

CHAPTER 4

Population Protection Planning

4-1. General. This chapter states FEMA's policy and describes FEMA's effort under the PPP Program element to support State and local emergency management planning. It delineates the area of activity and defines the products produced under the program. The provisions of this chapter apply to State governments receiving, or desiring to receive, Federal financial assistance from funds appropriated for the PPP element of the Civil Defense Program. Implementation of the program activities involves local governments and Federal officials as well.

4-2. Program Objectives and Description.

a. Objectives. The broad objective of the PPP Program is to provide the planning basis for a national emergency management capability. The thrust of this effort is concentrated on the development, evaluation, and maintenance of multihazard EOP's for State and local governments. These EOP's detail the planning provisions that are necessary to ensure the protection of people from the effects of nuclear attack and other identified hazards. The goals of the program are to:

(1) Foster a nationwide, systematic approach to State and local planning for attack-related emergency management;

(2) Ensure that a single multihazard EOP is developed in each jurisdiction. The EOP must thoroughly address evacuation, shelter, warning, communication, direction and control, emergency support services, emergency public information, resource management, and other critical emergency management functions. Full attention must be given, in an appendix to a functional annex or by some other means, to the unique characteristics of attack-related and any other hazard that may threaten the jurisdiction;

(3) Develop plans supporting a capability for prompt, coordinated response to large-scale disasters or threats simultaneously by all levels of government;

(4) Provide a basis for ensured COG at all the State and local levels of government during and after an attack on the United States and for the duration of large-scale disaster situations and other major emergencies;

(5) Improve the operational utility of emergency plans through exercises and other means;

(6) Promote the acceptance and use of an integrated planning process and to facilitate coordinated emergency response operations; and

(7) Reduce redundancy in plan documentation.

b. Description. The Federal government and the States and their political subdivisions have joint responsibility to be prepared for attack and other very large-scale disasters--disasters that would require a simultaneous, coordinated response by all levels of government. They must be able also to promptly respond and meet the demands of mobilization in case of a national security emergency. Such situations are very rare; but given the reality of the hazards and tensions that exist in the modern world, this cross section of natural, technological, and war-related hazards represents threats that warrant preparedness planning and development of a response capability.

(1) The PPP Program provides guidance and financial assistance to the States to enable them to produce State and local EOP's that will support the development of compatible response and recovery systems throughout the country. Every effort is made to show how a high degree of readiness for major emergencies can be achieved economically by basing preparedness on existing systems and by providing approaches and identifying the resources that would be required to augment or replicate commonly needed emergency management systems.

(a) The financial assistance provides each State the means to obtain the professional resources/expertise to develop plans, conduct exercises, and provide technical assistance to State and local officials responsible for emergency planning and operations. Therefore, for clarity and uniformity, the term "State population protection planners" will be used to identify the individuals employed under the PPP Program to plan and/or to manage the activities included in the negotiated statement of work.

(b) The first priority and foremost function of State population protection planners is their responsibility to provide State and local governments with assistance in the development of the nuclear attack preparedness portions of their EOP's. Once this task is satisfied, they may also provide assistance in planning for natural and technological hazards.

(c) The EOP's should describe in specific detail the provisions and procedures the jurisdiction will rely on for evacuating people from hazardous areas and/or providing them protective shelter as appropriate for any disaster threat, including the possibility of nuclear attack, which may be faced by their jurisdiction.

(2) The central activity in the PPP Program is the planning project. The project for a particular local area may be conducted by a State population protection planner, or--if the locality participates in the EMA Program--it is conducted by the local EPM with technical assistance, if needed, provided by the State planner. In either case,

a planning team is assembled, the needs of the community are assessed, existing plans are evaluated, and a new or improved emergency operations plan is developed. This process is described in detail in CPG 1-8. CPG 1-8A provides a means for evaluating the plan and ensuring that all necessary elements are included.

(3) FEMA headquarters and regional personnel working in this program are both planners and administrators whose objective is to ensure that the planning base exists to support a capability for simultaneous, coordinated response in very large-scale disasters and national security emergencies.

4-3. Program Activities and Products. The responsibilities inherent in PPP impact on the entire spectrum of readiness for a disaster situation. In jurisdictions that receive EMA funding, the federally subsidized emergency management staff is responsible for EOP development and maintenance. In EMA jurisdictions, State population protection planners may be used to assist these local emergency management staffs to update, review, and exercise their EOP's. However, there is a large number of jurisdictions throughout the United States which, because of location, population, or economic considerations, do not participate in the EMA Program. In these jurisdictions, State planners are responsible for working with local officials to develop, evaluate, and maintain their EOP's. Since the degree of involvement the State planners will have with each jurisdiction will vary and depend upon State planning priorities, availability of local EMA staff, and the type of jurisdiction (EMA or non-EMA) with which the planner is working, the following specific types of outputs and tangible end products should be produced:

a. Technical Assistance. State population protection planners who work with EMA participant jurisdictions provide technical assistance to the emergency management staffs of these jurisdictions to ensure that EOP's are updated in accordance with the schedule established in the EMA statement of work and the guidelines set forth in CPG 1-8 and CPG 1-8A. Technical assistance may include conduct of plan development workshops, development of functional annexes (with a priority on development of the attack preparedness planning considerations in the Evacuation and In-place Shelter annexes) or hazard specific appendices to the EOP, review of the EOP by completing the EOP crosswalk in accordance with CPG 1-8A, and participation in the conduct of exercises as specified in the State and Local Exercise Annex to the current year's CCA request for application package.

b. Local EOP's. State population protection planners who work with jurisdictions that do not receive EMA funding are responsible for ensuring that EOP's are produced.

