

Rules and Regulations

Federal Register

Vol. 48, No. 44

Friday, March 4, 1983

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains regulatory documents having general applicability and legal effect, most of which are keyed to and codified in the Code of Federal Regulations, which is published under 50 titles pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 1510.

The Code of Federal Regulations is sold by the Superintendent of Documents. Prices of new books are listed in the first FEDERAL REGISTER issue of each month.

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

5 CFR Part 900

Intergovernmental Personnel Act Programs; Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration

AGENCY: Office of Personnel Management.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) is revising the Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration. With this revision, OPM adopts the merit principles of the Intergovernmental Personnel Act as the basic personnel management requirement for administering all Federal intergovernmental assistance programs that require, by statute or by regulation, that the State or local agency receiving the assistance maintain a merit system of personnel administration. In addition, OPM establishes new procedures for assuring compliance with the Standards. OPM's approach to administration of the Standards relies primarily on certification of agreement to comply by State and local chief executives. OPM affirms the responsibility of chief executives to assure compliance of their jurisdictions with the Standards. However, OPM will retain ultimate authority to interpret the Standards and make determinations of noncompliance with them.

The revision is in keeping with the spirit of Executive Order 12372, Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs. It will: (1) Better implement the requirement of the Intergovernmental Personnel Act to minimize Federal intervention in State and local personnel administration; (2) remove unnecessarily burdensome and costly restrictions on State and local

merit personnel systems; (3) effect cost savings by eliminating the need for dual personnel systems that the existing Standards have led some State and local governments to maintain; (4) recognize the voluntary progress of State and local governments, over the years, in developing modern personnel systems and in voluntarily implementing the intent of the Standards, thus making detailed Federal requirements no longer necessary; (5) encourage innovation and allow for diversity in merit systems as required in the Intergovernmental Personnel Act; (6) recognize fully the rights, powers, and responsibilities of State and local governments; and (7) provide State and local governments more flexibility in administering their merit personnel systems, while maintaining protections where there is a Federal interest in promoting proper and efficient administration of Federal grants.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 4, 1983.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Terry W. Culler, (202) 254-3134.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under section 206(a) of the Intergovernmental Personnel Act, as amended, the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) is responsible for prescribing personnel standards which are to be followed by State and local governments as a condition of participation in Federal assistance programs which require of personnel administration on a merit basis for persons engaged in carrying out such programs.

Consistent with OPM's experience with State and local government implementation of the intent of the Standards, the requirement of the Intergovernmental Personnel Act itself that Federal intervention be minimized, and the President's goal to reduce unnecessary regulatory burdens on State and local governments, OPM reviewed its regulations carefully to identify unnecessary requirements.

As a result of this review, OPM published a proposed revision of its regulations in the May 11, 1982, Federal Register (47 FR 20142) for a 60-day public comment period.

Comments were received from 105 sources, including State and local governments, public interest groups, professional organizations, employee organizations, and individuals. The following summarizes the comments, suggestions and actions taken.

Appropriate Level of Regulatory Detail

The proposed revision removed detailed regulatory requirements and guidance and substituted the broad statements of principle found in the Act itself. A number of commentators agreed that the revision would ensure merit-based personnel administration while increasing State and local government efficiency and cost effectiveness. Other commentators suggested that broad statements of principle lack definition and invite inappropriate application. Some commentators were concerned that, without detailed guidance, Federal grantor agencies might impose inconsistent and possibly conflicting requirements on State and local jurisdictions. Other commentators were concerned that some State and local governments would misuse the flexibilities of the proposed revision to the detriment of proper and efficient administration of Federal grants.

Particular areas of concern were: (1) Criteria for exemption of personnel from standards coverage; (2) substitution of the IPA merit principles for more detailed guidance contained in the existing regulations; and (3) removal of the Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures from the Standards.

OPM appreciates the concerns outlined above, but believes that standardized, detailed requirements restrict flexibility, discourage innovation, and constitute an unwarranted regulatory burden on State and local governments. The problems which remain can best be dealt with through the joint State and local-Federal compliance process outlined in these regulations. In accordance with concerns about conflicting Federal policies, however, OPM has revised § 900.604(b)(3) and § 900.605 to make it clear that OPM has sole responsibility, aside from State and local chief executives, for interpretation of the Standards, and that OPM will review issues regarding compliance with the Standards. OPM believes that prudent exercise of its oversight role will strike the best balance between State and local needs for flexibility and the Federal need to ensure proper and efficient grants administration.

With regard to EEO, these Standards recognize equal employment opportunity requirements insofar as they apply by

statute to State and local jurisdictions under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Equal Pay Act of 1963, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act and other relevant laws. The Uniform Guidelines continue to apply to State and local governments through other appropriate regulations, and are duplicative and unnecessary in these regulations. Equal employment opportunity is specifically retained as a Standard under § 900.603(e).

Compliance Provisions

Some commentors suggested that the compliance provisions of the proposed revisions did not provide for a sufficient oversight role for OPM. Particular areas of concern were self-certification of compliance by State and local chief executives and the lack of a detailed review process. OPM has not changed the proposal for self-certification. OPM believes that self-certification, combined with effective resolution of compliance issues, will allow it to focus its efforts on improving those personnel systems with severe problems. The 1979 revision of Merit Standards regulations also provided for self-certification.

With regard to OPM's complaints review process, OPM agrees that there should be a mechanism for surfacing compliance issues and that all parties concerned should be informed of the specific procedures to be used in reviewing complaints. OPM is therefore adding a new section, § 900.606, which indicates that specific guidance will be published in the Federal Personnel Manual System and in other relevant publications.

State/Local Compliance Relationship

Several comments received made it clear that the provisions allowing for State supervision of local government certifications were confusing. In some States, State agencies have supervised compliance of local jurisdictions with the Merit Standards. OPM has no objection to a continued State/local supervisory relationship, should it be acceptable to the parties involved. The May 11 proposed revision therefore allowed for States to continue to collect local certifications of compliance. Comments made it clear that this provision was subject to misinterpretation. For example, some commentors apparently thought that OPM was promoting State supervision of local government merit personnel administration. Others apparently believed OPM intended to conduct reviews of State supervisory activities. From OPM's point of view, each chief

executive is responsible for ensuring compliance of his/her jurisdiction with the Standards. However, OPM wishes to minimize Federal interference in State and local relationships. It has no objection to continued State supervision of local governments; neither does it intend to promote such supervision. OPM has, therefore revised § 900.604(a) to delete all regulatory reference to the relationship between State and local governments.

