

RR NO.

13670

Federal Emergency Management Agency Office of Civil Defense



FY 1990 Congressional Civil Defense Testimony

March 1989

**Federal Emergency
Management Agency
Office of Civil Defense**

**FY 1990
Congressional
Civil Defense
Testimony**

March 1989



CONTENTS

The following are the texts of statements delivered before Congressional committees in support of the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Fiscal Year 1990 civil defense authorization and appropriation requests.

Statement of FEMA Director Julius W. Becton, Jr., before the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities of the House Armed Services Committee	1
Statement of Craig Alderman, Jr., Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, DoD, before the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities of the House Armed Services Committee	19
Statement of Joseph F. Myers, president of the National Emergency Management Association, before the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities of the House Armed Services Committee	23
Statement of Avagene Moore, past president, National Coordinating Council on Emergency Management, before the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities of the House Armed Services Committee	25

TESTIMONY OF THE HONORABLE JULIUS W. BECTON, JR.
DIRECTOR, FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON MILITARY INSTALLATIONS AND FACILITIES
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 15, 1989

FISCAL YEAR 1990 CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Madam Chairwoman and members of the Subcommittee, I greatly appreciate being able to appear before you today as you consider the Fiscal Year 1990 Civil Defense budget.

I said at last year's civil defense budget hearing that our 1989 budget would be a watershed for civil defense—and it was. Last year this committee confirmed this country's historical commitment to provide for the common defense of the American people against the possibility of nuclear attack and catastrophic peacetime emergencies. Your recommendation to the full House to approve \$160 million for civil defense gave FEMA the opportunity to begin significant improvements in the national civil defense program—improvements we hope, with your help, we can continue in Fiscal Year 1990 and beyond.

FEMA's FY 1990 civil defense budget request is for \$151,535,000—an increase of about four percent over the FY 1989 current estimate. In considering this request, it should be kept in mind that—AS WITH THE TOTAL FY 1989 BUDGET—over three out of every four budget dollars requested—or about 76 percent of all monies—are

in the form of direct support to State and local civil defense emergency management organizations by grants, including 50-50 matching funds, or FEMA-funded resources and services. Thus, the FY 1990 request includes an increase in State and local support of \$4,785,000 over FY 1989.

Let me briefly outline why I believe your continued support is necessary for the national civil defense program.

I. THE FRAMEWORK OF THE NATIONAL CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRAM

As you well know, our course has been charted by both law and Presidential policy. In accord with both the letter and spirit of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, we will continue to wholeheartedly support all-hazard civil defense with the clear understanding that meeting attack priorities must come first. Both the law and Presidential policy are clear as to the direction civil defense in this Nation will take. Both recognize that State and local governments have responsibilities to serve their citizens through all-hazard disaster and attack preparedness.

In FY 1990 we have realigned the framework under which the civil defense program operates to achieve both peacetime and attack preparedness with emphasis on the Presidential policy to achieve a minimally capable, barebones national civil defense program. While this does pose more risk than fully capable civil defense programs, I submit that it is a reasonable approach for many years to come, with real increases in the capability of our civil defense program.

The Administration aims at building "minimum-essential" capabilities that can respond to all types of national security emergencies, including nuclear attack. This approach develops and maintains baseline capabilities in peacetime which could be rapidly expanded by crisis "surge" actions in a time of increasing international tension or a slow crisis buildup.

The rationale underlying this policy is to improve baseline capabilities which cannot be deferred because of long lead-times in place to build upon during a crisis surge and to defer other costs. The civil defense program outlined to you last year emphasized that planning and strategies required to rapidly remedy shortfalls (like upgrading communications systems and emergency operating centers, recruiting and training more radiological monitors and shelter managers) CAN be deferred in order to cut current program costs. FEMA's FY 1990 civil defense budget continues to reflect that strategy.

Let us not forget, however, that civil defense based on surge actions does impose more risk. It is a concession to what is feasible and sustainable over the long term. Full capabilities, such as have been proposed previously, are clearly not going to be funded in a sustainable fashion. A "surge" civil defense program is critically dependent on time—we estimate two-to-twelve months—and a timely and courageous decision to initiate surge activities

based on a correct interpretation of a deteriorating international situation. Such a strategy is obviously inadequate to respond to a surprise attack or to a rapidly developing crisis, OR if the Federal Government—for whatever reason—fails to act decisively while there is still time to make the necessary improvements to civil defense capabilities.

Those caveats understood, our civil defense program is the best insurance we can buy under constrained budget levels.

The capability building outlined in Presidential policy is a reemphasis and realignment of existing programs rather than a new program. Let me discuss our FY 1990 budget in terms of how our programs will be aligned to directly support Presidential policy objectives, namely, Survivable Crisis Management, Improved Population Protection, and Maintenance and Improvement of the Civil Defense Emergency Management Infrastructure; and those civil defense programs which indirectly support those objectives. I believe you will see—as our State and local participants in the budget process saw—that this approach will give a clearer insight on how our \$151,535,000 request will be spent to achieve specific national security objectives.

II. INVOLVEMENT OF STATE AND LOCAL EMERGENCY MANAGERS AND OFFICERS

I believe that another reason you endorsed our FY 1989 budget request was the strong and clear support for the administration's approach voiced by State and local civil defense emergency managers and their national emergency management organizations. State and local emergency managers and their organizations have again participated in developing the budget you have before you today. We have discussed program priorities with

them as well as conferred on how much funding they will need to commit to achieve necessary emergency capabilities—capabilities which will mutually benefit State and local peacetime preparedness as well as national security. The States and localities recognize that FEMA remains committed to the all-hazard approach to building Federal, State and local civil defense capabilities and you will hear support for this approach from the testimony of those who almost daily practice peacetime disaster preparedness on the State and local “front lines.”

III. PRIORITIES ADDRESSED BY THE FY 1990 CIVIL DEFENSE BUDGET

Our State and local partners have helped us focus the FY 1990 civil defense budget toward addressing the priority of “capability-building.” I mentioned earlier that administration policy defers a major portion of the costs involved in building a full-scale national civil defense capability; instead, it emphasizes building minimally essential capabilities that **MUST** be in place—a national base capability upon which the remaining capabilities can be surged in a crisis. In addition to developing plans and strategies for expanding civil defense capabilities by surge actions, the civil defense program budget before you concentrates on three priority goals set by the Administration.

A. SURVIVABLE CRISIS MANAGEMENT

The first priority addressed in the FY 1990 civil defense budget is to develop State and local survivable crisis management capabilities. State and local governments must be able to continue to carry out emergency response operations for the population under all types of attack conditions. They must be able to perform fire suppression; search and rescue; debris removal; and restoration or repair of vital public services like water, waste

disposal, and electric power. And they must be able to broadcast lifesaving information over survivable communication systems before and throughout an attack on protective actions citizens can take to avoid injury or death. Our citizens rightfully demand these services of their State and local governments in peacetime. How much greater would be their need for these same services before, during, and following a nuclear attack?

State and local governments also play a crucial role in the continuity of our constitutional government; without their survival, the national government as a viable entity would cease to exist. All levels of government—Federal, State, and local—share responsibilities to ensure that constitutional government continues and that critical missions to this end can be completed regardless of the crisis which threatens. These capabilities can be accomplished only by the development of a survivable crisis management system at all levels of government.