c. State EOP. State population protection planners may work with other State emergency management agency staff (EMA, DPI, etc.) members to produce or update a State EOP. The State EOP provides a basis for State

readiness. Jurisdictions within the State cannot adequately develop their EOP's which include the use of personnel, facilities, and resources under State control unless the State EOP provides for such support. Therefore, the EOP must address how assistance will be provided to local jurisdictions during disaster situations that may tax or exceed local resources and capabilities.

d. EOP Crosswalk. State population protection planners complete and submit the cross-reference form contained in part II, CPG 1-8A, along with non-EMA jurisdictions DRAFT EOP's submitted to the region. This cross-reference form is commonly referred to as the EOP crosswalk and provides the planner with a practical means of identifying the location (page number, paragraph, chapter, section, etc.) of those critical planning requirements that should be included in an EOP.

e. State planners should meet, on a recurring basis, with the State military emergency management staff and the emergency management staffs assigned to military bases located in the State, as necessary, to discuss, coordinate, and ensure:

(1) The population protection elements of their military EOP's are compatible with the local/State EOP's; and

(2) Planning requirements associated with military support to civil defense and civil authorities are adequately addressed.

f. State population protection planner(s) may work with other State and local emergency management agency staff (EMA, EMT, DPI, RADEF, etc.) to conduct some of the specified exercises in the State and Local Exercise Annex.

g. Acceptability of Deliverables.

(1) Acceptability of EOP's and/or annexes to an EOP will be determined by the region using part III of CPG 1-8A.

(2) In determining the acceptability of EOP's as end products under the PPP Program, FEMA will pay particular attention to the validity of the nuclear attack risk assumptions adapted as the planning base for the jurisdiction. Nuclear attack risk assumptions will be taken from FEMA's NAPB-90 unless altered in the planning process with the knowledge and specific approval of the FEMA Regional Director.

(3) In evaluating the nuclear attack population protection strategy, FEMA will insist that the population protection option (evacuation or in-place shelter) selected be consistent with the risk conditions agreed upon by State and Federal authorities. Plans for high-risk areas must rely primarily on an evacuation strategy unless it is clearly established in the plan that there is existing shelter in

the area adequate to protect people from the blast, fire, and radiation effects which would occur based on the threat identified in NAPB-90 or otherwise agreed upon as the basis for the plan. Plans for high-risk areas that rely exclusively on an in-place shelter strategy must identify the existence of blast, fire, and radiation protection adequate to protect the population at risk. Plans for high-risk areas that rely primarily on an evacuation strategy should also feature an option for allocation and use of best available nearby shelters for short warning situations. It must be made clear, however, that this is an inferior option that provides relatively low probability of survival in the nuclear attack environment.

(4) Acceptability of technical assistance provided in the form of plan development workshops and participation in the conduct of exercises may be verified by review of workshop attendance rosters, exercise reports, or on-site observation, as appropriate.

4-4. State Application Responsibilities. The applicant is responsible for submitting an application in accordance with guidance contained in CPG 1-38, and for developing a specific work plan for PPP in accordance with the criteria established in each current year's CCA request for application package. Also, the following general guidelines apply:

a. Selection of Jurisdictions. The State Emergency Management Agency Director is responsible for determining which EMA jurisdictions, and/or which non-EMA jurisdictions, should receive assistance and for specifying the type of assistance that should be provided. This determination will provide a basis for negotiations with representatives of the FEMA region to reach agreement on a PPP statement of work that is both practical and addresses nationally established goals and priorities. The Director should ensure that EPM's in EMA participant jurisdictions are aware of the types of technical assistance that State planners can provide to help develop and refine local EOP's. The Director should encourage local jurisdictions to quantify their individual technical assistance needs. The Director, in coordination with the FEMA region, should establish priorities to ensure that the State-planner resource is used effectively, augmenting the capability of the State and local EMA cadre of employees to solve the highly technical planning problems associated with national security emergencies. With regard to non-EMA jurisdictions, the Director and FEMA region must ensure that State planners are used in an equitable manner that will ensure the emergency operations planning needs of these jurisdictions are satisfied in a timely manner. The Director and FEMA region are jointly responsible for ensuring that the State's overall EOP development effort is in consonance with the national emergency management program emphasis.

b. Statement of Work. The State is responsible for preparing a statement of work that includes:

(a) Sufficient detail to QUANTIFY the type and quantity and milestone dates for each end product that will be delivered.

(b) The identity, population, and type of jurisdiction (EMA or non-EMA participant) where PPP activity will be undertaken.

(2) A summary of the dollar cost associated with the completion of end products associated with the PPP Program. This information will be used by the regional staff to analyze the level of effort associated with proposed end products, simplify the negotiation process, and make a determination on the dollar allocation the State should receive. Specifically, the following cost information must be included:

(a) The individual salaries and benefits for each professional and clerical staff member who is to be paid with Federal PPP funds.

(b) The travel cost associated with:

- (i) EOP Development;
- (ii) Exercises; and
- (iii) Other (specify).

(c) Cost associated with:

- (i) Printing of non-EMA jurisdiction EOP's;
- (ii) Equipment;
- (iii) Vehicles;
- (iv) Office lease or rental; and
- (v) Office supplies (art, ADP, copier, maps, clerical, etc.).

(d) Percentage of indirect cost; and

(e) Other cost (specify).

c. Operational Information. The State is responsible for ensuring that operational information developed in the planning process is shared with other levels of government as required to support their emergency management planning activities.

