



INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EMERGENCY MANAGERS

# THE RESPONDER

## NEWS OF THE IAEM-STUDENT COUNCIL

May 2011  
Volume 5 Issue 3

### Student Housing Block for IAEM-USA 2011 Annual Conference

A student housing block has been made available for students attending the IAEM-USA 59th Annual Conference & EMEX 2011 in Las Vegas, Nevada:

#### Gold Coast Hotel

4000 West Flamingo Road (one block from IAEM's Headquarters Hotel)  
Las Vegas, Nevada

#### Reservations may be made by:

- Phone: Call 888-402-6278 and identify yourself with Group Reservation ID 1IAEC11.
- Online: [www.goldcoastcasino.com/groups](http://www.goldcoastcasino.com/groups) and enter Group Reservation ID 1IAEC11.

**Room Rates for November 11-16, 2011.** These rates are available until Oct. 13, 2011, or until the IAEM block is sold out.

- **Standard Room:** \$71 single/double on Friday and Saturday; \$28 single/double for all other nights.
- **Premium Room:** \$86 single/double on Friday and Saturday; \$38 single/double for all other nights.
- **Note:** In addition to these rates, a \$3 per day per room resort fee will be charged for use of the fitness center, self-parking, unlimited local and toll-free phone calls, in-room coffee, wake-up calls and shuttle service to "The Strip."

**If you have any other questions regarding the student hotel block, please direct all questions to Jeanette "Jet" Holt at: [JHolt2010@gmail.com](mailto:JHolt2010@gmail.com)**  
**And check out other student information at: [www.iaem.com/students](http://www.iaem.com/students)**

### The Interoperability Challenge: Communication Integration Made Simple

By Eric B. Johnson, Jr., MPSA, CAAMA, CHS, CPS, USAF

In the workplace/community setting of tomorrow, we must be ready for scenarios that may not seem as obvious as those in recent history. Partnering with area Fire, EMS agencies, Law Enforcement, and other EM-centric organizations is not enough. Collaborations must invest in and expand upon atypical capabilities and interoperable resourcing for the ever more complex environment of the future. We can all agree that investments in interoperable communications planning/technology are paramount to success.

Our nation faces a plethora of economic challenges – none of which escape the realities of every organization's pocketbook. As a result, the prospect of building, or even expanding, an agency's interoperable communications toolkit can seem insurmountable—and unaffordable. Ironically, some of the forecasted emergency scenarios potentially on the horizon could be driven by the very economic woes with which we are now faced—i.e., what if the dollar did collapse, or fuel prices exploded to where basic needs could not be met locally due to transportation impacts? What local crises would emerge in our communities if a large-scale terrorist attack struck an urban center, generating hundreds, if not thousands of patients? Are YOU ready and interoperable?

It is in challenging times like this that we need a healthy dose of an optimistic reality check. Having been an interoperability communications consultant for some time, I am reminded that the number one issue referenced in both exercise and real-world incident after-action reports is, you guessed it, communication (or a failure thereof). Radios may fail due to an absence of shared frequencies, phone lines may go (continued on page 2)

#### In this issue –

- 1 – 2011 IAEM Student Hotel / The Interoperability Challenge
- 2 – The Interoperability Challenge
- 3 - The Posse Comitatus Act and Domestic Law Enforcement
- 4 - The Planning P, Taking the Fear Away
- 5 – IAEM Scholarship / Multi-Agency Coordinating Systems- Bridging the Gap in Emergency Management
- 7 – Defining Terrorism and Evolution
- 8 - FEMA Approves \$2.8 Million in Aid/Grants for Tornado Damage
- 9 – Chapter News and contact information



INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EMERGENCY MANAGERS

# THE RESPONDER

## NEWS OF THE IAEM-STUDENT COUNCIL

May 2011  
Volume 5 Issue 3

down, and cell phone towers may not be able to support exponential increases in call volume during an incident. These are the technical foundations from which an incident may be made—or broken. Fixes and interoperable/contingency solutions along these lines may be expensive—or beyond the control of an organization. So, in the spirit of keeping it simple, allow me to draw attention to another aspect of communication failure often overlooked—relationships. I am amazed at how many incidents bearing train-wreck (no pun intended) after-action reports show that the technology was there, but that the people failed. In a lot of cases, agencies come together under unexpected circumstances and bring a host of shared frequencies, high-tech cellular back-up capability, and other bells/ community partners, you may fail. And if you see your relationship building as a destination, and not an on-going journey, you will fail.