B. IMPROVED POPULATION PROTECTION

A second Administration priority addressed by the FY 1990 civil defense budget is improving the population protection capabilities of State and local governments. Either as a complement to, or in the absence of a strategic defense against ballistic missiles, government will still have to provide its citizens with one or the other protective option: evacuation (either spontaneous or directed) away from areas at risk to direct nuclear weapon effects; or adequate shelter against such effects. Shelter against the radiation risk—or fallout—following an attack is needed regardless of whether blast shelter or evacuation plans are developed. Our budget continues to provide emphasis on State and local planning for both in-place protection (when this is feasible) and support of localized spontaneous and controlled (planned) evacuation.

The budget also reflects initiatives for giving citizens greater help in planning and preparing for their own protection. This will be through improved information on attack hazards and the kinds of protective measures they can take to mitigate those hazards, and by programs that encourage citizens and private organizations to voluntarily participate in community civil defense. Our critics have called this a cop-out; it is not. I submit that if civil defense were given ALL the resources it needed to build a full-scale national capability, the cornerstone of that system is still knowledgeable citizens prepared to act in time of crisis.

C. MAINTENANCE OF STATE AND LOCAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT INFRASTRUCTURE

Under the third priority of maintaining the State and local emergency management infrastructure, FEMA will continue to provide matching funds for State and local civil defense emergency management organization personnel. The funds provide for administrative costs, as well as new emphasis on professional development training for civil defense emergency management staffs and public officials, and private sector citizen "self-help" training.

D. FEDERAL-LEVEL SUPPORT

FEMA will devote \$25,810,000 to provide Federal-level support to State and local governments toward building a national security emergency and peacetime emergency operations capability through the National Telecommunications and Warning program and the maintenance of a headquarters automatic data processing system.

* * * * *

In summary, FEMA is seeking \$151,535,000 in FY 1990 to improve the Nation's civil defense

capabilities based on Presidential priorities and objectives:

FEMA CIVIL DEFENSE BUDGET REQUEST FOR FY 1990	
(Dollars in Thousands)	
<u>NSDD 259 Priority/Support</u>	<u>1990 Request</u>
Survivable Crisis Management	\$ 25,443
Population Protection	\$ 20,494
Infrastructure Maintenance	\$ 79,788
Federal-Level Support	\$ 25,810
 Total, Civil Defense (Budget Authority)	 \$ 151,535

I must point out again that over three of every four dollars requested—or about 76 percent (\$114,941,000)—are in the form of direct support to State and local emergency management organizations by money grants, 50-50 matching funds, or FEMA-funded resources or services.

In summary, Madam Chairwoman and members of the subcommittee, I request your consideration and approval of the FY 1990 civil defense budget that we are requesting in light of how I have outlined that budget will be spent, namely, in pursuit of Administration policy to the benefit of State and local preparedness for any emergency, including nuclear attack.

The civil defense resources you grant FEMA for FY 1990 will be used—in partnership with State and local governments—to help ensure the safety and protection of our people and its system of government.

Attached is a detailed description of the FY 1990 civil defense budget request as it relates to Presidential priorities and objectives. Because of the variances between the civil defense budget structure and these priorities and objectives, please

note that the figures cited do not always correlate exactly with the budget line items. They are intended to provide a crosswalk to indicate the

level of effort in the civil defense budget that is dedicated to the priorities and objectives of the Administration.

Attachment

ADMINISTRATION PRIORITIES AND PROGRAM ELEMENTS

A. SURVIVABLE CRISIS MANAGEMENT

The basic goal of our program for State and local survivable crisis management is to provide each State with the capabilities to fulfill critical missions and provide essential emergency services in an attack emergency as well as in other natural and technological disaster situations.

The "package" of civil defense program elements which contributes to survivable crisis management at State and local government levels includes emergency operating centers (EOCs), all necessary communications and warning equipment, survivable radio broadcast stations, radiological defense equipment, and trained EOC and emergency service personnel.

FEMA will devote approximately 16 percent—\$25,443,000—of its FY 1990 civil defense budget request toward achieving a national capability for survivable crisis management for all State governments. Of this amount, almost three out of every four dollars requested for survivable crisis management are in the form of passthrough monies to State and local governments, either by direct grants, 50-50 matching funds, or Federally funded services.

The remaining funds requested for survivable crisis management support salaries and expenses to provide State and local governments with technical guidance, assistance, and support. A summary of the civil defense programs or program elements contributing to this capability follows:

FY 1990 CD Budget for Survivable Crisis Management (Dollars in Thousands)	
<u>CD Program or Program Element</u>	<u>FY 1990 Request</u>
Emergency Operating Centers	\$ 5,804
State and Local Telecommunications and Warning	\$ 1,669
Emergency Broadcast System	\$ 5,606
Electromagnetic Pulse Protection	\$ 2,360
Radiological Defense Planning and Development	\$ 3,324
Radiological Instrument Engineering and Acquisition	\$ 4,608
Individual Mobilization Augmentees	\$ 2,072
 Total, Survivable Crisis Management (Budget Authority)	 \$ 25,443

1. Emergency Operating Centers

The first essential requirement for State and local crisis management is for Emergency Operating Centers (EOCs) from which emergency operations can be conducted in relative safety. The civil defense EOC program provides technical assistance to States and localities on the design, development, and completion of an EOC, including new construction and the upgrading of existing EOCs to protect against fallout radiation.

The national objective of this Administration priority is the development of a MINIMUM SPAN-OF-CONTROL EOC network in each State. This network will be made up of facilities capable of surviving in a radiation environment brought about

by a nuclear attack (with the same level of protection afforded citizens in designated fallout shelters) and will provide a basis for continuous operation during all phases of the crisis. To support this objective, FEMA is requesting \$5,804,000, of which \$5,000,000 is for 50-50 matching of State and local funds for construction of necessary EOCs at State and appropriate local sites.

In FY 1990 we intend to continue to build on the lessons learned from a Statewide prototype EOC network study funded in FY 1988. More projects of this sort will be funded this fiscal year, FY 1989, and in FY 1990. We are currently studying requests for other survivable crisis management prototype projects from 19 states.

The first prototype project, conducted in Alabama at a cost of approximately \$1,100,000, designed a complete Statewide survivable crisis management network including a new State EOC. This project and the ones funded in FY 1989 will give us the experience necessary to assist States to build networks tailored to their individual needs in the outyears at the most reasonable costs.

In developing this national, minimum span-of-control survivable crisis management network we will focus on the States with survivable State and local EOCs in-place, developing only missing capabilities needed for a complete network. Where this crisis management capability is low or non-existent (and there are States in this category), the development of minimum State networks requires several more years of Federal guidance and assistance from the civil defense EOC program.

2. State & Local Telecommunications & Warning

Without adequate telecommunications and warning capabilities in the State EOC network the

Administration priority to assure a survivable crisis management will not be met. The civil defense program for State and local telecommunications and warning therefore provides necessary, survivable, dedicated, and reliable telecommunications and warning capabilities that are designed to assure continuous operation during all phases of a national security or other type of emergency situation.

To build this State and local telecommunications and warning capability, FEMA requests \$1,669,000, of which \$1,150,000 is for 50-50 matching funds to States and localities for establishing and upgrading telecommunications and warning systems in State and selected local EOCs.

Although a number of State and local EOCs already have some of the telecommunications and warning capabilities required for a survivable crisis management network, this program provides a complete capability. Requirements vary but essential capabilities can be summarized as follows:

- Telecommunications between government levels—the next higher level government, the next lower level and with adjacent governments. In the case of State emergency operations, this means the ability to communicate with FEMA regions, with State operational area EOCs within the State and, if necessary, with adjacent State EOCs.
- Means to communicate emergency warning to the public via the Emergency Broadcast System or through outdoor and other appropriate warning systems.
- Lastly, protection against the effects of the electromagnetic pulse generated by nuclear weapon detonations.