4-5. Allowable and Unallowable Costs.

a. Allowable Costs. Allowable costs are those eligible under OMB Circular A-87 and which are directly associated with carrying out activities and developing products included in the approved PPP statement of work. These typically include salaries and benefits of personnel, travel expenses, the printing of non-EMA jurisdiction EOP's after review and acceptance (in accordance with chapter 3 of CPG 1-8A), and the cost of supplies and equipment. Costs associated with training and attendance at conferences approved by the FEMA Regional Director or FEMA headquarters as PPP related are allowable. However, ALL out of State travel must be reviewed and approved by the region.

b. Unallowable Costs. Unallowable costs are those not eligible under OMB Circular A-87 or not related to approved PPP work or not specifically approved by the FEMA Regional Director or FEMA headquarters. The purchase or long-term lease (not to exceed 3 months per fiscal year) of motor vehicles and the purchase or lease of automatic data processing equipment (hardware and/or software) are not allowed under the PPP Program.

CHAPTER 5

Radiological Defense

5-1. General. The RADEF system includes two programs: RDP&D and the RIM&C. These programs are fundamental in the development of State and local civil defense capabilities. RADEF is an inherent and integral part of all the programs and systems which collectively provide a means for surviving the radiation effects of a nuclear attack. This chapter provides policy, mandatory criteria, eligibility requirements, and general guidance to supplement the regulations in 44 CFR, Part 302. It describes FEMA assistance to State and local emergency management directors/coordinators in developing a complete RADEF system.

a. RADEF supports the development of complete RADEF system capabilities (shelter monitoring, emergency worker monitoring, and radiological assessment) in order to minimize the effects of war-related radiation hazards. The emphasis is on nuclear attack preparedness. RDP&D and RIM&C program resources will be used to assist each State and its local jurisdictions to develop, implement, and maintain RADEF system capabilities for nuclear attack preparedness. The RADEF system capabilities are described in detail in CPG 1-30, Guide For the Design and Development of a Local RADEF Support System. Capabilities include the following components: plans and procedures, instrumentation, facilities, and trained personnel which, when combined into a complete operational system, provide capabilities for nuclear attack preparedness.

b. Over five million radiological instruments valued in excess of \$50 million in 1962, have been granted to States by the Federal government. Distributed nationwide, these instruments are available for individual citizens, emergency workers, and emergency management and services users at all levels of government, to ensure availability of situation information in the event of a nuclear attack. The maintenance, calibration, and repair of the RADEF instruments issued to State and local jurisdictions is provided through State maintenance and calibration facilities. The facilities are funded by FEMA through RADEF to maintain the instruments at an acceptable level of operational readiness and reliability. These services are available to localities through the State Emergency Management Agency.

c. The RDP&D and RIM&C Programs recognize that States have radiological health programs designed for response to peacetime radiation accidents and incidents and that there are applications for RADEF in supporting State radiological health responsibilities for emergency preparedness, and vice versa.

5-2. RADEF System Objectives and Descriptions. The major objective of RADEF is to develop the capability to save lives, minimize radiation injury, and reduce loss of property that would result from radioactive

fallout in the event of a nuclear attack upon the United States. Objectives of the RADEF system are dictated primarily by the operational requirements for nuclear attack. They may also apply with limitations to other large scale radiological emergencies.

a. State and local radiological annex development and update will be accomplished in coordination with the yearly objectives of the PPP and EMA Programs. To assure acceptance of those EOP's, radiological annexes should, as a minimum, be developed or updated concurrently with the PPP and EMA effort. To that end, radiological annex objectives in FEMA Form 76-43 should identify the jurisdiction, its population, and its EMA or non-EMA status. Radiological annex development or update should not be limited to the EMA or PPP objectives. Annex submissions to the region without the base EOP should be accompanied by the applicable portions of the CPG 1-8A crosswalk. When annexes are updated ahead of the base EOP, the date of the annex should be placed at the bottom of each page.

b. Through the RADEF section of the CCA, FEMA assists State and local governments in developing comprehensive RADEF system capabilities by providing 100 percent funding for the following:

- (1) State RADEF Officer; and
- (2) RIM&C.

c. The State RADEF Officer is responsible for the planning, development, coordination, implementation and maintenance of a comprehensive RADEF system for the State and its local jurisdictions. The State RADEF Officer is a program manager who plans, assists in writing procedures, leads in the deployment of viable statewide RADEF emergency response capabilities, and serves as technical advisor to the State Director of Emergency Management on matters dealing with RADEF.

d. Operational readiness is the ultimate goal of all emergency operational systems for all State and local government organizations. An emergency organization must be established, based on legal authority. Then emergency operations plans and procedures must be prepared with assignments of responsibility.

(1) Each State and local jurisdiction requires RADEF operational procedures. These are usually contained in a RADEF annex to the Emergency Operations Plan. The RADEF annex describes the jurisdiction's plan of action for establishing and maintaining a RADEF system within the jurisdiction.

(2) RADEF procedures are the first priority item for establishing a viable RADEF system. In order for any system to function effectively, there must be procedures that describe how people, facilities, and equipment will be utilized. The RADEF procedures tell

who, what, when, where, and how all the capabilities of a RADEF system will operate in an emergency and how they interrelate with other emergency operations systems. The procedures should provide enough detail so that someone relatively unfamiliar with the system could still effectively operate in an emergency.

(3) The RADEF operations procedures should also identify those activities that are maintained in an operationally ready mode on a day-to-day basis; and those activities that are to be implemented during a period of increased readiness.

