levels.

The funding that FEMA provides to the states, and through them to local jurisdictions, is in jeopardy. In recent time, several states have considered alternative funding arrangements, less
dependent on FEMA, for their emergency management operations. Alaska, California, and Florida now have disaster trust funds, as mentioned.

In the mid-1990s, FEMA began to fashion Performance Partnership Agreements (PPA)/Cooperative Agreements (CA) with the states. These agreements customarily required that at least two-thirds of the money FEMA provided under the PPA/CA had to be passed on by the state to their respective local political jurisdictions. Under current policy, PPA/CAs no longer require this. Consequently, today some states have decided to keep all of the funding themselves or have pared the pass-through amounts to well less than two-thirds. This has in some cases created tension and conflict between state EM offices and local EM offices, particularly because many local EM offices are abjectly dependent on the pass-through federal funds.
Appendix 3: Local Governments and Disaster

In the U.S., local government is the heart of emergency management. Local governments assume primary responsibility for public safety, and so are the front-line public institutions which conduct the initial emergency response to a disaster or disaster threat. Local executives, elected (mayors) or appointed (city managers), usually are the lead authorities in charge of helping their jurisdiction confront the problem (unless another official is assigned that duty under law or ordinance). How local officials cope with and prepare for emergencies and disasters demonstrates their managerial competence and leadership ability, traits essential to winning and maintaining political office.

A LOCAL GOVERNMENT is any county, city, village, town, district or other political subdivision of any state, any Indian tribe, or authorized tribal organization, or Alaska Native village or organization, including any rural community or unincorporated town or village or any other public entity of a state or state political subdivision.

Local governments are responsible for developing and maintaining an Emergency Operations Plan. They plan, and when necessary, manage disaster evacuations. Localities are also responsible for providing emergency warning and emergency communication. Many local governments, manifesting sound emergency management, maintain a local Emergency Operations Center.

Local governments often possess substantial authority over land-use within their jurisdictions. This authority has a substantial impact on development and disaster mitigation activities. These are some common land-use powers.

BUILDING CODES are regulations adopted by a local governing body setting forth standards for construction, addition, modification, and repair of buildings and other structures for the purpose of protecting health, safety, and general welfare of the public. Local governments may impose sanctions for violations of their codes and ordinances.

STANDARDS represent codes, specifications, or rules required for the construction of facilities.
SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS are ordinances or regulations governing the subdivision of land with respect to such things as adequacy and suitability of building sites, utilities, and public facilities.

ZONING powers and zoning ordinances represent a form of police power that divides an area into districts and, within each district, regulates the use of land and buildings, height and bulk of buildings or other structures, and the density of population.

The political relevance of these powers is immense. Local officials entrusted with authority over these land-use instruments have the power to affect the economic growth of their jurisdictions (promoting new businesses, more jobs, expanded local tax base, etc). Correspondingly, these decisions involve judgments of disaster and hazard risk. Strong building codes may save lives and reduce property damage in the event of severe storms, strong winds, heavy snows, and flooding. Subdivision and zoning embodies responsibility for ensuring that new homes, offices, and industries are not sited in highly disaster vulnerable areas. Moreover, the nature of development and the mix and proximity of structures may have important consequences when emergencies and disasters do occur. Land use carries many opportunities to promote disaster mitigation, but often the political expedience of promoting economic growth at the expense of disaster mitigation is too tempting for authorities. Moreover, development interests often have significant political influence, particularly through the medium of campaign contributions to those seeking to win or maintain political office.

Beyond land use, local governments build, maintain, and improve infrastructure so essential to communities (i.e., bridges, roads, water systems, sewer systems, power systems, etc.) Often within their borders are dams, levees, river gauge monitoring systems, flood control works, etc. How these facilities and technologies are managed often has a profound impact on how well prepared a community is for disaster threat.

Local governments often manage sanitation, vector control, collection and disposal of toxic and pathogenic materials, regulation of underground storage tank operation, and more. These duties embody political issues as well as emergency management concerns.