3. *Emergency Broadcast System*

Approximately 926 selected broadcast stations of the 11,000 comprising the national Emergency Broadcast System (EBS) require protection to ensure their survivability and meet minimum national needs in a national security emergency. The EBS is designed for crisis communication with the public from Federal, State and local governments during a national security emergency, but is also used extensively by State and local governments to broadcast emergency information in other disasters. For national security emergency purposes, the objective of this element is to ensure its survivability, necessary because the EBS is intended to be used during trans- and post-attack periods for the President to speak to the Nation. Additionally, the EBS will be used to provide emergency information at State and local levels during these critical periods.

To support the EBS station protection program, FEMA is requesting \$5,606,000, of which \$5,061,000 is for financial assistance to approximately 101 priority broadcast stations in the national network for equipment maintenance and upgrading as well as for protection against fallout radiation hazards. Since funding for this program was resumed in FY 1988, 30 key stations have been fully protected.

4. *Other State and Local Direction, Control and Warning*

An important element of the FY 1990 civil defense program is Electromagnetic Pulse (EMP) Protection. The objective of this element, which is to ensure the survivability of all telecommunications and warning equipment, essential life support and alternative power sources, as well as continued operation of the EBS through the installation of devices that prevent damage to communication equipment from the electromagnetic pulse gener-

ated by the detonation of nuclear weapons. EMP protection helps ensure continuous operational capability during all phases of a national security emergency. In addition, as an example of this program element's dual-use applications, FEMA has evidence that lightning strikes on EMP-protected communications facilities produced minimal or no damage to sensitive equipment. This protection offered considerable cost savings since repairs, in most instances, were limited to the replacement of EMP protection devices while the original communications capability was maintained. Approximately \$800,000 will be used to provide EMP protection at State and local levels. The remaining program funds in this budget line item are to support the continued maintenance and service of existing essential telecommunications elements in the survivable crisis management system.

To add these vital capabilities to the Presidential policy of survivable crisis management, FEMA is requesting \$2,360,000, of which \$2,100,000 is to be used for: (1) financial assistance to States for the installation of devices that provide EMP protection for vital telecommunications and life-support equipment in the State and local EOCs and key EBS stations within the State; (2) to match State and local expenditures for maintenance, repairs and replacement equipment; and (3) model projects and guidance to assist States and localities in coordinating planning for Emergency Service providers to improve response capabilities.

5. *Radiological Defense Planning and Development*

The Radiological Defense (RADEF) Planning and Development element in the FY 1990 civil defense budget allows State and local governments to develop, implement and maintain capabilities to determine, assess, and take action on the risk from fallout radiation following a nuclear attack. This

information is essential in providing both the public and operational decisionmakers information on the threat. To support this element, FEMA is requesting \$3,324,000, of which \$3,067,000 represents funds for State and local government RADEF programs. The bulk of these program funds (\$2,967,000) is for continuing fully-funded State Radiological Defense Officer (RDO) positions in each State which are required to develop and maintain the minimum essential ("baseline") RADEF capability. On State and local EOC emergency staffs, these RDOs provide officials with the expertise necessary to assess a fallout radiation threat following nuclear attack and advise on courses of government actions such as emergency public information on how to deal with the threat. These State RDOs also manage the baseline RADEF program in the State, including preparations for and response to peacetime radiological incidences.

The remaining \$100,000 in this budget line item will be used in FY 1990 for Federal guidance to the States on developing RADEF programs to support crisis management, on civil defense surge concepts, and on the use of current detection instruments and devices in peacetime radiological incidents, and to revise operational and technical guidance to the States as well as Federal departments and agencies.

6. Radiological Instrumentation

In FY 1990 FEMA will continue research and development in state-of-the-art radiological detection instruments. Radiological instruments are the "eyes" that would permit survivors to "see" an otherwise invisible threat to their health in a post-attack environment: fallout radiation. These instruments enable survivors in a post-attack environment to detect and measure the hazard around them and, hence, to take appropriate pro-

tective measures to increase their chances of survival.

In FY 1990 funding provides for engineering support for instrument development and maintenance, logistical support, and the procurement of new instruments. The FEMA request of \$4,608,000 includes \$2,350,000 for procurement of new instrumentation required for developing a base level RADEF capability in support of State and local survival crisis management. Initiatives in this program will include: procurement of additional high range (0 to 200 Roentgens) dosimeters which continues procurement begun in FY 1989; initiation of procurement of chargers for dosimeters; and initiation of procurement of wide-range ratemeters which support both a crisis management base capability and responses to peacetime radiological incidences. These procurements are necessary to develop both a capability for mobilization and surge production and to meet base level instrument requirements in support of survivable crisis management at State and local levels.

7. Individual Mobilization Augmentees

An important addition to State and local agencies as well as to Federal facilities is provided by military reservists across the country who participate in the Individual Mobilization Augmentee (IMA) program. This program provides funds for military reservists to support Federal, State and local activities in planning for and exercising continuity of government capabilities in peacetime. When activated in a national emergency, these same reservists would augment mobilized Federal, State, and local EOC staffs for emergency operations.

To support this objective, FEMA is requesting \$2,072,000, of which \$1,500,000 covers reimbursements to the Department of Defense military services for the duty pay of approximately 650 IMA reservists.

B. ENHANCED POPULATION PROTECTION

The second administration priority supported by the FY 1990 civil defense budget is improved protection for the people of the United States during any emergency: natural, technological, or attack. The "package" of civil defense programs and program elements which comprises this priority includes fully-funded planners for State civil defense emergency management staffs; the identification of public shelter for protection against fallout radiation, as well as against natural and technological disasters; programs designed to foster volunteer participation in State and local civil defense programs from individuals and groups; information on attack, natural, and technological hazards as well as on protective actions citizens can take to protect themselves; and the development of emergency public information programs.

FEMA will devote \$20,494,000 of the FY 1990 civil defense budget request toward improving population protection in States and localities. Of this amount, almost three out of every four dollars requested will be provided to State and local governments either through fully-funded programs, 50-50 matching funds, or as Federal services to States and localities.

The remaining funds requested support salaries and expenses that are necessary to provide State and local governments with technical guidance, assistance, and support in the development of population protection for their citizens. A summary of the civil defense programs or program elements contributing to the achievement of this goal follows:

FY 1990 Budget for Enhancement of Population Protection (Dollars in Thousands)	
<u>CD Program or Program Element</u>	<u>1990 Request</u>
Population Protection	\$11,504
Facility Survey, Engineering and Development	\$ 5,420
Family Protection	\$ 525
Policy and Planning	\$ 1,187
Emergency Public Information	\$ 1,858
 Total, Enhanced Population Protection (Budget Authority)	 \$20,494

1. Population Protection

To support State and local government planning for population protection in all emergencies, FEMA provides 100 percent funding for State planners. In FY 1990 FEMA is requesting \$11,504,000, of which \$8,400,000 covers the costs of maintaining fully-funded planners on State emergency management agency staffs. These State-employed planners work directly with all non-civil defense localities within the State in the development of all-hazard emergency operations plans as well as provide technical training to local emergency management personnel on planning for government preparedness and population protection. In FY 1990 FEMA will continue to emphasize the development of plans for all hazards which might face the States or localities, with particular emphasis on developing population protection plans to mitigate the effects of nuclear attack. The remaining monies requested for this budget line item will support salaries and expenses necessary to provide State and local governments with technical planning guidance, assistance, and support.