(4) The State RADEF Officer is responsible for the development of State and local RADEF annexes and the necessary detailed procedures for development of a complete RADEF system at each level of government.

e. The State RADEF Officer is responsible for developing a comprehensive program and for assisting local jurisdictions to develop and maintain a RADEF system. RADEF activities are essential to complement the emergency management functions that address population protection, COG, and direction and control. The preparedness features of the RADEF system involve: planning and organizational guidance; personnel training; financial assistance; standards, criteria, and procedures related to radiation exposure; protection and mitigation measures; radiological instrument distribution, maintenance, and calibration; tests and exercises; public information and technology transfer.

f. Under the oversight and coordination of the State RADEF Officer, specially equipped State RIM&C facilities provide for the inspection, maintenance and calibration of civil defense radiological instruments on a 4 year cycle that have been procured by FEMA and granted to the States for distribution to local jurisdictions for use in radiological emergencies resulting from a nuclear attack.

g. RADEF CCA personnel provide for the overall management of FEMA-owned radioactive materials on loan to the State, and conduct semiannual leak tests on radioactive material training source sets; provide support to radiological defense training; and provide support to exercises of the RADEF system and its capabilities.

h. National objectives, policies and standards are prescribed in CPG 2-6(1), CPG 2-6(2), CPG 2-6(2)(3), CPG 2-6(4), CPG 3-1, CPG 4-1, TD-100, CPC 84-2, and NAPB-90.

5-3. Definitions.

a. Statewide Radiological Instrument Inventory. A report listing radiological instruments and sets, by type and quantity, currently on-hand, and including float stock.

b. Float Stock Inventory. A report based upon a format provided by FEMA that describes instruments that can be issued immediately for replacement or exchange. Normally, the float stock should not exceed 10 percent of the total State inventory.

c. State Float Stock/Bulk Storage Distribution Plan. Identifies the procedures, system, and location for distribution of the State float stock and bulk storage instruments in the event of a national emergency.

d. Shop Relocation Plan. Gives detailed information, procedures, system, and location for the relocation of the RIM&C facility in the event of a national emergency.

e. Quarterly Performance Report. Identifies productivity at quarterly intervals during the performance period of the CCA.

f. Lost Source or Radiological Incident Report. Any suspected or actual leakage of a sealed source or loss of FEMA radioactive material is to be reported to FEMA immediately.

g. Radioactive Materials Inventory (RAM) File. A current inventory of FEMA-owned radioactive materials on loan to the States.

h. State RADEF Officer. The State RADEF Officer provides the direction, leadership, and day to day management of the overall RADEF Program.

i. Radiological Defense Data Base. The radiological defense data base is an integral part of the FEMA program management information system. It is designed to track the status of State and local government radiological defense systems.

j. RIM&C Plan of Operation. A narrative, describing how the function inherent to the RIM&C facility will be accomplished.

k. RIM&C Facility. The State RIM&C facility operated to maintain a statewide program which provides for the distribution, inspection, maintenance and calibration of civil defense radiological instruments on a 4 year cycle. Service is available for all civil defense instruments within the State, including those located on Federal facilities. It has been FEMA's policy to maintain a minimum of 2 full-time personnel as the minimum staffing complement for the RIM&C facility, unless it can be justified that a staff of 1 is sufficient to meet program objectives.

l. RADEF Annex. The RADEF annex describes the jurisdiction's plan of action for establishing and maintaining a RADEF system within the jurisdiction. Included in the RADEF annex are RADEF procedures which tell who, what, when, where, and how all the capabilities of

a RADEF system will operate in an emergency and how they interrelate with other emergency operations systems. This is one of the work products produced by the State RADEF Officer under this program. RADEF annexes are not considered completed and accepted as a work product until a copy has been furnished to the regional RADEF Program Manager together with the RADEF-EOP crosswalk in conformance with CPG 1-8A.

m. RADEF-EOP Crosswalk. A completed copy of the cross-reference form contained in Part II, CPG 1-8A, for the RADEF annex submitted to the regional RADEF Program Manager. It provides a practical means to identify the location (page number, paragraph, chapter, section, etc.) of those critical requirements and capabilities which are a part of a RADEF system and are also an integral part of other systems, e.g., the RADEF radiological assessment capability is an integral part of direction and control for emergency operations management. Similarly, emergency worker monitoring capabilities must be included as part of any emergency services system.

5-4. Eligibility. All State governments, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are eligible to participate in RADEF as administered through the FEMA/State CCA. Each State applicant must meet basic eligibility requirements for receipt of funds under the FCDA of 1950, as amended, as specified in chapter 1, and in the current year's CCA request for application package.

5-5. Financial Assistance. FEMA headquarters budgets and allocates funds to FEMA regions which in turn distribute funds to States based upon requirements necessary for the development and maintenance of a RADEF system in the State and local jurisdictions. One hundred percent funding is provided for the hiring of one State RADEF Officer in each State, and a RIM&C staff. Funds are allocated to each region based upon the following points of consideration:

- a. One full time State RADEF Officer.
- b. Maintenance of a minimum staffing of two professional staff per each State RIM&C facility, unless it can be justified that a staff of one is sufficient to meet program objectives.
- c. Present day statewide inventory of instruments and instrument sets.
- d. The number of professional workyears required to maintain a 4-year cycle of instrument exchange by State.
- e. Historical background on funding levels and staffing requirements as provided to regions in the CCA.