Local governments often impose insurance regulations aimed at promoting public safety. Even matters as mundane as requiring smoke detectors and sprinkler systems represent local disaster mitigation activity.
Local Governmental Structure and EM

Local EM offices, like state offices, are organized in a variety of ways: sometimes as an independent agency or office reporting directly to the chief executive, sometimes under an intermediary, sometimes organized within a Fire or Police department, or sometimes buried deep within a local public agency responsible for a variety of programs.

EM staffing varies widely from part-time, unpaid volunteers, through full-time volunteers, through part-time ill-paid positions, to full-time one person shops that are either poorly paid or well paid, to well staffed full-time organizations.

Form of municipal government structure is relevant in emergency management. Under the STRONG MAYOR form of local government, a mayor usually has extensive powers to appoint and dismiss top municipal officials without the need to first gain city council permission. The mayor also has many budgetary powers in the "strong mayor" system. The strong mayor system puts few restrictions on the number of terms a mayor may serve in office. Strong mayor systems provide the opportunity for mayors to assume considerable command and control powers, especially under circumstances of emergency or disaster. However, partisan conflict may be pronounced in the strong mayor system.

Under the WEAK MAYOR form of local government, the mayor has many restrictions imposed on his or her work by the city council or other municipal authorities. The mayor may not be able to appoint many city department directors, may not be able to dismiss these directors, and may have only limited influence in preparation and execution of the budget. There may be restrictions on the mayor's ability to succeed himself or herself in office, sometimes the mayor is limited to a single term, sometimes two terms. Some domains of city administration may function independent of mayoral control (as authorities or special district governments, i.e., parking authorities, transit authorities, independent public school systems, etc.) Various local offices may be directly elected (i.e., Comptroller, Public Safety Director, Chief of Police, etc) which are otherwise mayorally appointed under the strong mayor system. Sometimes the weak mayor form of government fragments executive authority and may muddle or fracture coherent local emergency management. Local legislative bodies, city or county councils, retain primary political authority under many weak mayor systems.
Under the CITY MANAGER or manager-council form of local government, the city manager is appointed by the city council. City managers are not elected to office, but may hold much of the official power possessed by elected mayors. They are full-time professional administrators who work at the pleasure of the city council and who may be fired, sanctioned, or rewarded by the city council. They are accountable to the city council. They have limited powers of appointment but they exercise considerable influence in budgeting and program implementation. If there is a mayor at all in the city manager system, the mayor has purely ceremonial powers. The city manager and the mayor are two separate offices, the same person cannot occupy both posts at the same time. Partisanship is minimized in the city manager system and city managers are usually public administrators of the highest calibre. City managers are quite likely to understand and appreciate the importance of emergency management.

Under the COMMISSION form of local government each elected city council member heads a separate city department. One councillor heads the police department, another the fire department, another public works, another human services, another parks and recreation, and so on. Each council person has extensive appointment powers within his or her department, but each council person must compromise on matters of budgeting and general city administration with the other council people. There is no formal mayor, or the mayor has only symbolic authority. There is no professional city manager in this form of local government. There are few commission type local governments left in the U.S., and many of those which remain are likely to shift to another form, as many have already done. A key problem with this form is that by combining executive and legislative authority in the same job, department directors have an incentive to provide primary service to the local city district which elected them to office. Power is highly fragmented under the commission form and this does not bode well for the local agency coordination needed in emergency circumstances.

Waugh and Sylves examine the intergovernmental emergency management and discerns that "money" and "politics" are critical factors. Disasters carry political costs and benefits for affected communities. Local governments are essential constituencies of national emergency management. Local EM organizations are represented by the National Coordinating Council on Emergency Management (NCCEM) [Address: NCCEM, 111 Park Place, Falls Church, VA 22046. (703) 538-1795; (703) 241-5603 fax; NCCEM@aol.com]
Executive officials at the local level include mayors, city managers, county executives, city and county councillors and commissioners. They are expected to demonstrate political responsiveness in disasters and emergencies.