2. Facility Survey, Engineering, and Development

Shelter is an important protective action a government can provide its citizens against the effects of a wide range of disasters. In FY 1990, FEMA will continue to identify shelters, building on the present shelter data base, that may be needed in the event of a nuclear attack. Although emphasizing protection against attack hazards, many shelters identified within the State can provide some protection against other hazards as well.

Funding for this program will be aimed at ensuring that some 3,400 jurisdictions in all States will be surveyed by the end of FY 1993, and the level of funding FEMA is requesting, if supported, will accomplish this schedule. Priority survey funds will be granted to States based upon FEMA's own nuclear attack risk assessments.

For the Facility Survey, Engineering, and Development Program, FEMA is requesting \$5,420,000 in the FY 1990 civil defense budget. Of this amount, approximately \$3,918,000 will be given to States to accomplish necessary shelter surveys and to provide engineering technical support to the emergency management programs within the State. The remaining funds in this budget line item will be used to maintain the national shelter database, provide technical assistance and support to the States in the conduct of surveys, and to continue to develop a state-of-the-art shelter engineering and development program nationwide.

On completion in 1993, the developed shelter database will provide the minimum base to be maintained upon which additional shelter can be identified. During a crisis situation, shelters can be marked and prepared for habitation and, where necessary under the surge concept, may be upgraded to provide adequate fallout protection.

3. Family Protection

This "new" element specifically addresses the Presidential policy objective that requires more individual and private organization involvement in State and local civil defense activities and greater access by citizens to information on hazards. Family Protection consists of programs that stress volunteer assistance to civil defense; information on natural, technological, and attack threats facing the citizen; and emergency information and instructions to the citizen on actions to take to minimize or avoid injury or death in disaster environments, including nuclear attack.

Another related aspect of population preparedness addressed by this budget line item will be the study and development of necessary State and local planning for sustaining survivors following a nuclear attack and for post-attack recovery.

In support of the Family Protection Program, FEMA is requesting \$525,000. The total sum (salaries and expenses to be absorbed by current staffing) will be used for the development of materials and guidance for State and local emergency management agencies: (1) to foster voluntary participation by citizens in local activities in all disaster situations; (2) to provide information to the public on all disaster threats; and (3) to develop plans for sustaining survivors and for post-attack recovery following nuclear attack. Appropriations for this program in FY 1988 and FY 1989 sponsored two volunteer and self-help conferences involving national volunteer organizations that helped formulate a basis for approaches to implement a national program. In addition, a civil defense speaker's kit was developed in FY 1989 to assist State and local emergency organizations, private organizations and the general public on preparedness measures for nuclear attack and other natural and technological disasters. Our FY

1990 request for the Family Protection Program continues to expand such efforts.

4. Policy and Planning

The last budget line item contributing to the administration priority of Population Protection is the Civil Defense Policy and Planning element. While this element provides the theoretical basis for all civil defense strategies, policies and programs, it also supports the development of population protection capabilities at State and local levels through specific studies. (An example would be the development of peacetime disaster mass care and emergency medical response systems which will form the basis for similar but expanded strategies to respond during a national security emergency.)

To support the civil defense policy and planning program element in FY 1990, FEMA is requesting \$1,187,000, of which over half will be devoted to planning and the development strategies for the implementation of all civil defense program priorities, including population protection.

5. Emergency Public Information

The principal goal of the emergency public information element—funded at \$1,858,000 in the FY 1990 budget request—is to improve the abilities of Federal, State, and local governments to provide critical information to the public during a national security emergency. Emphasis will be placed on developing standby materials to be printed and disseminated during a crisis surge period when public demand for such information would increase dramatically. Information included in these materials will cover all-hazard threats facing the public, medical self-help instruction and guidance, and business and industry preparedness guidance.

C. MAINTENANCE OF THE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT INFRASTRUCTURE

The third priority supported by the FY 1990 Civil Defense Budget is the maintenance and enhancement of existing State and local government civil defense emergency management infrastructures. The bulk of funds supporting this priority is funded under the Emergency Management Assistance program, which provides matching funds for the personnel salaries and expenses at State and local emergency management agencies which plan and prepare for their government's response to all disasters, including nuclear attack.

Also vital to the maintenance of the emergency management infrastructure are the civil defense training and education programs, the State radio-logical instrument maintenance and calibration program, and the FEMA emergency assessment system. FEMA will devote \$79,788,000 toward improving and maintaining existing State and local emergency management infrastructures. Of this amount, approximately \$71,138,000 will be used for direct grants, 50-50 matching funds, and other Federal services to State and local governments. The remaining funds will be used to develop and administer Federal-State Comprehensive Cooperative Agreements which serve as FEMA's instrument for obligation of Federal funds and transfers to the States to develop, monitor and assess program management standards; and to provide training and education for State and local emergency managers, public officials, and the private sector.

A summary of civil defense programs and program elements contributing to the achievement of this priority follows:

**FY 1990 Budget for Maintenance of
the Emergency Management Infrastructure**
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>CD Program or Program Element</u>	<u>1990 Request</u>
Emergency Management Assistance	\$ 61,867
Training and Education	\$ 10,523
Radiological Instrument Maintenance and Calibration	\$ 6,016
Emergency Assessment System	\$ 1,382
 Total, Maintenance of the Emergency Management Infrastructure (Budget Authority)	 \$ 79,788

1. Emergency Management Assistance

Emergency Management Assistance provides funding for the civil defense personnel and administrative expenses of State and local emergency management officials. It is the cornerstone of our Nation's dual-use infrastructure in that it supports the emergency management professionals who day to day prepare their communities against all

types of emergencies and who are there to respond when disaster strikes. Emergency Management Assistance funds are provided on a matching basis to approximately 2,700 jurisdictions, the 50 State governments, the District of Columbia, and all U.S. territories. The combined population of these participating jurisdictions represents about 83 percent of the national population. To fund this assistance, FEMA is requesting \$61,867,000 in FY 1990, of which \$59,123,000 will be used by State and local governments to match their own contributions for personnel salaries, expenses and administrative expenses.

2. Training & Education

The primary target audiences of the varied training offered by the Civil Defense Training and Education program are State and local emergency managers, government officials, and government emergency services personnel.

To support the civil defense all-hazard Training and Education program, FEMA is requesting \$10,523,000. (This is a decrease of \$1,946,000 from the FY 1989 budget, reflecting the effect of the transfer of \$2,298,000 from the Training and Education program of the civil defense budget to the Training and Fire Programs activity of the FEMA budget, consolidating all funds for site administration of the National Emergency Training Center.)

Approximately \$5,700,000 (or about 46 percent of the civil defense Training and Education Program request) will provide direct support to States through 100 percent funding of State Exercise Officers and training activities for State, local and private sector personnel involved in civil defense preparedness activities. The remaining funds will support: (1) the preparation of instructional programs and course materials; and (2) the financing of resident training programs at the Emergency Management Institute at FEMA's National Emergency Training Center in Emmitsburg, Maryland.

In addition to the above funds, approximately \$1,815,000 are provided for the preparation of emergency public information materials.