5-6. State Application Responsibilities. All appropriate procedures referenced in chapter 1 apply. Reference must also be made to CPG 1-38 and the current year's CCA request for application package. In addition:

a. A State is responsible for submission of:

- (1) Application which must satisfy requirements outlined in the current year's CCA request for application package;
- (2) Statement of Work (Program Activity Output/Products);
- (3) Plan of Operation; and
- (4) Quarterly Performance Reports.

b. The statement of work addresses individual State RADEF system activity/output/products, an estimate of scheduled activities and professional workyears of effort. The statement of work should be reflected on FEMA Form 76-43 and shall include a list of staff requirements; position titles of qualified employees required to accomplish the approved workload objectives; and cost projections for the fiscal year, specifically salaries, overhead (amount and percentage), fringe benefits (amount and percentage), travel, contractual and planned needs for supplies and equipment based on current State operating costs with appropriate salary increases factored in. An individual breakout of program costs for the State RADEF Officer and RIM&C activity (a separate breakout is required in order to track program costs since the State RADEF Officer is funded under the RADEF subelement of Planning and Development. The RIM&C activity is funded under the RADEF subelement Instrumentation).

c. State RADEF Program Management Plan. The State RADEF Officer shall develop a RADEF program management plan which specifies the State's long range 5 year program objective. The plan shall separately indicate the current year's program objectives, procedures and administration concerning: (1) the development of local RADEF systems; (2) the development of the State RADEF system; (3) technical support to the conduct of exercises of developed RADEF systems; (4) technical support for statewide training of RADEF Officers, Radiological Response Teams (RRT's), and Radiological Monitors (RM's); and (5) State Radiological Instrument Distribution and Maintenance. The program management plan shall be updated yearly with an assessment made and submitted each year indicating progress made in meeting the long range objectives.

d. State RADEF Program Profile. The State shall maintain a current profile of State and local RADEF systems in terms of their level of development, operational readiness, and time-phased plan for improvement of these systems. The RADEF profile shall be updated yearly.

e. Radiological Emergency Preparedness (REP). If State RIM&C facilities are to be utilized to support REP, the CCA application must identify the use of resources to support the REP effort and identify how that support is funded in order to assure proper use of civil defense funds.

f. RIM&C Facility Plan of Operation.

(1) This plan of operation of the RIM&C facility is required to be submitted only once to FEMA and will be retained as a public record kept on file with the region. It is, however, required to be amended based upon changes made. Any proposed changes to the plan of operation will be formally transmitted to the region for acceptance. In order to maintain eligibility for annual renewal of the RIM&C section of the RADEF Program funding, the State is required to make a statement to the effect that the plan of operation dated (or as revised of) is up-to-date and will be the operating basis for the FY RIM&C portion of the RADEF CCA Program. This plan, when initially submitted to the region or when it is revised, shall be submitted in an original and two copies and will be a part of any resultant cooperative agreement by reference.

(2) The plan of operation details how the statewide RIM&C Program is implemented. It describes objectives, specifies requirements, and defines activities to meet these requirements. It should include: specific details regarding the methods to be used for exchange of instruments, a projected 4-year time-phased schedule, and area map broken out each year by counties, showing area of the States being serviced, battery requirements, calibration of CDV-711's at EOC's, etc. The extent of personnel involvement and scheduled REP support should also be described and detailed including: description of support to be provided; type of instruments or instrument sets serviced; quantities involved; locations supported; frequency of service; and justification for frequency of service. REP support should be broken out by counties and visually represented on a State map showing scheduled areas.

(3) The plan of operation for maintaining a 4-year cycle of instrument inspection maintenance and calibration should be updated as necessary based on: (a) a significant program change; and (b) actual operating experience.

g. Close coordination and cooperation by FEMA Regional Program Managers should ensure that the State RADEF Officer is performing authorized RADEF activities. Further, all State applicants are responsible for submitting copies of RADEF annexes to the appropriate FEMA region for review as specified in CPG 1-38, and the current year's CCA request for application package. State RADEF Officers funded by the RADEF Program are available to assist local jurisdictions in developing and exercising the radiological protection annex to an EMA and non-EMA participant's EOP.

h. The State must ensure:

(1) Personnel with the appropriate scientific and management background are hired;

(2) Assigned personnel are utilized to fulfill agreed-upon products/outputs;

(3) FEMA funding is used for the accomplishments of contract agreed-upon products/outputs;

(4) The State RADEF staff funded under RADEF receive appropriate training;

(5) The most cost-effective use of FEMA provided funds.

5-7. Allowable and Unallowable Costs. Allowability principles prescribed for Federal grant-in-aid programs can be found in OMB Circulars A-87, A-21, A-122, CPG 1-32, CPG 1-38, and each current year's CCA request for application package.

a. The allocation of funds for RADEF Programs is predicated upon developing and maintaining a RADEF capability. Funding for other than civil defense purposes, e.g., support to REP, under the oversight and guidance of State Radiological Health personnel, will be accomplished through alternative funding sources. The policy that permits the use of civil defense radiological instruments for peacetime emergencies does not obligate the FEMA RADEF Programs to incur additional costs associated with that use. Funds other than civil defense must be used to accomplish more frequent cycling of civil defense radiological instruments and development of peacetime radiological emergency response plans to meet these REP requirements. RIM&C facilities and equipment may be used to support REP efforts if there are no additional costs to RADEF. Staffing and personnel expenses associated with more frequent cycles of maintenance and calibration are not authorized.

b. The FEMA policy for the maintenance and calibration of radiological instruments to meet authorized program requirements is based upon readiness and reliability data gathered on 37,682 CDV-715 radiological instruments that were retrofitted, calibrated, and placed in the field from 1 to 5 years without being recalibrated. Based on these data, a 4-year maintenance and calibration cycle is considered to be adequate to maintain an acceptable level of operational readiness and mission reliability for civil defense radiological instruments.

c. Allowable Costs. Allowable costs are those directly associated with the accomplishment of expected outputs (products) of the FEMA/State CCA and includes salaries, fringe benefits, travel, equipment, and supplies. Contractual expenses and miscellaneous expenses are to be explained and justified to FEMA prior to expenditure. Costs associated with training and attendance at conferences approved by the FEMA Regional Director or FEMA headquarters as RADEF related are allowable. However, ALL out of State travel must be reviewed and approved by the region.