When a major disaster strikes a community, often it quickly becomes obvious whether outside help will be needed or not. If it appears that outside assistance will be needed, a DAMAGE ASSESSMENT is necessary. Sometimes the damage is so significant that outside help is needed to conduct the damage assessment itself. If local authorities conclude that their jurisdiction is overwhelmed, they are empowered to declare an emergency and request state assistance.

In most jurisdictions the local elected government official declares an emergency through an orderly process defined by statute, ordinance, or some form of enabling legislation. The declaration usually describes the nature of the emergency, the areas impacted, and the authority the official invokes in making the declaration. Generally, guidelines will specify varying levels of activation and emergency according to the severity and extent of the disaster or emergency. Exact procedures vary from locality to locality. When local governments experience disaster their municipal (city, county, etc) authorities are expected, if possible, to conduct a damage assessment (mentioned above), deploy as many local resources as possible, and ask for help from surrounding jurisdictions and the state.

Among duties assumed by local elected or appointed executives are:

- Mobilize resources and transfer and direct emergency personnel for emergency management purposes,
- Require and direct evacuation of all or part of the population within a disaster area,
- Prescribe routes, modes of transportation, and destinations in connection with evacuation, and prohibit certain conduct in the disaster area,
- Commandeer or use private property,
- Suspend local statutes as necessary,
- Authorize emergency spending.

There are many important professionals active in the response phase of emergency management, and who work at the county or local level. Firefighters, police, and emergency medical service workers are especially important, though there may be rivalries between these services owing to their competition over jurisdiction and budget resources.
In any disaster it is important that response agency people have a clear understanding of their roles so they can effectively coordinate their efforts, use resources efficiently, and help disaster victims. No single agency can manage a disaster effectively. In the U.S. system, the response effort requires the resources and expertise of law enforcement, the fire service, emergency medical personnel, public health and public works, and many others.

Public information following a disaster is also critical. It is essential that local officials disseminate clear and accurate public information to a diverse population in a timely manner. The information must be in language and form that all people in a community understand. In other words, in areas or communities with non-English speaking populations, public information needs to be disseminated in the languages that are spoken in those communities. Another important but often misunderstood local government disaster role involves RUMOR CONTROL. It is imperative that facts about the disaster or emergency be made public and correspondingly, rumors, hearsay, and misinformation circulating amongst the public need to be repudiated by local officials.

People expect much of their governments during emergencies and disasters. They need reassurance that their local government is doing everything possible to help disaster victims. However, local citizens often hold a different view during normal times. In normal times disasters hold LOW POLITICAL SALIENCE both in the minds of local residents and in the minds of their elected representatives.

Disasters are by their very nature high-risk, low probability events. Their infrequency makes it difficult to justify expenditure of public money in view of seemingly more pressing, on-going public needs and issues. A corollary problem of issue salience within the realm of disaster policy is traditional American opposition toward, or resistance to, national planning and regulation (especially fears of federal zoning).

Despite the best efforts of governments and volunteer organizations at all levels, it is indisputable that in a major disaster, governments and volunteer organizations cannot immediately be everywhere at once, helping everyone who needs help. It may take many hours or even days for disaster services to begin to reach all those who need assistance. Thus, it is incumbent upon government to inform citizens of this state of affairs lest they be left with a false sense of security and fail to take those actions which would help them cope with a disaster.
It is vitally important to emphasize that local governments are central organizations in disaster damage assessment. They are key in every phase of emergency management. If local government public facilities are impacted by disasters or emergencies, local officials may prove that their jurisdiction is eligible for PUBLIC ASSISTANCE and MITIGATION PROJECT ASSISTANCE. Counties often initiate the process of requesting state and federal disaster or emergency assistance. Local governments also shoulder substantial burdens in providing EMERGENCY WARNING and RISK COMMUNICATION. Local governments often maintain an EMERGENCY OPERATIONS CENTER. Local governments plan, manage, and practice EVACUATIONS and supervise SHELTERING operations. A shelter is a facility to house, feed, and care for persons evacuated from a risk area for periods of one or more days. For the risk areas, the primary shelter and the reception center are usually located in the same facility. RECEPTION CENTERS are set up to register evacuees and to assess their needs. Some evacuees may be referred to shelters. Those who stay elsewhere provide addresses where they can be contacted.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS, is a term which describes the interaction of federal, state and local officials. This includes general purpose governments as well as special district governments. General purpose governments are cities, counties, towns, or other municipal jurisdictions which collect broad based taxes to pay for a wide variety of public services. Special district governments, usually hived off from cities or counties, customarily operate to provide one or two specialized services funded from an earmarked (dedicated) single tax or sometimes user fees. In modern usage, the term also encompasses the interaction of these bodies with groups and organizations of the non-profit and private sectors.