Employee Protections

A number of employee organizations have suggested that the proposed revision will result in a weakening of employee protections. OPM does not believe that this will happen since State and local governments have, over the years, made considerable progress in implementing the intent of the Standards. However, should any abuses of merit principles occur, OPM will resolve them through its complaints review process. With this revision, OPM is reducing Federal regulation. These Standards in no way require or encourage State or local governments to reduce employee protections.

E.O. 12291, Federal Regulation

OPM has determined that this is not a major rule as defined under section 1(b) of E.O. 12291, Federal Regulations.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

The purpose of this revision is to eliminate unnecessary and burdensome requirements on State and local governments. It places no new requirements on State and local governments. However, it will allow State and local governments to make certain changes in their personnel operations, should they find such changes to be desirable.

I certify that this regulation will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities, including small business, small organizational units and small governmental jurisdictions.

List of Subjects in 5 CFR Part 900

Administrative practice and procedure, Civil rights, Equal employment opportunity, Government employees, Grant programs—education, Handicapped, Intergovernmental relations.

Office of Personnel Management.

Donald J. Devine,

Director.

Accordingly, the Office of Personnel Management amends 5 CFR Part 900 by revising Subpart F to read as follows:

PART 900—INTERGOVERNMENTAL PERSONNEL ACT PROGRAMS

* * * * *

Subpart F—Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration

Sec.

900.601 Purpose.

900.602 Applicability.

900.603 Standards for a merit system of personnel administration.

900.604 Compliance.

900.605 Establishing a merit requirement.

900.606 Publication of procedures to implement merit requirements.

Appendix A to the Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 4728, 4763; E.O. 11580, 3 CFR Part 557 (1971-1975 Compilation).

Subpart F—Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration

§ 900.601 Purpose.

(a) The purpose of these regulations is to implement provisions of Title II of the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970, as amended, relating to Federally required merit personnel systems in State and local agencies, in a manner that recognizes fully the rights, powers, and responsibilities of State and local governments and encourages innovation and allows for diversity among State and local governments in the design, execution, and management of their systems of personnel administration, as provided by that Act.

(b) Certain Federal grant programs require, as a condition of eligibility, that State and local agencies that receive grants establish merit personnel systems for their personnel engaged in administration of the grant-aided program. These merit personnel systems are in some cases required by specific Federal grant statutes and in other cases are required by regulations of the Federal grantor agencies. Title II of the Act gives the U.S. Office of Personnel Management authority to prescribe standards for these Federally required merit personnel systems.

§ 900.602 Applicability.

(a) Sections 900.603-604 apply to those State and local governments that are required to operate merit personnel systems as a condition of eligibility for Federal assistance or participation in an intergovernmental program. Merit personnel systems are required for State and local personnel engaged in the administration of assistance and other intergovernmental programs, irrespective of the source of funds for their salaries, where Federal laws or regulations require the establishment and maintenance of such systems. A

reasonable number of positions, however, may be exempted from merit personnel system coverage.

(b) Section 900.605 applies to Federal agencies that operate Federal assistance or intergovernmental programs.

§ 900.603 Standards for a merit system of personnel administration.

The quality of public service can be improved by the development of systems of personnel administration consistent with such merit principles as—

(a) Recruiting, selecting, and advancing employees on the basis of their relative ability, knowledge, and skills, including open consideration of qualified applicants for initial appointment.

(b) Providing equitable and adequate compensation.

(c) Training employees, as needed, to assure high quality performance.

(d) Retaining employees on the basis of the adequacy of their performance, correcting inadequate performance, and separating employees whose inadequate performance cannot be corrected.

(e) Assuring fair treatment of applicants and employees in all aspects of personnel administration without regard to political affiliation, race, color, national origin, sex, religious creed, age or handicap and with proper regard for their privacy and constitutional rights as citizens. This "fair treatment" principle includes compliance with the Federal equal employment opportunity and nondiscrimination laws. (f) Assuring that employees are protected against coercion for partisan political purposes and are prohibited from using their official authority for the purpose of interfering with or affecting the result of an election or a nomination for office.

§ 900.604 Compliance.

(a) *Certification by Chief Executives.*

(1) Certification of agreement by a chief executive of a State or local jurisdiction to maintain a system of personnel administration in conformance with these Standards satisfies any applicable Federal merit personnel requirements of the Federal assistance or other programs to which personnel standards on a merit basis are applicable.

(2) Chief executives will maintain these certifications and make them available to the Office of Personnel Management.

(3) In the absence of certification by the chief executive, compliance with the Standards may be certified by the heads of those State and local agencies that are required to have merit personnel systems as a condition of Federal

assistance or other intergovernmental programs.

(b) *Resolution of Compliance Issues.*

(1) Chief executives of State and local jurisdictions operating covered programs are responsible for supervising compliance by personnel systems in their jurisdictions with the Standards. They shall resolve all questions regarding compliance by personnel systems in their jurisdictions with the Standards. Findings and supporting documentation with regard to specific compliance issues shall be maintained by the chief executive, or a personal designee, and shall be forwarded, on request, to the Office of Personnel Management.

(2) The merit principles apply to systems of personnel administration. The Intergovernmental Personnel Act does not authorize OPM to exercise any authority, direction or control over the selection, assignment, advancement, retention, compensation, or other personnel action with respect to any individual State or local employee.

(3) If a chief executive is unable to resolve a compliance issue to the satisfaction of the Office of Personnel Management, the Office will assist the chief executive in resolving the issue. The Office of Personnel Management, as authorized by section 206 of the Intergovernmental Personnel Act, will determine whether personnel systems are in compliance with the Standards and will advise Federal agencies regarding application of the Standards and recommend actions to carry out the purpose of the Act. Questions regarding interpretation of the Standards will be referred to the Office of Personnel Management.

§ 900.605 Establishing a merit requirement.

Federal agencies may adopt regulations that require the establishment of a merit personnel system as a condition for receiving Federal assistance or otherwise participating in an intergovernmental program only with the prior approval of the Office of Personnel Management. All existing regulations will be submitted to the Office of Personnel Management for review.