These three training and education elements support the civil defense training needs of State and local emergency management organizations to build all-hazard operational capabilities. FEMA develops instructional programs and materials to provide:

- Greater knowledge and improved skills for all-hazard disaster operations for State and local emergency managers, public officials and volunteers.
- Nuclear attack procedures designed to implement the objectives of Presidential policy; and
- Support for long-range curriculum planning, program evaluation and documentation including improved use of computer technology in instruction and in State and local emergency management.

FEMA's Field Training Deployment System supports a nationwide civil defense emergency management training infrastructure at the State level which delivers courses and other training and exercising activities developed at the Emergency Management Institute to State and local target audiences. This program provides financial assistance to the States to support State emergency training and exercise activities as well as to support State personnel engaged in such efforts. The cadre of State instructors supported by this program element is the base upon which additional instructors can be trained in a national security emergency.

The resident program element supports student participation in courses, seminars and workshops at the Emergency Management Institute. Students (about 3,000 yearly) include Federal, State, and local civil defense emergency management professionals and volunteers as well as public officials from across the Nation.

3. Radiological Instrumentation

The current stock of RADEF instruments in the States must be routinely inspected (operationally

checked) and periodically calibrated to assure proper functioning in a crisis. To accomplish this objective, FEMA's request provides \$5,400,000 to fully fund State maintenance and calibration facilities as well as approximately 131 full-time State technicians for the annual inspection, maintenance, and calibration of one-quarter of the national inventory of 4.3 million instruments.

4. Emergency Assessment System

The Emergency Assessment System provides for the operation, maintenance, and continued development of an automated information system to allow FEMA to assess civil defense program management. The system assesses State and local vulnerability to attack and non-attack hazards, their capabilities to respond to such hazards, and their ongoing efforts to enhance preparedness capabilities or reduce hazard risk, or both. A central database of information from over 3,300 State and local governments is the core of the system. This database allows FEMA to manage the civil defense program and the activities of the participants in the system.

To support this activity in FY 1990, FEMA is requesting \$1,382,000 for the continued maintenance and operation of the Hazard Identification Capability Assessment/Multi-Year Development Plan database, as well as improvements to enhance response time and accessibility of the system to all users at State and local levels.

D. FY 1990 FEDERAL-LEVEL SUPPORT OF ADMINISTRATION CD PRIORITIES

FEMA implements and maintains two Federal-level program initiatives which provide support to all Administration civil defense priorities and to the overall development of national security emer-

gency operational capabilities at State and local government levels: the National Telecommunications and Warning program and the maintenance of a headquarters automatic data processing capability to support the civil defense program.

FEMA will devote \$25,810,000 to provide Federal-level support to State and local governments toward building a national security emergency and peacetime emergency operations capability. Of this amount, approximately \$16,167,000 will provide direct support services to States to improve their ability for emergency operations. A summary of the Federal-level civil defense programs or program elements that contribute to and support State and local emergency operations is as follows:

which offer direct operational support to State and local emergency management agencies during both peacetime disaster operations and emergency operations during a national security emergency. These NEMS systems, which in most cases include State as well as local participation, include the following:

- a. National Warning System (NAWAS)/Washington Area Warning System (WAWAS) - In FY 1990, FEMA will continue to operate the NAWAS as the only dedicated, commercially-leased, nationwide voice telephone warning system in the Nation. The WAWAS is a separate system funded by FEMA to provide a unified warning system for the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area.

Operated on a 24-hour basis, the NAWAS special purpose telephone circuits transmit attack warnings from the North American Air Defense Command to approximately 2,126 terminals throughout the Nation including terminals located at FEMA Headquarters and Regions; selected Federal departments and agencies; military installations; and State and local government facilities. The NAWAS system has also been used extensively by FEMA and by State and local governments for warning the public of natural or technological disasters.

FEMA will be undertaking a cost-benefit analysis of the NAWAS and WAWAS systems to determine the status of the existing equipment and the requirements for an upgraded or new system.

- b. FEMA Switched Network (FSN) - In FY 1990, FEMA is requesting funding for the installation and maintenance of new FSN equipment in State EOCs. This capability at State operational levels will provide a link into an autonomous communications network (under

FY 1990 Budget for Federal-Level Support of Administration CD Priorities (Dollars in Thousands)	
<u>CD Program or Program Element</u>	<u>1990 Request</u>
Telecommunications & Warning Headquarters Automatic Data Processing	\$ 23,686
Processing	\$ 2,124
Total, Federal-Level Support to Administration CD Priorities (Budget Authority)	\$ 25,810

1. Telecommunications & Warning Support

FEMA is requesting funds to continue the development of its National Emergency Management System (NEMS) to provide the most responsive, reliable, and survivable communications, automatic data processing, and information systems. For FY 1990, FEMA is requesting a total of \$23,686,000 to support NEMS development, of which \$16,167,000 covers system improvements

FEMA control) for use during day-to-day operations, natural disaster operations, and other crisis situations including nuclear attack. Eventually, the FSN will be configured as an electronic tandem voice and data telecommunications system, thus incorporating State emergency operations into a nationwide system.

c. FEMA National Radio System (FNARS) - This dedicated high-frequency emergency voice and record communications system is designed to provide survivable communications among FEMA Regions, Federal, State and local government EOCs. The system is government-owned with equipment installed in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and U.S. territories and possessions. FNARS provides the States a survivable augmentation to the FSN since FEMA provides for the purchase, installation, and maintenance of equipment, and for protection against electromagnetic pulse (EMP) in a nuclear attack environment.

In FY 1990, FEMA is requesting funds for the purchase of ancillary equipment; antenna upgrading and survivability; military assistance for installation and maintenance of equipment; installation of EMP devices in State EOCs; systems engineering, operation and maintenance of the system; and leasing of commercial communications circuits.

d. Information Systems Support Services - This budget line item supports NEMS communication systems by providing for various types of

information, equipment and services required to maintain a reliable communications capability. Communications services under this program element include: teletype services to receive weather data for use in predicting nuclear fallout patterns, protected cabling between the six FEMA Federal Regional Centers to maintain contact with State EOCs, protected cabling with associated commercial telephone systems hardened switching centers, and secure and non-secure Federal telephone and other telecommunications services.

e. Other Telecommunications & Warning Support - In FY 1990, FEMA requests funding for other support to Presidential priorities. These include the following programs: (1) reimbursement for U.S. Army Civil Preparedness Detachments to support the communications and security programs of FEMA regional facilities in a national security emergency; and (2) reimbursable support to the Department of Defense for communications and electronics functions to ensure FEMA communications and warning systems meet standards of national security, and State and local government requirements and operational readiness.

2. Headquarters Automatic Data Processing

The FY 1990 budget request of \$2,124,000 supports personnel costs to maintain support for all civil defense programs including the development and preparation of national exercises which involve State and local government participation.

STATEMENT OF
CRAIG ALDERMAN, JR.
DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR POLICY
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON MILITARY INSTALLATIONS AND FACILITIES
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
MARCH 15, 1989

FISCAL YEAR 1990 CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Madam Chairwoman, members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to testify on behalf of the Federal Emergency Management Agency's proposed Civil Defense Program for Fiscal Year 1990. This program has the endorsement and support of the Department of Defense.

Last year, we, in the Defense Department, were gratified by the small but significant increase in funding to begin implementing the National Civil Defense Policy expressed in NSDD 259. This policy was the outgrowth of extensive deliberation within the national security community; when fully implemented, it will provide an effective, yet affordable, civil defense posture for the Nation. Therefore, we strongly reiterate our belief in the need to fund civil defense programs at the minimum level of \$152 million for FY 1990, as the Administration has requested. Civil Defense will play a significant role in our Nation's defense strategy and posture for years to come. We believe that the Civil Defense Budget request for FY 1990 will effectively continue Federal programs to lead

and support State and local civil defense efforts.