Here is a possible formula for success:

- (1) Establish an on-going process within your organization to identify agency partners with whom you need to engage for all phases of EM.
- (2) Identify atypical partners based on on-going discussions within your organization that anticipate the threats/challenges/emergencies of the future (i.e., Is the Electric Company a first responder? I bet they are during an ice storm. And what about the construction company that whistles—only to struggle with the reality of not having a good relationship foundation.
- Even as we approach the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the tragic events of September 11, 2001, it is still worth reminding folks that interoperability starts with relationships. You can have the best technology in the world, but if you do not continually invest in establishing GENUINE relationships with your own 40+ bulldozers? I bet they become first responders after an earthquake/explosion.)
- (3) Establish working relationships with these organizations so that you don't play "get to know you" during an emergency. Half the interoperable battle is knowing WHO people are—not just HOW to communicate with them.
- (4) Build upon these working relationships through on-going dialogue and table-topping of exercise scenarios. ALWAYS include discussion about how

to communicate under the worst possible communication scenarios (i.e., what if you had no radios, no phones, and no internet?)

(5) Document everything you do with shared after-action reports. Make sure you capture everyone that participated—and ensure that strengths are identified and corrective actions are tracked/resolved.

(6) Begin building agency-specific interoperable communications plans for your organization that identify the primary, secondary, and tertiary means of interoperable communication with these other organizations. Assuming they build the same internal documents within their organizations, share them and build consolidated, multi-organizational plans that identify shared frequencies and capabilities.

(7) Assess plans often to determine opportunities for improvement (i.e., providing shared access to frequencies where possible, ensure phone numbers/cell numbers are accurate, proactively identify potential bottle-necks and saturations points)

(8) Continue table-topping and full-scale exercises that allow formal validation of your communications plans. If the number one failure identified in after-action reports is communication-based, then I would argue that EVERY exercise (CBRNE, tornado, terrorist attack, disease containment, etc.) You MUST have a communications element that is tested and evaluated. When did your organization last table-top or formally exercise a total communications failure? These exercises are not easy or fun—but they are oh-so-valuable to have in your rear-view mirror!

Steps 1-8 are circular and on-going. Minus a few dollars for printing and some significant staff time to document the progress, these steps are not too cost prohibitive. One might argue that these steps can leverage critical funding and resources through state and federal agencies looking to invest in your success story. A collaboration of organizations with a demonstrated history of genuine, documented relationships is poised to apply competitively for grants and other funding to support the costs of expensive technology (continued Page 3)



As the saying goes, let form follow function—and start simple. Build relationships, establish/document existing and shared communications capabilities, nourish/test communication lines actively, and then build upon all of the above to add incremental technological solutions. And if you can, get someone else to pay for it as a reward for your successful EM collaboration planning efforts!

Whether you're a wealthy organization with an established interoperable communications plan, or a poor organization without such capabilities (but armed with a hunger for readiness), investing in relationships is the key to interoperable success. Interoperability starts with dialogue – not technology. Making this a priority within your agency will best position you to be a ready, able, and interoperable organization prepared for the asymmetrical threats of today and tomorrow.

### **The Posse Comitatus Act and Domestic Law Enforcement**

By John Cook

During Katrina, we watched military personnel patrolling the streets of New Orleans. If you looked closely enough you could make out the unit patches. The question is, was that unit National Guard or regular army. Although administratively and legally distinctly different, they wear the same uniform and have generally the same equipment and can only be distinguished by the unit identification and in the case of National Guard personnel whether they have been "federalized". The distinction between National Guard (a state resource or Title 32) and regular (federal or Title 10) army is essential when considering the Posse Comitatus Act (PCA). Under the PCA, federal troops are prohibited from engaging in direct law enforcement activities. Is the PCA still relevant or is it an unnecessary obstacle to U.S. Northern Command's (USNORTHCOM) effective response during large-scale disasters within the United States?