§ 900.606 Publication of procedures to implement merit requirements.

Procedures to implement these merit requirements will be specified in the Federal Personnel Manual System and other relevant publications of the Office of Personnel Management.

Appendix A to the Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration

Part I: The following programs have a statutory requirement for the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis.

Program, Legislation, and Statutory Reference

Food Stamp, Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended; 7 U.S.C. 2020(e)(6)(B).

National Health Planning and Resources Development, Public Health Service Act (Title XV), as amended by the National Health Planning and Resources Development Act of 1974, section 1522, on January 2, 1975; 42 U.S.C. 300m-1(b)(4)(B).

Old-Age Assistance, Social Security Act (Title I), as amended by the Social Security Act Amendments of 1939, section 101, on August 10, 1939; 42 U.S.C. 302(a)(5)(A).¹

Employment Security (Unemployment Insurance and Employment Services), Social Security Act (Title III), as amended by the Social Security Act Amendments of 1939, section 301, on August 10, 1939, and the Wagner-Peyser Act, as amended by Pub. L. 81-775, section 2, on September 8, 1950; 42 U.S.C. 503(a)(1) and 29 U.S.C. 490(b).

Aid to Families with Dependent Children, Social Security Act (Title IV-A), as amended by the Social Security Act Amendments of 1939, section 401, on August 10, 1939; 42 U.S.C. 602(a)(5).

Aid to the Blind, Social Security Act (Title X), as amended by the Social Security Act Amendments of 1939, section 701, on August 10, 1939; 42 U.S.C. 1202(a)(5)(A).¹

Aid to the Permanently and Totally Disabled, Social Security Act (Title XIV), as amended by the Social Security Act Amendments of 1950, section 1402, on August 28, 1950; 42 U.S.C. 1352(a)(5)(A).¹

Aid to the Aged, Blind or Disabled, Social Security Act (Title XVI), as amended by the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962, section 1602, on July 25, 1962; 42 U.S.C. 1382(a)(5)(A).¹

Medical Assistance (Medicaid), Social Security Act (Title XIX), as amended by the Social Security Amendments of 1985, section 1902, on July 30, 1985; 42 U.S.C. 1396(a)(4)(A).

State and Community Programs on Aging (Older Americans), Older Americans Act of 1965 (Title III), as amended by the Comprehensive Older Americans Act Amendments of 1978, section 307 on October 18, 1978; 42 U.S.C. 3027(a)(4).

Adoption Assistance and Foster Care, Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act of 1980; 42 U.S.C. 671(a)(5).

Part II: The following programs have a regulatory requirement for the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis.

Program, Legislation, and Regulatory Reference

Occupational Safety and Health Standards, Williams-Steiger Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970; Occupational Safety and

¹ Pub. L. 92-603 repealed Titles I, X, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act, effective January 1, 1974, except that "such repeal does not apply to Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands."

Health State Plans for the Development and Enforcement of State Standards; Department of Labor, 29 CFR 1902.3(h).

Occupational Safety and Health Statistics, Williams-Steiger Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970; BLS Grant Application Kit, May 1, 1973, Supplemental Assurance No. 15A.

Child Welfare Services, Social Security Act (Title IV-B); 45 CFR 1392.49(c).

Development Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction, Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act, as amended by Pub. L. 95-602, on November 8, 1978; 45 CFR 1386.21.

Emergency Management Assistance, Civil Defense Act of 1950 (Title II), as amended; 44 CFR 302.5.

Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973; 29 CFR 98.14(a).

Part III: The following programs have personnel requirements which may be met by a merit system which conforms to the Standards for Merit Systems of Personnel Administration.

Program, Legislation, and Reference

Disability Determination Services, Social Security Act (Titles II and XVI), as amended; SSA Disability Insurance State Manual, Part IV, § 425.1.

Health Insurance for the Aged (Medicare), Social Security Act (Title XVIII), especially as amended by the Health Insurance for the Aged Act, on July 30, 1965; SSA State Operations Manual, Part IV section 4510(a).

[FR Doc. 82-4804 Filed 2-3-83; 8:48 am]

BILLING CODE 3320-01-0

APPENDIX C

The Role of Exercising
in a
Comprehensive Emergency Management Program

In spite of excellent exercise efforts in many States, there is still a lack of nationwide consensus on scope, length of play, amount of simulation, required participation, frequency, subject matter, and basic definitions on exercise activity. About the only area of agreement is in the need for exercises. Even then, constraints of time, staff, and other resources, as well as political concerns represent serious barriers. As a result, in many State and local jurisdictions, exercises have been assigned low priority and are initiated only under duress.

In considering any State and local exercise program, three fundamental issues must be addressed:

- (1) What purpose does an exercise really serve?
- (2) Is an exercise program really necessary?
- (3) Is an exercise program feasible at the State and local level?

Purpose of exercises. Experience has shown that there is a great deal to be learned from exercises. A good exercise, which is well evaluated, will reveal disconnects in plans, highlight deficiencies in resources, and underscore the need for remedial training. In addition to these general benefits, a properly designed exercise program will also:

- (1) Develop proficiency and confidence of participants;
- (2) Test plans and systems in 'live' situations;
- (3) Enhance community capabilities for emergency response;
- (4) Enhance public information capabilities and proficiency;
- (5) Foster cooperation among government agencies and private sector resources;
- (6) Increase public awareness of proficiencies, capabilities, vulnerabilities, and needs;
- (7) Help formulate public policy on community readiness posture; and
- (8) Demonstrate utilization of the emergency management process, i.e., the use of emergency management resources, the need for centralized operations, etc.

Necessity of exercises. A conscious decision not to exercise emergency plans and procedures involves substantial risks in that in an actual emergency, the participants may not know or thoroughly understand their jobs and how they relate to other activities; equipment may not function as expected; procedures may not be as effective as anticipated, and so forth. Such risks, when thoroughly considered, are unacceptable to most government leaders especially with increasing liability insurance costs. Accordingly, it is clear that a broad spectrum of exercise activity is necessary if emergency response capability is to be realistically assessed.