To place this Department of Defense testimony in perspective, I would remind you that the Department of Defense and National Security Council share responsibility for oversight of FEMA's Civil Defense efforts. That responsibility derives from mandates we received several years ago, from both the President (in Executive Order 12148) and the Senate Armed Services Committee, to ensure that:

- Civil Defense planning continues to be fully compatible with the Nation's overall strategic policy, and
- Legitimate needs of national security not be unintentionally subordinated to disaster relief in programming.

In compliance with your instructions, we have provided annually for your committee's consideration, a written assessment of FEMA's proposed

program, together with an analysis of the data upon which our assessment is based. For FY 1990, we concur with FEMA's description and assessment of the various budget items, and how they support the policy set forth in NSDD 259. Therefore, our reports to the respective Committee Chairman today do not contain separate assessments of the proposed budget.

Through our extensive and continuing interface with civil government preparedness activities at the Federal Region and State levels, we know that the Civil Defense Policy adopted in National Security Decision Directive 259 is both viable and acceptable at those levels of government. The States obviously would like to receive far more in terms of Federally funded assistance. Yet, we are certain that they recognize the essential merit of some modest but well thought out and sustainable growth for programs which emphasize State responsibility for population protection, Federal and State preparedness to "surge" civil defense capabilities, public information, and development of volunteerism.

The Armed Services and Defense Agencies continue to participate in numerous planning and training exercises, and to develop their military plans, to ensure full support by Defense Components for Federal assistance to State and local civil defense programs. We, therefore, have a sound basis for confidence in our shared ability to meet the civil defense objectives established by NSDD 259, provided that a reasonable level of Federal funding support is sustained over time.

Now, I would like to place the Defense Department's strong support for civil defense in general, and this FY 1990 proposal in particular, in a strategic perspective. Ultimately, civil defense is a significant element of our total policy and posture for deterring war; not only for deterring

nuclear attack, but for deterring all forms of attack, by demonstrating our Nation's will to survive any form of attack and retaliate effectively. For deterrence to succeed, we must continue to convince all adversaries that the cost of aggression will exceed any possible gain.

We must continue to deter the Soviet Union from any temptation to use its awesome military power, especially its capability for strategic nuclear attack on the United States. To do so, we must ensure that we have the means, and the national will, to respond effectively to aggression, or to coercion of any kind. In our democratic society, it is essential for the Nation's will to be based on public awareness of the spectrum of threats that we face, as well as confidence in our ability to cope with any and all forms of disaster.

Our defense policy increasingly must seek to prevent any type of coercion of the United States, and its Allies and friends. If we are vulnerable to coercion due to lack of confidence of our populations, Free World nations may give our enemies the benefits of victory without the cost of war. And, the means of coercion, as well as the nations and groups who could use those means to gain their objectives, are continually increasing in number and complexity. Thus, while the essential foundation of U.S. deterrence resides in our strategic and conventional forces, a mix of active and passive defense programs, including civil defense, also is an important element of our ability to deter attack today.

In spite of the real progress in negotiations to reduce nuclear arms, Soviet arsenals of strategic weapons are no smaller today than they were when President Gorbachev ascended to power; and those arsenals now include the increased threat posed by highly mobile ground-based weapons. Therefore, any major crisis involving the United

States and the Soviet Union will continue to have the possibility of escalating to strategic nuclear attack on the United States and its allies.

The Civil Defense Act of 1950 established a framework for coordinated inter-departmental Federal assistance to the States for emergency preparedness and response to any attack on the United States, and later amendments clarified the ability to use civil defense capabilities for non-attack disasters. NSDD 259 refocuses attention to civil defense requirements of government at those levels closest to the people, as its policy seeks to address the threats of the late 1980s and 1990s. The 1950 Act and the 1987 policy, therefore, are sufficient statements of national will and authority to meet the needs of the foreseeable future.

NSDD 259 and FEMA's proposed Civil Defense Program for FY 1990 sustain programs that provide minimum essential assistance to the States for attack preparedness. They also recognize the reality that the use of some attack preparedness facilities and resources to respond to natural and technological disasters can provide training, testing and development of capabilities that would be useful in any disastrous circumstance, including the obvious probabilities of catastrophic earthquakes and radiological accidents.

Concomitantly, while maintaining our primary responsibility to protect the Nation through military readiness and deterrence, the Department of Defense also supports, to the extent our resources permit, the development of a nationwide civil defense infrastructure that will be capable of addressing peacetime hazards and rapidly expanding to meet the greater needs of any national security emergency. This includes developing the existing planning structures with FEMA and the States, the commitment of Reserve military officers to several civil defense-related programs, and an ongoing study of our ability to create larger

numbers of civil defense and home defense forces from obligated military retirees if a national security emergency justifies that action.

The proposed FY 1990 Civil Defense Program continues to implement NSDD 259 by supporting State and local government development of the minimum essential civil defense base. Through a surge of emergency preparedness measures during a warning period, these level governments, with the assistance of organized and trained volunteers, can help their populations and institutions survive and mitigate the effects of a major disaster, including nuclear attack. This capability requires an in-being cadre of civil defense professionals, effective State emergency operating centers, and a continuing program to provide civil defense information to the public. The FY 1990 Civil Defense Budget will continue our progress toward those ends.

In testifying today, we emphasize our belief that there will be popular support for the essential aspects of civil defense if the Civil Defense Program begun under NSDD 259 is sustained and developed to meet the basic State and local needs for preparedness to deal with the consequences of any form of attack. In the Department of Defense, we are aware of an extraordinary need for public awareness of the real threats to the Nation today, and in the foreseeable future.

We continue to support the approach of FEMA to complement attack preparedness with all-hazards protection, and our programs of military support to civil authorities recognize that goal. We also recognize the obvious risk to the Nation from unwillingness of the public to accept the reality of a continuing nuclear threat. This denial risks undermining the national will to preserve our way of life in the face of coercion, even if our lack of preparedness is never tested by an attack. Maintaining our national awareness and national will

are important benefits of a credible National Civil Defense Program.

The proposed civil defense spending for FY 1990 remains very small as a national commitment to needed protection for the Nation's population and its institutions. Yet, this budget will accommodate a flexible use of the available Federal resources to assist the State and local jurisdictions in continuing enhancement of their ability to respond to attacks and other catastrophes, as permitted by the Civil Defense Act.

We believe the Civil Defense Program proposed for FY 1990 is in accordance with the National Civil Defense Policy, as stated in NSDD 259, and that its application of the requested resources is wise. The Department of Defense will continue to work actively to support FEMA and the States in the revitalized civil defense activities. We, therefore, endorse the proposed FY 1990 Civil Defense Program as meeting the criteria and intent of Executive Order 12148 and the Civil Defense Act of 1950; and we urge that the Congress fund the program as proposed.

Thank you.

STATEMENT OF
JOSEPH F. MYERS, PRESIDENT
NATIONAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON MILITARY INSTALLATIONS AND FACILITIES
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
MARCH 15, 1989

Madam Chairwoman and Members of the Committee, on behalf of the National Emergency Management Association, I appreciate this opportunity to testify on the FY 1990 Civil Defense budget of the Federal Emergency Management Agency. NEMA's members are the directors of State emergency management agencies, and are responsible for coordinating, guiding and supporting State emergency management programs. My testimony is intended to complement and support that of the National Coordinating Council of Emergency Management, which represents the professionals serving at the local government level.