d. Unallowable Costs. Unallowable costs include: program activities and travel not relative to the programs (i.e, planning and

development activities that do not include nuclear attack preparedness as the primary objective), the purchase or lease of automatic data processing equipment (hardware/software), and any expenses more properly assigned to another program area. (Cost sharing expenses for State-owned ADP equipment may be allowed if justified and approved by the FEMA Regional Program Manager and not already included in overhead.)

e. Technical Support to Training. Program support to RADEF training is defined as: identifying the need for training in particular areas of the State, including the type of course, potential audience, etc.; coordinating training in conjunction with the development of Statewide RADEF capabilities; and providing instructions and expertise as required. While the personnel funded under the RADEF Programs are expected to support this training, FEMA looks to the EMT Program to be responsible for: course funding; the conduct of the course; establishing the course location, facilities, etc.; and for other responsibilities described under the EMT portion of this agreement. The State RADEF Officer or other personnel funded under the RADEF Programs may not serve as a primary instructor, but as an adjunct instructor for specific course modules (i.e., State radiological defense management, radiological defense annexes, appendixes, SOP's and checklists, etc.).

f. Technical Support to Exercises. Personnel funded under the CCA may participate in exercises involving the State level radiological assessment group when appropriate, and may assist in evaluating the radiological aspects of exercises required by the State and Local Exercise Requirements Annex. The State RADEF Officer hired under RADEF may assist other State and local emergency management staff, e.g., EMA, T&E, DPI, PPP, etc., to conduct the radiological portions of some of the exercises specified in the State and Local Exercise Requirement Annex.

CHAPTER 6

Hazard Mitigation Assistance Program

6-1. General. The HMA Program is designed to reduce a State or local government's vulnerability to risk through hazard mitigation planning and implementation activities.

6-2. Scope. The HMA Program provides a limited amount of funding to States to cover or to assist in covering the cost of preparing a site specific or functionally specific hazard mitigation plan, one or more components of such a plan, or a related activity which will contribute to reducing vulnerability to hazards either throughout the State or for a selected area within the State. Hazard mitigation plans may be prepared by general purpose local governments, including counties, or by State government agencies with responsibility for one or more aspects of disaster recovery or mitigation.

6-3. Objectives. The HMA Program is intended to encourage a State or local government to assess the degree of risk and to develop a comprehensive mitigation strategy to effectively reduce potential losses. Hazard mitigation planning may be carried out either prior to the occurrence of a disaster (predisaster planning), after the occurrence of a disaster (postdisaster planning), or may be an ongoing project of the State or local government. Target areas for the program are those which are threatened by repeated or potentially severe hazards thereby increasing the likelihood of implementation within the useful life of the plan.

6-4. Definitions. The following definitions help clarify the basic objectives of the HMA Program:

a. Hazard Mitigation. Hazard mitigation is defined as actions intended to reduce the degree of risk of vulnerability to hazards present in an area, such as adopting and effectively administering building codes which include features to prevent vulnerability of structures to earthquakes, floods, fires, etc. Hazard mitigation does not include actions which simply involve preparing for or responding to the existing level of risk or vulnerability such as developing warning systems and plans for temporary evacuation of hazard-prone areas. Mitigation actions involve modifying the degree of risk or vulnerability of an area over the long term. Mitigation activities complement preparedness and response measures in that successful mitigation can reduce or eliminate the need for response capabilities.

b. Predisaster Planning. Predisaster plans are those developed in advance of a disaster so that (1) recovery efforts can be guided in such a way as to minimize the potential for recurrence, and (2) routine decisions such as the adoption or enforcement of building code standards

or zoning regulations can be influenced to reduce vulnerability to a disaster.

c. Postdisaster Planning. Postdisaster plans are simply those which are developed after the occurrence of a disaster, though in actuality become pre-disaster plans which are to be implemented before the next disaster event. The occurrence of a disaster heightens the awareness of a community or State to the reality of hazard vulnerability and often results in calls for official actions to address hazard vulnerability. As a condition of Federal assistance following a presidentially declared disaster States are required by FEMA under PL 93-288 Section 406 to evaluate their hazards and identify measures to mitigate these hazards. HMA funds are not to be used to develop plans required under Section 406, because that is a State commitment for receiving Federal disaster assistance. HMA may be used, however, to fund mitigation actions identified in Section 406 plans if the mitigation actions satisfies HMA guidelines. HMA may also be used to fund other post-disaster planning efforts aside from the Section 406 requirement.

d. Hazard Mitigation for All States. Each State should work toward creation of a hazard mitigation section or annex of the State emergency plan. This annex should clearly identify significant hazards present in the State for which mitigation measures are appropriate. (This identification of hazards and mitigation measures should be drawn to the extent practicable from assessments conducted in accordance with HICA/MYDP outlined in CPG 1-36, 1-35, and 1-35a.) For such hazards, the annex would identify what mechanisms are currently in place for reducing long term vulnerability (e.g., State building or fire codes, authorities for construction of flood control facilities, awareness and training program for developers and building inspectors, etc.) and what mechanisms, programs or authorities are needed to address reduction of long term vulnerability that are not already in place.