Feasibility of exercises. It is not unreasonable to assume that emergency resources, potential capability, and community size, generally go hand in hand. Therefore, while an exercise program must be scaled to fit needs and resources, a functionally oriented exercise program of some sort is feasible at all levels of government and in all sizes of cities and towns. The dividends paid by an active exercise plan are numerous and well worth the time, talent and effort involved.

Disaster Response Questionnaire

The Disaster Response Questionnaire (DRQ), FEMA Form 90-2 was officially implemented by FEMA on November 12, 1986. The information collection requirement was approved by the OMB.

Purpose

The DRQ will provide a valuable body of data on emergency response. The information will enable headquarters to evaluate the effectiveness of FEMA programs in light of actual responses. The data will also validate the preparedness information contained in the HICA/MYDP submitted by local governments.

The questionnaire can be used by State and local jurisdictions affected by an emergency. It provides a format for critiquing the effectiveness of the response and noting areas where remedial actions may be required. The other major benefit to local governments--and one that should be stressed by regions and States--is that the DRQ is the mechanism for receiving credit for the FSE or FE requirement contained in each current year's CCA request for application package.

Implementing Instructions

The DRQ is requested from all local jurisdictions involved in a Presidential declaration of a major disaster. Its completion is voluntary; thus, failure to submit it will not result in the loss of existing FEMA funding or other benefits. FEMA strongly encourages DRQ submissions, because we would like to establish a complete historical data base on emergency local response to major disasters. The completed DRQ should be forwarded by the States to the regional office within 90 days after the declaration date. This will allow each State to choose the most appropriate time to administer the questionnaire.

The DRQ may also be submitted for other disasters or emergencies that involve a significant response but do not result in a Presidential declaration. This form should not be used, however, to report routine day-to-day emergency situations involving a limited response (e.g., house fires, small-scale rescue operations).

The decision to credit a non-Presidentially declared emergency response toward the CCA exercise requirements rests with the Regional Director. The State is expected to provide supplementary information along with the completed DRQ to indicate the scope of the local response. This will serve as the basis for the Regional Director's decision. Factors on which the Regional Director can base a decision on the significance of a non-Presidential response are contained in the Exercise Annex to each current year's CCA request for application package. No credit will be granted without the submission of a completed DRQ to FEMA headquarters.

Responsibilities

FEMA Headquarters:

- o Notify the regional office point of contact upon a Presidential declaration of a major disaster. State and Local Programs Support Directorate, Office of Civil Defense, Emergency Management Systems Development Division is the headquarters point of contact for coordination with regions on pending declarations.
- o Provide followup on contact with the region, as necessary;
- o Maintain a data tracking system;
- o Provide DRQ and FEMA Form 95-16 (check actual occurrence block) to EMI, Attention: Field Programs Coordination, when the Regional Director approves an exercise credit; and
- o Analyze aggregate data and prepare reports. Provide feedback to regions/States.

FEMA Regional Offices:

- o Designate a point of contact for coordination of this effort;
- o Provide a DRQ to each State in the region;
- o Coordinate with States after a Presidential declaration to ensure submission of the DRQ and resolve problems, as necessary.
- o Review submissions to ensure they are complete;
- o Render a decision on an exercise credit, when requested, and prepare approval letter to the appropriate State; and
- o Forward the completed DRQ and a copy of the exercise credit approval letter, when applicable, to FEMA headquarters, Standards and Assessment Branch.

State Emergency Management Offices:

- o Administer the DRQ to the appropriate local jurisdictions on a face-to-face basis;
- o Submit completed forms to the regional office within 90 days after the date of the Presidential declaration or the emergency for which an exercise credit is being requested.
- o Provide supplementary justification for an exercise credit for non-Presidential disaster responses, if appropriate; and
- o Encourage local jurisdictions to address identified deficiencies in their plans for the year.

Local Jurisdictions:

- o Complete the DRQ; it should be completed by a local official involved in the disaster response (e.g., emergency program manager, mayor, or county executive). (Incorporate remedial actions into future work plans.)

General Instructions

The Disaster Response Questionnaire (DRQ) should be completed by local jurisdictions who have been designated in a Presidential declaration of a major disaster. FEMA recommends that it be administered by State emergency management personnel on a face-to-face basis to one of the principal local officials involved in the emergency response (e.g., local emergency program manager, mayor, county executive). The questionnaire should be submitted to the FEMA regional office no later than 90 days after the date of the Presidential disaster declaration.

Completion of the DRQ is voluntary, thus failure to submit it will not result in the loss of existing FEMA funding or other benefits. However, submission of the form and its approval by the FEMA Regional Director can serve to satisfy the full scale or functional exercise requirement contained in the CCA. Its submission is a requirement for regional consideration of a request to substitute an actual response for a required exercise. Therefore, it is to the advantage of the affected local jurisdiction to complete and submit the questionnaire.

The DRQ may also be used for other significant disaster/emergency* responses that are not declared major disasters by the Federal government. In this case, the State should provide enough supplementary information to indicate the scope of the local response so that it may serve as a basis for the Regional Director's decision to waive an exercise requirement in the CCA guidelines.

This replaces the DRQ transmitted with my memorandum dated April 28, 1986. The previous editions should no longer be used.

Specific Instructions

Complete the questionnaire by CIRCLING the appropriate response or ENTERING A NUMBER, LETTER OR DOLLAR VALUE IN THE SPACE PROVIDED. The circled responses are:

Y for YES,
N for NO,
NA for NOT APPLICABLE, or
A through P for multiple choice questions.

If the local jurisdiction wishes to substitute the emergency response for an exercise requirement, the narrative questions (Numbers 27 through 29) at the end of the questionnaire must also be completed.

* The term "disaster" signifies an actual occurrence which results in significant damage to property and may involve deaths and injuries to people. "Emergency" is a broader term that refers to an actual disaster occurrence OR a situation which seriously threatens loss of life and damage to property, but does not necessarily result in a disaster.

The Office of Management and Budget approval number 3067-0188 has been assigned to this data collection instrument. This approval number expires September 30, 1989.

DISASTER RESPONSE QUESTIONNAIRE

Jurisdiction _____

Respondent Name _____

Respondent Title _____

Interviewer Name _____

Interviewer Title _____

Interviewer Organization _____

Date Form Completed _____

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Identify the hazard which resulted in the emergency.