Loosely translated from Latin, "Posse Comitatus" refers to a posse, or group of able-bodied men, supporting a local or county authority. The debate on the use of the military to support

and/or conduct law enforcement activities at the local or county level has been going on since the formation of the United States. Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution describes the use of militia to execute the law. The central issue is that the founding fathers made a distinction between militia reserved to the States, and the national Armies and Navy. The Constitution doesn't specify that the Army or Navy can or cannot be used to execute the law, but the President may command while Congress regulates and governs the army and naval forces. American regular military troops were deployed by the President Grant to assist the U.S. Marshall Service in providing security during the presidential election in 1876. This controversial action was the last time American military troops were used for direct law enforcement purposes and the impetus for enactment of the PCA. When the PCA of 1878 was passed, the use of the regular Army units to perform direct law enforcement activities was forbidden. However, the use of National Guard units was not addressed by the PCA.

In 2002, the United States formed a joint command to focus on homeland defense, and the protection of U.S. territory, citizens, and critical infrastructure. The mission of USNORTHCOM is to provide command and control for all Department of Defense (DoD) homeland defense and to support domestic authorities. Although USNORTHCOM appears to be a large command with many subordinate individual and joint commands it has a limited number of "boots on the ground". The command structure provides for both joint and service planning staffs to facilitate the deployment of an appropriately sized mix of joint and/or individual service tasked elements in response to a mission. Examples could include: strategic transportation for land components (including airlift and sealift), tactical transportation (truck companies, track vehicles, etc.), heavy equipment and engineer support, communications and intelligence, rapid response medical services (medevac, hospital ship, mortuary, etc.) and CBRNE expertise (USNORTHCOM, 2010). The available (continued on Page 4)



INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EMERGENCY MANAGERS

# THE RESPONDER

## NEWS OF THE IAEM-STUDENT COUNCIL

May 2011  
Volume 5 Issue 3

resources could be either National Guard or Title 10.

Does the PCA deter or inhibit USNORTHCOM in accomplishing its mission? The NRP and other planning documents use the PCA to determine what resources can be deployed by the state (i.e. Title 32) and which resources (i.e. Title 10) need presidential/congressional authorization to mobilize. The PCA appears to be consistent with the use of federal (Title 10) assets to support local responders overwhelmed by large-scale incidents. The use of appropriately deployed military assets in supporting roles allows local and state assets to focus on what they do best, like enforcing domestic laws.

Is the PCA out of date or irrelevant? The original language of the act can be construed as being obsolete given modern interpretation. However, the courts are constantly interpreting the meaning of laws and how those laws are enforced. Therefore, the PCA can be kept relevant when defining the role (both in terms of prohibited and permitted activities) of Title 10 personnel and equipment during a disaster or major incident that threatens our security within our borders. Furthermore, it can be a means to define opportunities for as well as limits upon NORTHCOM's domestic support operations.

---

### **The Planning P, Taking the Fear Away**

By Lourinda R. Willey, PhD, CSHO, SHEP

The biggest fears I have seen is when students of Incident Command System are when they are shown the Planning P Diagram. To best train this process do not show them the Planning P Diagram, until you have explained the process in a situation which they would relate. It is not easy to erase "Deer in the Headlights."

First, explain how every event in life has similar steps to the Planning P. When we experience an abnormal condition (fire, accident, incident) the base of the Planning P occurs, no getting around it. The incident has occurred. We make notifications (call 9-1-1, call a supervisor, yell to get someone's attention.) We assess the area

before we enter for our own safety and safety of others who might follow (Initial Response and Assessment.) Whether we write it down or not, we experience the elements of the ICS-201 Incident Briefing. The ICS 201 covers basic information you should always gather before proceeding. L.I.P.S. (Life Safety, Incident Stability, Property/Environmental Conservation, and Social Restoration) is an acronym to rank and identify priorities.

