

NHMA is happy to support Senator Kerry's efforts with regards to this proposed bill. We offer the following comments:

1. Introduction, consider adding: "To institutionalize the capabilities of Resiliency across the Federal, State, Local and Tribal communities so as to mitigate and manage pre and post event challenges to our Nation."
2. Section 1, item (b), consider adding the following language, "seek federal opportunities to support our Nation's efforts to..." after "The Purpose of this Act is to..."
3. Section 1, item (b)(1), considering adding the following language at the end of the paragraph: "and the FEMA program known as Risk MAP (Mapping Analysis and Planning) designed to empower our collective National community capabilities for reducing our National Risk Profile related to extreme or natural hazard risks and the consequences they bear."
4. Section 2, item (2), the definition of "resiliency." We hope you will consider an analysis of how this particular definition fits in with other common definitions of the term, such as the definition used by PPD-8? The term "Reposition" is not one we have often seen used.
5. We would like to see the term "mitigation" appeared more often. It only appears in the reference to cost savings (Section 1.(a)(7)). There should be a recognition that there is an existing hazard mitigation infrastructure that builds resilience and can be the foundation for the programs being promoted. For example, Section 3.(b)(2) could read:

(2) create summaries of the existing efforts and programmatic work underway on extreme weather resilience, including related work on disaster resilience and natural hazard mitigation programs and activities, for each sector identified under paragraph (1) and across the sectors, specifically including summaries of—
6. We would like to suggest that local government be given a voice in the Interagency Working Group.
7. Section 3, item (a)(1), replace the Director of the Office of Science and Technology with: "Assistant Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency specifically within the Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration".
8. Section 3, item (a)(2)(a), add the Director of the Office of Science and Technology to the list.
9. Section 3, item (a)(4), replace "Director" with "Assistant Administrator". Replace future references as well.
10. Perhaps "hazard mitigation" could be identified as a key sector in Section 3.(b)(1). We view it as part of, but different from, emergency management, so perhaps it could be added to (G) Emergency Management.

11. We suggest adding “planning, land use, and development management” to the list of key sectors. The current list is reactive and is missing the involvement of a proactive sector.
12. In Section 3. (b) (2) (c) we would recommend that the list include academic institutions and professional associations as well.
13. It’s hard to tell what the advisory committee in Section 3.(b)(6) is for. We recommend clarifying why should there be something different from the interagency working group? Why is it under GSA and not the “Director?” The Office of Science and Technology Policy is in the White House – the best place for a coordinator of agencies and input. Also, regarding the membership of the advisory committee we recommend the inclusion of social science within academia.
14. While the proposal is laudatory, there doesn’t seem to be any funding for it. There is also a major report expected that will include a lot of research and it has to be done in a relatively short period of time (14 months). A lot of the time allowed will be used up in organizing the various committees and parceling out work. We recommend that some additional thought be given to this challenge.