Circle the appropriate letter (A through P).

- | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| A. Avalanche | I. Hurricane/tropical |
| B. Civil Disorder | storm |
| C. Dam Failure | J. Landslide |
| D. Earthquake | K. Tornado |
| E. Fixed Nuclear Facility | L. Tsunami |
| F. Flood/flash flood | M. Volcano |
| G. Hazardous materials-- | N. Wildfire |
| stationary | O. Winter Storm |
| H. Hazardous materials-- | P. Nuclear Attack |
| transportation | Q. Other _____ |
-

2. Provide the following information on the extent of the disaster or emergency:

- 2.1 Date(s) of disaster/emergency: _____
- 2.2 Number of deaths: _____
- 2.3 Number of injuries: _____
- 2.4 Number of people evacuated: _____
- 2.5 Number of people sheltered: _____
- * 2.6 Estimated damage to public facilities: \$ _____
(e.g., roads, bridges, public buildings, equipment)
- * 2.7 Estimated damage to the private sector: \$ _____
(e.g., homes, business, industry, agriculture)
- 2.8 Approximate number of local personnel
involved in the emergency response: _____
- 2.9 Approximate number of hours
contributed by volunteers: _____
-

EMERGENCY ORGANIZATION, PLANNING, AND MANAGEMENT

3. List the title of the individual who had the lead role
in coordinating the emergency response (e.g., emergency
program manager, mayor, fire chief, county executive). _____
-

* Do not answer this question for Presidential declarations; FEMA will obtain
the information from its own records.

4. Was the local Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) activated? Y N

5. If the jurisdiction has any Individual Mobilization Augmentees (IMA's) assigned, did they play a role in the response? Y N NA

DIRECTION, CONTROL AND WARNING

6. Was the Emergency Operating Center (EOC) activated and did it serve as the focal point for decision making during the emergency response? Y N NA

7. Was there a need to use the EOC emergency power generator? Y N NA

8. From what location was the initial public warning activated? A B C D E

Mark A, B, C, D, or E.

- A. Local EOC
- B. Local Warning Point (if not EOC)
- C. EBS station
- D. Other radio/TV stations
- E. Not applicable

9. Approximately how long did it take to alert the following after receipt of a warning from a credible source:

Mark A, B, C, D, or E for each.

- A. Up to 5 minutes
- B. 6 to 15 minutes
- C. 16 to 30 minutes
- D. Longer than 30 minutes
- E. Not applicable

9.1 Key government officials (e.g., mayors, county executives)? A B C D E

9.2 Emergency responders (e.g., police, fire)? A B C D E

9.3 The general public? A B C D E

10. Was the Emergency Broadcast System (EBS) activated during the recent emergency? Y N NA

11. In your judgement, what was the most effective means of warning the population?

A B C D E

Mark A, B, C, D, or E.

- A. Outdoor warning devices (e.g., sirens, whistles, horns)
 B. Radio/TV stations
 C. Door to door notification
 D. Other _____
 E. Not applicable

12. Did your jurisdiction receive warning from the National Weather Service (NWS)?

Y N NA

POPULATION PROTECTION

13. Was an evacuation order issued?

Y N

14. If evacuation was necessary, was an existing evacuation plan activated for this emergency?

Y N NA

15. Were people evacuated outside the boundaries of your jurisdiction?

Y N NA

16. If Yes to Question 15, how would you characterize the coordination with the receiving jurisdiction(s)?

A B C D

Mark A, B, C, or D.

- A. Very good
 B. Adequate, but could have been better
 C. Poor, hampered evacuation operations
 D. Not applicable

17. If temporary shelter facilities were used, were they adequately staffed to provide mass care?

Y N NA

18. How were buildings selected to serve as temporary shelter facilities?

A B C D E

Mark A, B, C, D, or E

- A. A pre-selected list of appropriate buildings was used
 B. Red Cross shelters were used
 C. The FEMA National Shelter Inventory was used
 D. Other means _____
 E. Not applicable

CONTAMINATION MONITORING AND CONTROL

19. If hazardous materials accident occurred, how effectively did emergency support services personnel (e.g., police, fire, medical) respond?

A B C D

Mark A, B, C, or D.

- A. Very effectively
 B. Some problems hampered the response
 C. Serious problems hampered the response
 D. Not applicable

-
20. Did emergency support services personnel have adequate equipment to respond to the hazardous materials accident?

Y N NA

PUBLIC EDUCATION AND EMERGENCY INFORMATION

21. Was the responsibility for disseminating official emergency information to the media and the public centralized (i.e., was a Joint Information Center or its equivalent established)?

Y N NA

-
22. Was adequate, accurate, and up-to-date emergency public information provided to the public during the following time periods:

22.1 Prior to the onset of the emergency?

Y N NA

22.2 During the emergency period?

Y N NA

22.3 During the immediate post-emergency period?

Y N NA

EMERGENCY SUPPORT SERVICES

23. Were the existing plans/procedures of the emergency support services adequate for this response?

Y N

OVERALL EVALUATION OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

24. Based on your best judgment, provide an assessment of the jurisdiction's response in selected emergency management areas. Answer for each of the three components (i.e., facilities/equipment, plans/SOP's, response personnel) and make an overall evaluation.

- o Facilities and equipment--were they available in sufficient quantity and adequate for performing emergency operations.
- o Plan/procedures/SOP's--were they developed in advance of the emergency, were they followed, and were they adequate to meet the needs of the situation.
- o Response personnel (public officials, EOC staff, emergency support services responders)--were they trained for their emergency responsibilities and did they perform satisfactorily.
- o Overall evaluation--considering the components above, provide an overall evaluation of each area.

Mark A, B, C, D, or E for each.

A. Excellent
B. Good
C. Fair

D. Poor
E. Not applicable

Emergency management area	Facilities Equipment	Plans SOP's	Response Personnel	Overall Evaluation
24.1 EOC Operations				
24.2 Communications				
24.3 Warning systems				
24.4 Emerg. Public Info.				
24.5 Evacuation				
24.6 Shelter/mass care				
24.7 Coordination*				
24.8 Resource use				
24.9 Contamination monitoring & control				

* How effective was coordination among officials, EOC staff, emergency support services, or other response personnel.