Personnel responding to an emergency might gather some information at an emergency scene in mere moments, or over a period of hours (monitoring, data gathering, blueprints, chemicals involved, number of people exposed.) It might be hours before we process through the Planning P, before our Operations Team is at the heart of the incident, to their meeting. Immediately we can protect the public, create boundaries, while not endangering personnel or rushing into a dangerous scene. ICS provides an avenue to define critical factors of the Incident with a Team Perspective. When the Incident Commander/Unified Command has proceeded through their meetings and conferences on the facts, unknown/suspected information, and it is reported at the meetings, along with use of their prior experiences, quality goals are set. Each new shift or period must cycle through the top of the "P." Depending upon the severity this may occur multiple times in one day, for days, even months. The Leader, IC/UC, must decide what are the most important objectives and methods to responding to this incident using LIPS. The next meeting adds in the expertise of the Operations Chief, who should be experienced in this type of emergency and will identify critical objectives, methods, equipment needs, plus add qualified manpower to his team. Once your team (responders) begin arriving at Incident Scene you begin appointing personnel and/or bystanders to roles (Command and General Staff positions.) Document those positions on your Organizational Chart. Make sure they are Roles these individuals can handle and they know who to call (Continue on Page 5)



INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EMERGENCY MANAGERS

# THE RESPONDER

## NEWS OF THE IAEM-STUDENT COUNCIL

May 2011  
Volume 5 Issue 3

upon if they have difficulties or questions. The items you discuss now will be able to lead you into deciding "HOW" you will tactically handle this incident (Tactics Meeting.) You continue this flow of discussing with your Operations Personnel and Experts on how and what you plan on doing. Once you know those elements you will share the information with your Planning Team, who will research, gather pertinent data to your situation, and ensure you are proceeding safely and reasonably to the situation at hand. They meet and discuss the information gathered in previous meetings with the current meeting (checks and balances ensuring this Incident will be covered with the proper safety, strategy, equipment, and processes.)

The Incident Action Plan is written and presented to the Incident Commander for Approval. Any questions which arise or items which have been brought to light (changing weather, updated data/information, ETA on personnel arriving at scene, equipment delivery) will be reviewed and considered, even added to the IAP, before the Operations Briefing.

All these items on the IAP are brainstormed, thought through, and the IAP has been Approved by the IC/UC. Now the Operations Chief with their people, who are going to be the boots on the ground entering the scene and other operational matters, will proceed equipped with the best knowledge they need to execute the IAP. Every time this operational period or shift changes the top portion of the Planning P must be re-visited, goals/objectives amended, and new goals defined. The Planning P is a Plan, Do, Check, Act Process with continual revisions and updates. Incident Command Systems does not end until the incident has been restored to the initial condition, before the emergency occurred. Until then there will be an Incident Commander and Team who will operate through the Planning P until closure.

### **IAEM-SC Scholarship Deadline Approaching**

The deadline for the 2011 IAEM scholarships is Friday May 13th. Please be sure to mail all materials to Dawn Shiley-Danziesen, Scholarship Program Director. at IAEM

headquarters (201 Park Washington Court Falls Church, VA 22046-4527, Attn: Dawn Shiley-Danziesen).

The IAEM Scholarship Program was established to nurture, promote and develop disaster preparedness and resistance by furthering the education of students studying the field of emergency management, disaster management or a related program. The purpose of the program is to assist the profession by identifying and developing students with the intellect and technical skills that can advance and enhance emergency management or disaster management. Scholarships are awarded to full-time students pursuing an associate or diploma, baccalaureate, master's or doctoral degree in emergency management, disaster management or a closely related field. To apply for this scholarship, please follow these instructions and application tips.