NEMA strongly supports the proposed increases in FEMA's Civil Defense budget, and wishes to recommend additional specific modifications for your consideration.

Natural or man-made disasters can strike any community and can cause enormous injury and stress to families, individuals, institutions, and businesses. Programs to prevent or mitigate this injury and stress require coordination, cooperation and unity of purpose from all levels of government; local, State, and Federal. This can only be

achieved through the continued partnership of Federal, State, and local emergency management organizations. We believe that FEMA is a most critical member of this partnership, for it provides the technical, educational, and financial support necessary for State and local programs to maintain and improve their capabilities.

This year is a pivotal one for the Nation's emergency management organizations. Major natural and technological disasters, as well as significant new legislative initiatives, have fostered unparalleled efforts to improve our emergency management capabilities. These efforts have created demands that greatly exceed the technical, educational, and financial resources that State and local governments have available to dedicate to emergency management. Therefore, the Federal funding available to State and local emergency management agencies is vitally important.

A portion of the FEMA Civil Defense funds are passed through to State and local government emergency management programs and become the infrastructure for efforts to prepare for all types of hazards, whether natural or man-made. For this

reason NEMA appreciates the increase in the FY 1989 Civil Defense budget and strongly supports FEMA's proposal for an overall increase in the FY 1990 budget. However, because of the importance of FEMA's Civil Defense budget in preparing for all-hazards, NEMA urges you to consider an even greater increase in this budget. It should be stressed that any increases should not be re-programmed dollars.

Several specific concerns affecting the integrated emergency management systems are:

First, a NEMA survey conducted in 1988 estimated a shortfall of over \$20 million in Emergency Management Assistance (EMA) funds when compared with the actual need at the State and local levels. We believe substantial, phased annual increases are needed to reach an adequate level of Federal financial support to State and local programs.

Second, the need for adequate training of emergency personnel and managers is overwhelming. Reduced support for such training programs will ultimately contribute to increased risks for the public and emergency response personnel. FEMA's proposed reductions in training stipends for State and local officials, and first responders attending the Emergency Management Institute and the National Fire Academy resident programs must be restored to the FY 1989 level.

Third, the Armenian Earthquake demonstrated the acute need to effectively prepare for this type of disaster. NEMA urges that the current (FY 1989) Federal-State cost sharing basis for earthquake mitigation grants be maintained. The basis proposed for FY 1990 by FEMA

creates a burden that will be very difficult for many States to shoulder, and can only delay the Nation's efforts to prepare for earthquake disasters.

Finally, and while it is not directly related to the civil defense budget, I must express our concerns regarding FEMA's role in implementing Title III of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986. Title III specifically authorizes \$5 million in funding for FEMA to support related training programs. Federal funding provided during FY 1988 was the only source available for urgently needed training for local governments' hazardous material emergency responders. We are distressed that no funds for FY 1990 will be available. I appeal to you to restore this critically needed funding.

In addition, Title III has resulted in unprecedented State and local efforts to prepare for hazardous material accidents and to inform the public about hazardous chemicals in the community. However, the absence of Federal funding for these efforts is seriously impeding our progress. NEMA urges your support to make available a portion of the monies within the Superfund for our Title III planning and right-to-know programs.

In summary, although NEMA supports the proposed increases in the Civil Defense budget of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, we are opposed to using re-programmed dollars to enhance funding in the areas I have just discussed. The emergency management professionals at the State and local levels need your assistance and welcome your support.

Thank you.

TESTIMONY OF

AVAGENE MOORE, PAST PRESIDENT
GOVERNMENT INFORMATION COMMITTEE CHAIR
NATIONAL COORDINATING COUNCIL ON
EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

BEFORE THE

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
SUBCOMMITTEE ON MILITARY INSTALLATIONS AND FACILITIES

MARCH 15, 1989

My name is Avagene Moore, and I am the immediate past president and current Government Information Committee Chair of the National Coordinating Council on Emergency Management (NCCEM). With me are Dick Kendall, local Emergency Planning Coordinator from New Castle, Delaware and Elizabeth Buzzerd, Executive Manager from NCCEM's national office. I am the local emergency manager from Lawrenceburg, Tennessee, and I appreciate the opportunity to testify before this subcommittee.

Originally established as the United States Civil Defense Council in 1952, the name was changed to the National Coordinating Council on Emergency Management several years ago to reflect the all-encompassing responsibilities of the membership. We are a non-profit organization primarily composed of local emergency managers/civil defense directors from across the country and are charged with saving lives and protecting the property of our citizens on a daily basis. Our

members are involved in all phases of emergency management: mitigation, preparedness, response and recovery of disasters. The association's membership also includes professional/technical individuals and others interested in the broad field of emergency management.

Our testimony complements and supports the National Emergency Management Association's testimony.

Today we focus on that portion of the FEMA budget identified as "Civil Defense" as it relates to State and local government. It is in this FEMA budget category where one finds the program elements which pass Federal funds through to States and localities. The local-State-Federal infrastructure incorporates all hazards, man-made or natural, across the United States. The Fiscal Year 1990 FEMA budget has been sent to Congress and requests \$151,535,000 for activities under this portion of the law. This request level reflects the

dual-use nature of the program and tries to incorporate and meet the objectives of National Security Decision Directive 259.

The National Coordinating Council on Emergency Management supports the FEMA budget request for 1990 with several specific enhancements that require additional dollars, not reprogrammed dollars. We support the budget request because it is required to maintain the present status of emergency management/civil defense needs of our Nation. However, we couple this support with the following specific recommendations:

1) The Emergency Management Assistance Program funds only partially support the localities and must be increased to help deal with the current need. States report a shortfall of approximately \$20,000,000 to \$25,000,000 in eligible items on emergency management assistance programs. NCCEM supports the concept of gradual yearly increases in the range of \$5,000,000 per year.

2) Under the Training & Education provisions the stipends must be fully funded. The long-term Federal goal of a three-year phase out fails to recognize that local governments currently pick up expenses as their personnel attend classes at the Emergency Management Institute. Local government resources now cover expenses related to the absence of

their employees as they attend courses, and there are also expenses not presently covered under the FEMA stipend program.

In regard to overall emergency management, NCCEM supports the integrated emergency management system concept - all hazards approach - including nuclear attack preparedness. This approach recognizes that by planning for and dealing with emergencies and disasters which occur day-to-day better prepares us for the ultimate attack-related disasters. An integrated emergency management program strengthens our ability to contend with any and all disasters that may befall our communities and country.

In closing, NCCEM and allied organizations are in search of a funding source to relieve local and State governments of the tremendous cost for implementation of SARA Title III, in order to help local communities protect public health and safety and the environment from chemical hazards. Disasters are increasingly becoming more complex and challenging for our Nation's emergency managers/civil defense directors. A higher concentration of civilian personnel and property exists as our population grows which only complicates matters and requires greater response capabilities. In order to meet these challenges now and in the future, additional funds, resources and training are required.

The following publications of general interest on civil defense subjects and ways you can protect yourself and your family from disasters and emergencies are available from the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

Soviet Civil Defense (FEMA-52). This publication presents a comprehensive examination of the Soviet civil defense program. It provides judgments on the pace, scope, and effectiveness of the program.

Shelter Management Handbook (FEMA-59). This handbook provides step-by-step instructions for effective operation of a fallout shelter. The reader is also provided with emergency self-help information that will assist in coping with any type of shelter environment.