25. Was an evaluation of the emergency response conducted? Y N

26. Does the jurisdiction seek FEMA regional approval for using this emergency response to fulfill an exercise requirement contained in the Exercises Annex of the CCA? Y N

NARRATIVE SECTION

Jurisdictions that answer YES to Question 26 must address the following questions.

27. Did functional areas or aspects of emergency management stand out as working very effectively?

28. What areas did not function as anticipated and caused serious problems in the emergency response?

29. What remedial actions are planned to address identified deficiencies?

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY EXERCISE DATA (FUNCTIONAL & FULLSCALE)				FY _____	QUARTER _____	OMB NO 3067-0189 <i>Expires October 1988</i>	
PREPARED BY (Include title)			EXERCISE ASSISTANCE OFFICER (If applicable & different from preparer)		DATE(S) OF EXERCISE		NO OF RESPONSE PARTICIPANTS
REGION	STATE	JURISDICTION	FIPS CODE (If known)		POPULATION	EMA FUNDED <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
LEVEL OF EXERCISE <input type="checkbox"/> SINGLE JURISDICTION <input type="checkbox"/> STATE <input type="checkbox"/> MULTIJURISDICTION			ACTIVATION EOC ACTIVATED <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO		TYPE OF EXERCISE <input type="checkbox"/> TABLETOP (TT) <input type="checkbox"/> FULLSCALE (FSE) <input type="checkbox"/> FUNCTIONAL (FE) <input type="checkbox"/> ACTUAL OCCURRENCE		
PURPOSE OF EXERCISE (Check as many as apply) <input type="checkbox"/> TEST RESPONSE TIME <input type="checkbox"/> TEST REPORTING PROCEDURES <input type="checkbox"/> ENHANCE AGENCY COORDINATION <input type="checkbox"/> VALIDATE EMERGENCY OPERATIONS PLAN (EOP) <input type="checkbox"/> SATISFY CCA PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS (List) <input type="checkbox"/> INCREASE AWARENESS OF CAPABILITIES & VULNERABILITIES OTHER _____			HAZARDS SCENARIO (Check as many as apply) <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div> <input type="checkbox"/> EARTHQUAKE <input type="checkbox"/> FLOOD <input type="checkbox"/> HURRICANE <input type="checkbox"/> TORNADO <input type="checkbox"/> FIRE (Wild) <input type="checkbox"/> WINTER STORM <input type="checkbox"/> ATTACK (Nuclear or conventional) <input type="checkbox"/> CIVIL DISORDER </div> <div> <input type="checkbox"/> DAM FAILURES <input type="checkbox"/> HAZ MAT - STATIONARY <input type="checkbox"/> HAZ MAT - TRANSPORTATION <input type="checkbox"/> NUCLEAR POWER PLANT <input type="checkbox"/> RADIOLOGICAL <input type="checkbox"/> TRANSPORTATION ACCIDENT (Air/Rail) <input type="checkbox"/> FIRE (Urban) OTHER _____ </div> </div>				
AGENCIES/PERSONNEL REPRESENTED (Indicate No. of response participants)							
___ ELECTED OFFICIAL(S)		___ CIVIL AIR PATROL		___ CITY/COUNTY ADMINISTRATION		___ PRIVATE INDUSTRY	
___ POLICE		___ ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCY		___ RED CROSS		___ PUBLIC INFORMATION	
___ SHERIFF/DEPUTIES		___ PUBLIC WORKS		___ SALVATION ARMY		___ NEWS MEDIA	
___ STATE PATROL/POLICE		___ HOSPITALS		___ SCHOOLS		___ ENGINEERING	
___ FIRE		___ SOCIAL SERVICES		___ AMATEUR RADIO		___ OTHER _____	
___ RESCUE		___ PUBLIC HEALTH		___ UTILITIES		___ _____	
___ EMS		___ MENTAL HEALTH		___ EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT		___ _____	
___ NATIONAL GUARD		___ RADIOLOGICAL HEALTH		___ TRANSPORTATION		___ TOTAL PARTICIPANTS _____	
FUNCTIONS EVALUATED/TESTED (Check under "Y" if function performed according to plan, "N" if it did not. Leave blank if not tested)							
Y	N	Y	N	Y	N		
___	___	___	___	___	___	OTHER: _____	
___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
___	___	___	___	___	___	___	
PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED (Check as many as apply)							
<input type="checkbox"/> INADEQUATE DISASTER PLANS		<input type="checkbox"/> STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES		<input type="checkbox"/> COMMUNICATIONS			
<input type="checkbox"/> ALERT/WARNING/NOTIFICATION		<input type="checkbox"/> LACK OF RESOURCES (Generators, Equip)		<input type="checkbox"/> INADEQUATE INTERAGENCY COORD.			
<input type="checkbox"/> INADEQUATE TRAINING		<input type="checkbox"/> INADEQUATE CROWD CONTROL		OTHER _____			
<input type="checkbox"/> AGENCY RESPONSE		<input type="checkbox"/> LACK OF ELECTED OFFICIAL SUPPORT		_____			
<input type="checkbox"/> MESSAGE CONTROL IN EOC		<input type="checkbox"/> LACK OF PERSONNEL		_____			
PRE-EXERCISE TRAINING (Training courses conducted for either some or all of the participants)							
REMEDIAL/FOLLOW-UP ACTION PLAN(S)							
<input type="checkbox"/> UPDATE PLAN - PROPOSED COMPLETION (Mo/Yr.) _____				<input type="checkbox"/> ADDITIONAL TRAINING (Type) _____			
<input type="checkbox"/> OTHER (List) _____							
NEXT SCHEDULED EXERCISE							
MONTH/YEAR _____				TYPE: <input type="checkbox"/> TABLETOP <input type="checkbox"/> FUNCTIONAL <input type="checkbox"/> FULLSCALE			
HAZARD SCENARIO (List, if known) _____							
ACCOMPLISHMENTS/SURVEY (List)							
IF MORE SPACE IS NEEDED FOR ANY ITEM, USE REVERSE AND IDENTIFY BY ITEM HEADING							

APPENDIX D

Course Manager/Instructor Requirements

The following matrix outlines requirements for individuals providing the various types of instructional or managerial assistance for courses and activities using EMT funds under the CCA.