Information about the application can be found on the IAEM website within the Scholarships tab on the left hand side. I highly recommend reviewing all In response to a major disaster or incident, multiple organizations or agencies must work together in the response. As the Incident Commander coordinates with the firefighting, law enforcement, EMS, and other responding organizations, others in the Emergency Operations Center, Medical Operations Center and other such organizations of the jurisdiction are coordinating with private organizations, non-governmental organization, and other partners of preparedness identifying and locating resources needed for an effective response to the disaster. Through the use of the Multiagencydocumentation prior to submission to ensure you meet the requirements of the application. IAEM headquarters can be reached at (703) 538-1795 or questions can be emailed to Dawn at [shiley@iaem.com](mailto:shiley@iaem.com)

### **Multi-Agency Coordinating Systems-Bridging the Gap in Emergency Management**

By Jon Shoemake, Logistics & Transportation Supervisor, N Central Texas Trauma Regional Advisory Council

Coordination System (MACS), response agencies and support agencies work together, and communicate vertically and horizontally providing (Continue on Page 6)



INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EMERGENCY MANAGERS

# THE RESPONDER

## NEWS OF THE IAEM-STUDENT COUNCIL

May 2011  
Volume 5 Issue 3

response actions.

The Multiagency Coordinating System (MACS) concept starts at the Federal level. States and lower jurisdictional levels interpret the Federal guidance and create State and Jurisdictional level supplements containing information on how the MACS will operate in their own jurisdiction when needed.

It is important to understand the how the Multiagency Coordinating System works in regards to local jurisdictions within a state. Knowing the principles and more pointedly implementing them is a key element for smaller jurisdictions with limited resources. Through the use of MACS Emergency Managers can prepare for, request, and coordinate response and recovery efforts with multiple organizations whether governmental or non-governmental, public or private, or local, state, and even federal level if needed.

Before looking at State and Local Jurisdictional levels of Multiagency Coordinating System implementation, one must first understand the Federal intent of the MACS. At the Federal level, several different definitions or explanations exists either defining or explaining the purpose of a MACS. According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) a MACS is a process allowing all levels of governments, all disciplines, crossing jurisdictional boundaries to effectively and efficiently prepare for and respond to emergencies and disasters (Federal Emergency Management Agency). The National Response Framework describes the primary function of a MACS as being coordination activities above the field level of operations providing prioritization of critical assets needed be multiple organizations ultimately assisting ground operations by dispersing the assets to the area they are needed most (2008). A third Federal level publication explaining the function of a MACS is the National Incident Management System, which explains a MACS as a process of prioritizing and coordinating the distribution of available resources against resource allocations, needs of other incidents, along with other constraints and considerations (2008).

Through the use of the Multiagency Coordination System (MACS), response agencies and support agencies work together, and communicate vertically and horizontally providing

Upon studying the definitions and explanations of a Multiagency Coordinating System provided by the three Federal level references above, the overall intent of a MACS is clear; the MACS is a tool or resource for the Incident Commander in the field. The main function of a MACS is to link multiple organizations together to locate, procure, prioritize, and distribute needed assets identified by the Incident Commander on the ICS Form 213. Representatives from each discipline of emergency management, including but not limited to public, private, governmental, non-governmental, along with other partners in preparedness work in a Multiagency Agency Coordinating System, providing knowledge and expertise, all with the goal of providing assistance to those responders in the field.

The first level of support and responsibility of an incident is the local jurisdiction. It is the responsibility of the emergency management coordinator to enter into mutual aid agreements with neighboring jurisdictions and develop a MACS with local and neighboring partners in preparedness. The emergency management coordinator works with the mayor or county judge serving as the emergency management director for the jurisdiction ensuring appropriate actions are taken during a disaster preparedness and response. The emergency management director normally takes a position in the EOC while the emergency management coordinator either serves as the incident commander or takes a post in the EOC to support response operations in the field.

Through researching the background of the Multiagency Coordinating System, the Federal intent is clear, the development of a tool or way for Incident Commanders and Emergency Managers to coordinate with other agencies to procure needed assets for the response to a disaster in a quick and efficient manner. It also (Continued on Page 7)



becomes clear that a secondary intent of the Federal government is for states and jurisdictions to use the same system in preparedness plans and cultivate relationships with future partners in emergency response. Through the use of the multiagency coordinating system, states, local jurisdictions, and tribal governments can enhance their preparedness levels by coordinating with, developing relationships with, and entering into mutual aid agreements with multiple partners. These actions ultimately enhance the emergency preparedness levels and response capabilities at all levels.