Recovery From Nuclear Attack (FEMA-160). This publication explores not only the effects and consequences of a nuclear attack, but also the conditions a person would face in its aftermath. Ways in which recovery from such an attack could be addressed are also explored in the publication.

A Comparison of Soviet and U.S. Civil Defense Programs (FEMA-161). This booklet highlights and contrasts various aspects of each nation's civil defense program. Future trends and historical differences between the two programs are examined in the publication.

Are You Prepared? (FEMA-166). This brochure describes what civil defense is and why the U.S. has a civil defense program. It discusses the many reasons why emergency preparedness and civil defense are important to you and details examples of how civil defense measures have been instrumental in saving the lives of millions of Americans.

In Time of Emergency -- A Citizen's Handbook on Emergency Management (H-14). This publication provides information on what families can do to prepare for a wide range of natural disasters and other emergencies.

Planning For Survival (H-20). This booklet describes the effects of a nuclear detonation and protective actions that you can undertake.

Radiological Emergency Management (HS-3). This home study course provides reading material and test questions on a wide range of radiological emergencies, including nuclear attack and nuclear power plant accidents. The course provides information on the effects of radiation and steps that can be taken to reduce or limit these effects.

Preparedness Planning for a Nuclear Crisis (HS-4). This is a home study course with reading material and test questions that cover the effects of nuclear weapons and what citizens can do to protect themselves from a nuclear detonation. It includes information on evacuation, sheltering, and family emergency planning.

What You Should Know About Nuclear Preparedness (L-138). This brochure answers many commonly asked questions about nuclear attack. Questions on warning, shelters, fallout, the Emergency Broadcast System, and evacuation are answered in the brochure.

Emergency Preparedness Checklist (L-154). In a checklist format, this pamphlet provides general information on emergency preparedness such as stockpiling food and evacuation planning.

In addition, the following materials detailing the building of shelters for protection from blast and fallout radiation are also available from the Federal Emergency Management Agency. Shelters H-12-A through H-12-F should be constructed only in low risk areas (one which is not expected to be subjected to the blast effects of a nuclear weapon).

- H-12-A **Home Fallout Shelter/Modified Ceiling Shelter-Basement Location Plan A**
(8 Pages)
This shelter can be permanently installed in the basement of your home and will not interfere with its utility in any way. A materials list, detailed plans, a construction sequence, and general instructions are provided.
- H-12-B **Home Fallout Shelter/Modified Ceiling Shelter-Basement Location Plan B**
(8 Pages)
This shelter can be permanently installed in the basement of your home and will not interfere with its utility in any way. Protection is provided in a basement corner by bricks or concrete blocks between the overhead joists. The brochure discusses two sizes of shelters of this type and provides a materials list and construction sequence for both.
- H-12-C **Home Fallout Shelter/Concrete Block Shelter-Basement Location Plan C**
(4 Pages)
A compact shelter is provided in a basement corner by the use of common lumber and concrete blocks with mortar joints for permanent construction. This shelter will provide low-cost protection from the effects of radioactive fallout. A materials list, detailed drawings for a contractor, and a construction sequence are displayed.

- H-12-D **Home Fallout Shelter/Snack Bar-Basement Location Plan D**
(4 Pages)
A snack bar built of brick or concrete block can be converted into shelter. Detailed drawings, a materials list, and a construction sequence are provided.
- H-12-E **Home Fallout Shelter/Tilt Up Storage Unit Shelter-Basement Location Plan E**
(4 Pages)
A storage unit is hinged to the wall in a basement corner. It is tilted-up to rest on stacked brick or concrete block and filled with brick or solid concrete block for overhead protection. Also provides detailed drawings, a materials list, and a construction sequence.
- H-12-F **Home Fallout Shelter/Lean-To-Shelter-Basement Location Plan F**
(4 Pages)
Pre-built wood components stored in the basement may be assembled and filled with bricks or concrete blocks for emergency protection. Detailed drawings, a materials list, and a construction sequence are, again, provided.
- H-12-1 **Belowground Home Fallout Shelter**
(8 Pages)
This family fallout shelter for the yard is designed primarily for homes without basements. Also provides protection against earthquakes, hurricanes, and tornadoes. Detailed designs and a materials list for the contractor are provided.
- H-12-2 **Aboveground Home Fallout Shelter**
(8 Pages)
Intended for persons who prefer an aboveground shelter, or for other reasons (for instance, a high water table) cannot have a below ground shelter. It also provides significant protection from the effects of hurricanes, tornadoes, and earthquakes. Detailed sketches for a contractor as well as a listing of materials needed for construction are provided. Four alternatives of design for aesthetic purposes are included.
- H-12-3 **Home Blast Shelter**
(8 Pages)
This family underground blast shelter can be placed in the yard and will provide protection against thermal effects, fallout radiation, and the blast effects from a nuclear weapon. Describes general characteristics of the shelter and provides drawings the contractor may need to construct the shelter.

H-12-4 **Home Shelter**

(8 Pages)

This publication describes plans for a home shelter of reinforced concrete and masonry block that provides protection from nuclear fallout radiation and tornadoes. The shelter is designed for placement in the yard and primarily is for houses without basements. It also provides plans for the contractor and a materials list. The companion booklet, H-12-4.1, provides more detailed information in the form of step-by-step instructions.

H-12-4.1 **Instructions For Building A Home Shelter**

(44 Pages)

This publication provides step-by-step instructions for building a belowground shelter for protection from nuclear fallout radiation and tornadoes. Detailed sketches and instructions are intended as an aid for the "do it yourself homeowner" who may do some or all of the construction work himself. Explanatory written instructions are also provided describing every phase necessary in building a complete fallout shelter. The booklet ends with an example of a shelter actually built.

CIVIL DEFENSE PUBLICATIONS REQUEST

PLEASE SEND ME THE FOLLOWING:

- Soviet Civil Defense (FEMA-52).
- Shelter Management Handbook (FEMA-59).
- Recovery From Nuclear Attack (FEMA-160).
- A Comparison of Soviet and U.S. Civil Defense Programs (FEMA-161).
- Are You Prepared? (FEMA-166)
- In Time of Emergency -- A Citizen's Handbook on Emergency Management (H-14).
- Planning For Survival (H-20).
- Radiological Emergency Management (HS-3).
- Preparedness Planning for a Nuclear Crisis (HS-4).
- What You Should Know About Nuclear Preparedness (L-138).
- Emergency Preparedness Checklist (L-154).
- H-12-A Home Fallout Shelter/Modified Ceiling Shelter-Basement Location Plan A
- H-12-B Home Fallout Shelter/Modified Ceiling Shelter-Basement Location Plan B
- H-12-C Home Fallout Shelter/Concrete Block Shelter-Basement Location Plan C
- H-12-D Home Fallout Shelter/Snack Bar-Basement Location Plan D
- H-12-E Home Fallout Shelter/Tilt Up Storage Unit Shelter-Basement Location Plan E
- H-12-F Home Fallout Shelter/Lean-To-Shelter-Basement Location Plan F
- H-12-1 Belowground Home Fallout Shelter
- H-12-2 Aboveground Home Fallout Shelter
- H-12-3 Home Blast Shelter
- H-12-4 Home Shelter
- H-12-4.1 Instructions For Building A Home Shelter

NAME

MAILING ADDRESS

CITY

STATE

ZIP CODE

REMOVE AND MAIL TO:

FEMA

P.O. BOX 70274

WASHINGTON, DC 20024