6-5. Expected Outputs. The basic responsibility of the applicant will be to comply with the requirements and produce the final output, and any interim outputs or reports, as described in the statement agreed to by the State and FEMA regional office. Generally speaking the final output will be a hazard mitigation plan, or implementation of specific mitigation measures, which would be drawn from one or more of the key elements and processes outlined below. The format of the product should be designed to meet the needs of the audience whose support the State or community must enlist to accomplish the actions required. The following key elements and processes are to be used in developing the hazard mitigation plan, or in implementation of specific mitigation measures:

a. Hazard Evaluation. An indepth analysis of the principal hazard(s) affecting the area to provide a basis for proposed mitigation strategies.

b. Community Development Issues/Objectives. An identification of the major community, area or State development issues or objectives which would be affected by the occurrence of a disaster and would therefore become a part of the mitigation planning process.

c. Mitigation Capabilities. A review of existing programs, policies, laws, regulations or activities which are designed to have the effect of reducing vulnerability.

d. Recovery and Mitigation Options/Opportunities. An identification of mitigation opportunities such as mitigation measures identified in a Section 406 Hazard Mitigation Plan or an Interagency Hazard Mitigation Team report.

e. Mitigation Constraints. An examination of legal, political, financial or administrative obstacles to either the preparation or implementation of mitigation strategies.

f. Recovery/Mitigation Plan Action Items. The formulation of specific mitigation tasks, actions or procedures to be followed in the event that an anticipated disaster occurs.

6-6. Evaluation Criteria. In order to select the most worthwhile projects the following factors will be used in evaluating proposals:

a. Serious or repetitive problems of hazard vulnerability which make it likely that the State/locality can reasonably expect to sustain damages in the next 5-10 years (i.e. within the useful life of the HMA plan or project.)

b. Commitment on the part of the responsible State or local governmental unit to the objectives of long-term recovery and mitigation as demonstrated by previous support for active programs of risk reduction.

c. Compliance with all regulatory requirements of the NFIP, PL 93-288 Section 406, and E.O. 11988 and E.O. 11990 if applicable.

d. Potential for the achievement of long term benefits as a result of the project through reduction of hazard vulnerability and promotion of State/local development objectives.

e. Capability to involve the private sector and general public in recovery and mitigation initiatives.

f. Transferability of issues, problems, recommendations, or implementation measures to other States/localities with hazard-prone areas.

g. Vulnerability to multiple hazards such as the following: earthquake, hurricane, tsunami, riverine flooding, coastal flooding, landslide or other earth movement, tornado, drought, avalanche, dam failure, hazardous materials incidents, etc.

h. Established and active community development program.

6-7. State Application Responsibilities. HMA Program proposals are to be submitted in accordance with CPG 1-38 and the current year's CCA request for application package.

CHAPTER 7

Disaster Preparedness Improvement Grant Program

7-1. General. The DPIG Program is designed to assist States in upgrading and improving plans and programs to deliver disaster assistance to communities and individuals and to reduce exposure to hazards.

7-2. Scope. The DPIG Program is currently authorized to provide each State a grant up to \$25,000 per annum for not more than 50 percent of the cost of developing products that improve a State's capability in individual assistance, public assistance, and/or hazard mitigation. In identifying activities eligible for DPIG funds, States are to assess current disaster relief, recovery, and mitigation capabilities based on evaluation of recent disaster operations or current skills and knowledge of personnel required to execute disaster-related tasks. Consideration may also be given to efforts designed to build capabilities to avoid or mitigate exposure to hazards.

7-3. Objectives. The DPIG Program is intended to improve each State's level of disaster preparedness by developing or improving State disaster plans and procedures to increase the capability of the State to respond to the needs of victims, businesses, and local governments following disasters and to reduce the State's vulnerability to natural disaster agents through effective mitigation strategies.

7-4. Expected Outputs. The basic responsibility of the applicant will be to comply with requirements agreed to in the CCA and provide products agreed to in the statement of work. All grants must result in products that contribute to a State's capability to respond to the needs of disaster victims, advance hazard mitigation strategies, or correct deficiencies in State disaster operations including the application for Federal disaster relief. The following list of products is not all inclusive but offers examples of the types of PRODUCTS appropriate for DPIG funding:

- a. Comprehensive disaster assistance plans and their updates;
- b. Procedures for State agencies to execute responsibilities under State disaster plans;
- c. Products to design and deliver training of State personnel in disaster recovery and mitigation functions;
- d. Predisaster hazard mitigation plans/strategies;
- e. Individual and Family Grants (IFG) plan updates;

- f. Damage assessment plans and procedures;
- g. Procedures for search and rescue operations;
- h. Disaster accounting procedures; and
- i. State or local flash flood warning and evacuation plans.

7-5. Evaluation Criteria. In order to select the most appropriate projects for DPIG activities, States and FEMA regional offices should use the following broad criteria for considering proposals:

- a. States should review postdisaster critiques to identify deficiencies in State disaster operations.
- b. States should examine the currency of State plans and procedures for implementing IFG, crisis counselling, food stamp and other disaster programs administered by the State in light of program standards and current regulations.
- c. States should consider using grant funds for developing predisaster hazard mitigation plans.
- d. States should consider using DPIG funds to ensure compatibility of State disaster assistance plans and procedures with local governments' disaster plans through training and exercises.

7-6. State Application Responsibilities. DPIG Program proposals are to be submitted in accordance with the guidelines in CPG 1-38 and the current year's CCA request for application package.