The lefthand vertical column indicates type of experience, background, or additional training for the various titles (categories) shown in the top horizontal row. There are two options (either/or) for Course Managers and Lead Instructors.

Background and/or Training	TITLE (Type/Category)					
	A		B		C	D
	Course Manager		Lead/Associate Instructor		Content/ Practitioner Instructor	Guest Lecturer
	Option A	Option B	Option A	Option B		
1. Degree	X	-	X	-	R	R
Adult Educ. Teaching Experience	R	X	R	X	R	R
Instructional Techniques Course - 1-1/2 days (Field Course) -or- Local College Course on Instructional Techniques (Field)	N	X	N	X	X	N
Methods and Techniques of Adult Educ. 5 Days (Resident)	R	X	N	X	R	N

X = Required

R = Recommended

N = Not Required

Definitions:

Course Manager: Personally responsible for the conduct of the course or training activity, including completion and submission of post-course reports and evaluation data.

May personally deliver all instruction or supervise Lead/Associate Instructors, Content/Practitioner Instructors, or Guest Lecturers.

Requires a degree; Adult education and teaching experience is recommended. If nondegreed, some type of teaching experience is required, as is completion of the 1-1/2 day Instructional Techniques Course and 5-day Methods and Techniques of Adult Education Course.

Lead/Associate Instructor: Assists the Course Manager in the conduct of the course or training activity and may assume responsibility during the Course Manager's absence.

Personally delivers one or more instructional modules.

Supervises Content/Practitioner Instructors and Guest Lecturers during the absence of the Course Manager.

Same educational requirements as the Course Manager.

Content/Practitioner Instructor: Conducts specific blocks of instruction, only in areas of personal expertise.

A degree and teaching experience is recommended. In their absence, the Instructional Techniques Course is required.

Guest Lecturer: Individuals who appear for a limited time as lecturer in a block of instruction, generally three hours or less.

While a degree and teaching experience are recommended, there are no requirements.

APPENDIX E

Applicable Civil Preparedness Circulars

<u>Title</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Date Issued</u>
Permissive Use of DCPA Communications and Warning Systems	CPC 77-4	07-05-77
Disaster Notification Using the National Warning System (NAWAS)	CPC 78-7	06-08-78
Warning to State and Local Governments on the Use of Outdated CDV-800, CDV-805, and XM-28E4 Protective Masks	CPC 80-1	08-28-80
Shelter Supplies	CPC 83-1	08-15-83
A Conceptual Approach to State and Local Exercises	CPC 84-2	04-17-84
Slide/Tape Presentation "A Special Kind of Place"	CPC 86-1	04-23-86
Systems Interconnections and Establishment of Users Accounts for Integrated Emergency Management Information System	CPC 86-2	10-29-86

APPENDIX F

Applicable Civil Preparedness Guides

<u>Title</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Date Issued</u>	<u>Programs Covered</u>
Change 1		November 1986	EMA
Objectives for Local Emergency Management	CPG 1-5	July 1984	Being Coordinated for Update)
Disaster Operations - A Handbook for Local Governments	CPG 1-6	July 1981	
Guide for Increasing Local Government Civil Defense Readiness During Periods of International Crisis	CPG 1-7	May 1981	EMA, SLDCW, PPP, RADEF, Exercises, EMT, FS, IMA
Guide for Development of State and Local Emergency Operations Plans (EOP's)	CPG 1-8	October 1985	EMA, SLDCW, PPP, RADEF, Exercises, EMT, HP, EP, DPI, FS, IMA
Change 1		March 1987	
Guide for the Review of State and Local EOP's	CPG 1-8A	October 1985	Same as CPG 1-8
Nondiscrimination in Federally Assisted Programs of the DCPA	CPG 1-9	July 1975	
FEMA IMA Program	CPG 1-11	March 1984	IMA
Principles of Warning and Criteria Governing Eligibility of NAWAS Terminals	CPG 1-14	November 1981	SLDCW
NAWAS Operations Manual	CPG 1-16	November 1980	SLDCW
Outdoor Warning Systems Guide	CPG 1-17	March 1980	SLDCW
Emergency Communications	CPG 1-18	January 1977	SLDCW
Guidance for Development of an Emergency Fallout Shelter Stocking Plan	CPG 1-19	July 1983	FS

<u>Title</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Date Issued</u>	<u>Programs Covered</u>
Emergency Operating Centers Handbook	CPG 1-20	May 1984	SLDCW
Guide for the Design and Development of a Local Radiological Defense Support System	CPG 1-30	June 1981	RADEF
A Guide to the DFIG Program	CPG 1-31	April 1982 and May 20, 1985	DFIG
Broadcast Station Protection Program	CPG 1-33	May 1984	EBS, BSPP
HICA/MYDP - Overview	CPG 1-34	January 1985	IEMS
HICA/MYDP - For Local Governments	CPG 1-35	January 1985	IEMS
HICA/MYDP - Response Book for Local Governments	CPG 1-35a	January 1985	IEMS
MYDP for State Governments	CPG 1-36	January 1985	IEMS
Federal Assistance Handbook: State and Local Communications and Warning Systems Engineering Guidance	CPG 1-37	September 1984	SLDCW
CCA Policies and Procedures Guide	CPG 1-38	June 1986	All Programs Receiving FEMA Financial Assistance Under the CCA
Radiological Protection Preparedness	CPG 2-6.1	February 1985	RADEF
Radiological Defense Manual	CPG 2-6.2	June 1977	RADEF
Hardware for Aerial Radiological Monitors	CPG 2-6.2.3	April 1983	RADEF
Radiation Safety in Shelters	CPG 2-6.4	September 1983	FS
Prototype Plans for Production and Maintenance of Electric Power in Crisis Relocation	CPG 2-8.6	August 1975	SLDCW