Many policy areas and programs in the U.S. are implemented through intergovernmental relations (i.e., environmental policy, disaster policy, housing policy, social welfare policy, unemployment policy, business regulation, etc.). For example, federal, state, and local representatives in disasters clearly beyond the recovery capabilities of state and local governments produce PRELIMINARY DAMAGE ASSESSMENTS of disaster losses. This information is shared and passed between officials at each level of government. Disputes sometimes arise over the matter of what is "clearly beyond" recovery capability. Considerable political and administrative negotiations may result.
A longstanding suspicion about the nature of intergovernmental interchange after disaster is that a "beggar-thy-neighbor" syndrome occurs. Local governments impacted by disaster have every incentive to exaggerate their scales of damage in order to maximize outside state and federal post-disaster aid. If local governments pay little or no matching money for each dollar of state and federal aid they receive, they have an incentive to detail every conceivable disaster loss eligible for state and federal assistance. States also have an incentive to maximize, if not exaggerate, their magnitudes of disaster loss. With 75/25 federal/state matching aid, 75 cents of every dollar of state disaster loss may be subsidized by federal assistance. When states share their matching burden with localities, sometimes 12.5% state and 12.5% local, the state government derives even greater gain. Since the federal government carries the bulk of financial burden in paying for the public costs of presidentially declared emergencies and major disasters, it is no surprise that FEMA officials are often highly suspicious of state and local estimates of disaster loss. They sometimes suspect that state and local government officials are conspiring to maximize federal disaster dollars dispatched to their jurisdictions.

It is in these interchanges that political factors often come into play. Mayors press governors for more state and federal aid. A governor, lamenting the high costs of a disaster and the state matching shares they must produce, sometimes receives permission to borrow from the federal government the money his or her state needs to pay its own match! At least one GAO Report indicates that states frequently fail to repay all or most of the federal money they have borrowed to cover their matching share. In catastrophic disasters, governors sometimes succeed in securing from the president a higher federal match (100 percent for Florida after Hurricane Andrew and 90 percent for California after the Northridge earthquake). Such a generous federal matching share is a tremendous stimulus for state and local loss estimators.

Intergovernmental Program Management

U.S. emergency management is based on SHARED AUTHORITY, not on a top-down command and control system. FEMA cannot tell states and localities what they must do in the emergency management arena. Instead, there is a bottom-up approach wherein local political subdivisions (i.e. cities, towns and counties) are responsible for emergency management. In the U.S., disasters are managed at the local level with the support of state government as needed, followed by federal government support. State and local governments have by history, tradition,
and their own laws, been delegated authority and responsibility for disaster response. The federal government comes to the assistance of a state government when it is overwhelmed by, or incapable of, addressing a disaster. The governor asks for assistance, and a presidential disaster declaration is granted.

Fragmented government is a political challenge for disaster managers. America has a highly decentralized, federal system which, under the U.S. Constitution, affords the national government a range of authority, with some powers reserved for the states under the 10th Amendment. In some policy domains (i.e., regulation of business, education, health care, prisons, etc.) the national and state governments share authority concurrently. Similarly, local governments, though legally vestiges of their respective state government, also are afforded certain powers under Home Rule provisions approved by their states, by each state's constitution, or through enabling statutes. Thus, the need for multi-agency and multi-jurisdictional coordination challenges emergency management work.

U.S. emergency management is by its very nature intergovernmental and intercommunity. The U.S. political and social system requires coordination and cooperation between and among levels of government as well as cooperation and coordination within a community in preparing for, and responding to, a disaster.