CHAPTER 8

State Support Services Element of the National Flood Insurance Program - Community Assistance Program

8-1. General.

a. The NFIP-CAP Program is intended to identify, prevent, and solve floodplain management issues before they develop into problems requiring enforcement actions. The CAP is also intended to ensure that communities participating in the NFIP are achieving flood loss reduction objectives.

b. The program consists of two main elements:

- (1) Needs assessment process; and
- (2) Assistance delivery systems.

c. The purpose of the first element, the needs assessment process, is to identify community assistance needs through an analysis of pertinent NFIP community information. The second element, assistance delivery systems, is intended to enable the most effective provider of program assessment and assistance services to aid communities in their efforts to implement comprehensive flood loss reduction programs.

d. The assistance delivery systems element can involve FEMA regional office staff, Federal agencies, States, and the private sector. In addition to on-going FEMA regional office staff activities, two specific efforts have been developed to enhance FEMA's delivery of program assistance to NFIP communities. The first assistance delivery effort empowers other Federal agencies to provide technical assistance to NFIP communities through existing or proposed interagency agreements with FEMA. The second effort is the SSSE of the CAP. The CAP-SSSE enables the Federal Insurance Administration (FIA) to enter into agreements with States to provide services meeting the identified technical assistance needs of the States' NFIP communities.

e. Funding for tasks undertaken by States participating in the CAP-SSSE is based upon a level of effort as established by the FEMA regional offices and negotiated with the States. The funding available under the CAP-SSSE is provided on a 75 percent maximum Federal and 25 percent minimum non-Federal cost-sharing basis. Both cash and in-kind resources must be specifically identifiable to the designated allowable task activities of the program.

8-2. Program Description and Objectives.

a. The SSSE of the CAP is designed to utilize the existing capabilities of States in a cost-effective partnership with FEMA to provide flood loss reduction assistance to local NFIP communities. The SSSE of the CAP is a task-specific, product-oriented program directly related to the identified flood loss reduction objectives of the NFIP. State participation in the SSSE is voluntary and is contingent upon meeting the established eligibility requirements of the program and upon need as determined by FEMA.

b. FIA will annually develop a list of allowable program tasks which support and further the objectives of the NFIP and which prescribe technical assistance services to NFIP communities. As the objectives of the NFIP may change over time, the types and priority of allowable CAP-SSSE tasks may also be changed.

c. The FEMA regional offices will determine the technical assistance needs of the State's NFIP communities and select those tasks which States are determined to be capable of performing in response to that need. The FEMA regional offices will then negotiate and assist each State in developing a mutually acceptable statement of work program.

d. Funding for tasks undertaken by States participating in the CAP-SSSE is based upon a level of effort as established by the FEMA regional offices and negotiated with the States.

e. FIA retains the responsibility to provide program oversight and guidance to ensure the program direction is consistent with the established purpose and intent of the CAP-SSSE. In addition, the Administrator, FIA, reserves the right to reassess State capability and program eligibility as needed, and, if necessary, suspend program funding for reasons of inadequate performance by the State.

8-3. Eligibility.

a. The CAP-SSSE is made available to those States meeting the established eligibility requirements for the program. The eligibility criteria that States must satisfy in order to participate in the CAP-SSSE are as follows:

(1) Minimum Resources Level: The State must demonstrate a minimum resources level as evidenced by the presence of at least 1 State-funded, full time equivalent (FTE) dedicated to the performance of the duties and responsibilities listed under paragraph 60.25, State Coordination, of the Rules and Regulations of the NFIP. The qualifying FTE must be composed of professional staff and must be limited to include no more than 4 people contributing toward the completed FTE. Certification of the presence of this FTE by the Governor or his or her

designee will be required on an annual basis prior to the determination of State eligibility to participate in the program or the subsequent allocation of program funds to the State; and

(2) Minimum Skill Level. The State must demonstrate a minimum skill level as evidenced by the presence of capability to perform Community Assistance Visits (CAV's) in accordance with the Community Assistance Program Manual and the capability to perform Ordinance Assistance activities which includes the capability to discuss the adequacy of existing hazard identification information, local administrative techniques, regulatory requirements, and the ordinance adoption process as specified under the SSSE task.

b. FEMA will undertake an evaluation of the States' minimum skill level and notify States of their eligibility under this criterion prior to the CAP-SSSE negotiations. FEMA's determination of the State's ability to satisfy this requirement will be based on current and previous year SSSE performance. In the case of disputed capability (i.e., States which have not previously participated in the CAP-SSSE or there have been changes in State personnel), the State must demonstrate capability of performing CAV's and Ordinance Assistance independent of CAP-SSSE funding by submitting evidence to the FEMA regional office. Such evidence may take the form of CAV reports, adopted ordinances, or other evidence deemed appropriate by the FEMA regional office. At the request of the State, attendance by a FEMA regional office staff member at a State-initiated CAV or other community visit is encouraged to verify capability.

c. States meeting these eligibility requirements will be allowed to participate in the SSSE and perform those tasks which are deemed necessary by the FEMA regional office and which correspond to the identified capabilities within that State.

d. States are expected to perform the SSSE task activities as part of their normal duties and responsibilities as listed under paragraph 60.25 of the NFIP Rules and Regulations. States which are unable to assume all or a portion of the additional workload relating to the performance of SSSE tasks, but still meet the minimum resources level requirement of the program, may employ additional staff, using program funds, to complete the expected tasks of the SSSE. Persons employed by the States under this provision must be certified by the responsible State agency official as being fully-trained and capable of competently performing the SSSE tasks expected of the State prior to the start of the program year.

8-4. State Application Responsibilities.

a. Eligible States wishing to participate in the SSSE must develop a detailed statement of work in accordance with the current year's CCA request for application package. The statements of work

must provide a clear picture of the technical scope of each program task and include specific information on task need, expected task and product descriptions, and a work-plan consisting of an estimated schedule for task completion and a detailed budget for each task performed by the State.

b. All anticipated task deliverables of the program are considered products of the NFIP's CAP. States are expected to strictly adhere to the estimated schedule for task completion. Failure to comply with the program requirements of the CAP-SSSE may prompt a reevaluation of State capability which could result in the suspension of program eligibility or withdrawal of program funds as necessary.