<u>Title</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Date Issued</u>	<u>Programs Covered</u>
Alternate Ways of Providing Host Area Fallout Protection	CPG 2-8.9	October 1976	RADEF
Home Basement Sharing: An Analysis and a Possible Approach to Planning	CPG 2-8.10	January 1977	RADEF
Planned Maintenance Management System	CPG 2-13	April 1986	SLDCW
Designing an Effective Maintenance Program for Emergency Equipment	CPG 2-13A	April 1986	SLDCW
Maintenance Manuals - Portable Antennas	CPG 2-13B	April 1986	SLDCW
Maintenance Manual - Antenna Guylines and Mounting	CPG 2-13C	April 1986	SLDCW
Maintenance Manual - Primary and Secondary Power Feed Lines	CPG 2-13D	April 1986	SLDCW
Maintenance Manual - Radio Transmission Lines	CPG 2-13E	April 1986	SLDCW
Maintenance Manual - Electronic Testing Equipment	CPG 2-13F	April 1986	SLDCW
Maintenance Manual - Tone Alert Transmitters and Receivers	CPG 2-13G	April 1986	SLDCW
Maintenance Manual - Security System for Emergency Operations Center	CPG 2-13H	April 1986	SLDCW
Maintenance Manual - Map and Chart Projection Display Equipment	CPG 2-13I	April 1986	SLDCW
Maintenance Manual - Microwave Repeaters	CPG 2-13J	April 1986	SLDCW
Maintenance Manual - Microwave Transmitters and Receivers	CPG 2-13K	April 1986	SLDCW
Maintenance Manual - Heating, Ventilating and Air Conditioning (HVAC) Systems for EOC's	CPG 2-13L	April 1986	SLDCW
Maintenance Manual - Water Storage Services and Pumps	CPG 2-13M	April 1986	SLDCW

<u>Title</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Date Issued</u>	<u>Programs Covered</u>
Maintenance Manual - Remote Radio Pickup Units	CPG 2-13N	April 1986	SLDCW
Maintenance Manual - Mobile Transmitters and Receivers	CPG 2-130	April 1986	SLDCW
Maintenance Manual - Fixed Station Transmitters and Receivers	CPG 2-13P	April 1986	SLDCW
Maintenance Manual - Warning Sirens and Their Activation Devices	CPG 2-13Q	April 1986	SLDCW
Maintenance Manual - Emergency Generators	CPG 2-13R	April 1986	SLDCW
Maintenance Manual - Emergency Lighting Systems	CPG 2-13S	April 1986	SLDCW
Letter of Credit Policies and Procedures for Recipient Organizations	CPG 2-14	February 1984	
A Guide to HP Planning for State and Local Officials	CPG 2-16	December 1984	HP
EMP Protection Guidance	CPG 2-17	January 1986	SLDCW
State and Local Earthquake Hazard Reduction: Implementation of FEMA Funding and Support	CPG 2-18	August 1985	EP
Safeguards and Control of Secure Telephone Units and Associated Keying Material - (Controlled)	CPG 2-19	October 1986	SLDCW
Radiological Instruments: An Essential Resource for National Preparedness	CPG 3-1	September 1986	RADEF
Repair and Maintenance Manuals for Radiological Instruments, Change 1	CPG 4-1	September 1985	RADEF
Volume 1, RIM&C Memoranda			
Volume 2, G M Tube Instruments			
Volume 3, Ion Chamber Gamma Instruments			

<u>Title</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Date Issued</u>	<u>Programs Covered</u>
Volume 4, Ion Chamber Beta Gamma Instruments			
Volume 5, Dosimeters and Chargers			
Volume 6, Special Purpose Instruments			
Volume 7, CDV 790 and CDV 797 Calibrators			
Volume 8, CDV 794 Calibrators and CDV 765 Transfer Standards			
Volume 9, CDV 782 Training Source Set			
Repair and Maintenance Manual for Radiological Instruments Appendixes			
Change 2	CPG 4-1	August 1986	RADEF
Change 3	CPG 4-1	December 1986	RADEF

Appendix G

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

February 4, 1987

NATIONAL SECURITY DECISION
DIRECTIVE NUMBER 259

U.S. CIVIL DEFENSE

It is the policy of the United States to have a civil defense capability as an element of our overall national security posture.

PRINCIPLES, CONCEPTS, AND OBJECTIVES

The civil defense program will continue to support all-hazard integrated emergency management at State and local levels, to the extent that this is consistent with and contributes to preparedness of the Nation in the event of an attack, whether by nuclear or non-nuclear means.

The civil defense program must be clearly communicated to the American public.

The civil defense program will provide improved prospects for protection of the population and resources of the Nation in the event of nuclear attack and improved ability to deal with any occurrence, including natural, technological, or other emergency, which seriously degrades or seriously threatens the national security of the United States. The program will emphasize development of a civil defense infrastructure capable of rapid expansion in a national security emergency. The objective of the civil defense program will include:

(1) Population protection capabilities, with the Federal Government providing guidance and assistance to enable State and local governments to develop the requisite plans, systems, and capabilities.

(2) State and local government crisis management capabilities to effectively support the population in national security emergencies.

(3) Information to promote a clear understanding by the public of threats, including nuclear attack, which may affect their localities and on actions they should take to increase their chances of survival.

(4) Information to assist U.S. business and industry in taking measures to protect their work forces and physical assets in national security emergencies.

June 2, 1987

(5) Voluntary participation by citizens and institutions in community civil defense activities and emphasis on citizen protective actions.

(6) Plans for sustaining survivors and for postattack recovery.

(7) Plans which include provisions both for incremental or gradual mobilization of civil defense capabilities in a period of gradually increasing world tensions, and for a civil defense surge in an international crisis.

IMPLEMENTATION

The Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2251 et seq.) provides that responsibility for civil defense is vested jointly in the Federal Government and the States and their political subdivisions. Accordingly, the U.S. civil defense program will be based on the following:

(1) The Federal Government will focus on guidance to the public and to State and local governments to improve preparedness for national security emergencies. Financial assistance will be provided in cooperation with State and local governments.

(2) The Federal Government will encourage States to develop agreements to furnish mutual aid in the event of an attack or disaster.

(3) The States have the primary responsibility for developing their capabilities for peacetime emergencies and share responsibility for attack preparedness. They should support development of civil defense plans, systems, and capabilities for themselves and their political subdivisions. States will assure that where Federal civil defense funds and assistance are applied to natural and technological disaster preparedness, such use is consistent with, contributes to, and does not detract from attack preparedness.

(4) Local governments have the primary responsibility for developing their capabilities for peacetime emergencies and share responsibility for attack preparedness. They should develop under State guidance the capability to provide protection for their citizens in all emergencies which may affect their communities.