#### References

Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency. (2008). National Response Framework. Washington, DC: Federal Emergency Management Agency Publication.

Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency. (2008). National Incident Management System. Washington, DC: Federal Emergency Management Agency Publication.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. (n.d.). Multiagency coordination systems.

Retrieved from

<http://www.fema.gov/emergency/nims/MultiagencyCoordinationSystems.shtm>

### **Defining Terrorism and Evolution With Meaning in Today's World**

By: David Glazebrook

Terrorism in the context as it is understood today has many definitions. The long history of terrorism used against people and societies help define these definitions along with political pressures and perceptions of the reality by the public.

While all these factors should be used to define terrorism there is a missing element to the final discussion in its definition, that is the real objective world or the world as it actually is without influence and perception. This missing element takes the other factors and places it in the realities of today's terrorism. The importance of a definition goes to the very aspect of what we as the elements fighting terrorism are fighting against. We as the Western World are still caught in the

"good old days" of the Cold War where Countries had boundaries, Armies had uniforms, and spies could infiltrate the other because we all looked basically the same<sup>1</sup>.

The reality is that those good old days were a unique time in history of warfare. The reality is that through most of history war has pitted what we would consider a super power verses a weaker set of opponents<sup>1</sup>.

In history entities have used terrorism as a key tactic, from the Romans use of the Crucifix, the Celtics drinking of their enemies' blood, the Nazi concentration Camps, Gangu Khan's extermination approach, and the French revolution "reigns of terror".

Terrorism as a tactic has been used in just about every conflict in human history. Terrorism as a tactic has evolved and to place today's terrorism as similar or from the past would be a mistake. While its roots are in the past and this will help one understand its development, it will not show the realities of today's tactic of terrorism.

The new evolution of terrorism is the complete indiscriminate killing of anyone who opposes its will or view. While terrorism has always targeted innocents, normally not innocents of it own persuasion.

This new kind of terrorism will not only kill them but excommunicate those of the same faith, belief or view at any time it feels it is needed. This leaves no person safe from the violence<sup>1</sup>.

In the recent past during the Cold War, terrorism was regarded much more as a crime than an act of war. The events of 9/11 have changed this conventional wisdom, yet many countries find themselves hand cuffed by laws that push them towards treating the acts as a crime. It has led some to define Terrorism as a "Criminal War", which by the perceptions of a "legitimate War" it is. However this does nothing to place the tactic of terrorism in a correct reality so that it can be dealt with in a manner fitting the action of terrorism. This is most evident with the debate on the Terrorist held in Guantanamo Cuba. Are they combatants subject to our western rules of combat (Continued on Page 8)



or are the criminals to be persecuted under the legal system of America<sup>1</sup>.

The reason for this debate in total is because terrorism and our perception of a "legitimate war" are still based in a world dominated with Cold War realities. The answer to this definition is in history and the realities of terrorism, conflict and war today<sup>1</sup>.

The acts of 9/11 were acts of war. This is common sense, so why does the United States want to prosecute the enemy under the civilian rights afforded to no combatants? In 1996 Timothy McVeigh destroyed a Federal Building killing over 100 people, all innocent. This was a criminal act. Why? Why in the two above scenarios does it seem understandable to place in the two different categories? The simple answer is that it makes sense.

Al-Qaeda is an international organization that has declared war on the United States. Has an agenda to remove western influence from land it deems its own, by violence. If we replaced Al-Qaeda with Iran in the above sentence, or Iran claimed responsibility for 9/11, would that not be an act of war?

Timothy McVeigh was an American citizen who believed the American government had become corrupt and needed to be overthrown. The organization he belonged to was an American organization. His act was a crime. If Timothy McVeigh had attacked Britain as "supporters" of the American government, would that be a crime? No, it is an act of war by his *organization*. America and Britain would decide how to combat them on American soil.

Where both acts of terrorism? Yes both where, so therefore terrorism is both a crime and an act of war based on the circumstances behind the attack, not the border in which the perpetrators find themselves. Therefore there should be two accepted definitions of terrorism, one criminal, one an act of war. It would be up to the country attacked to decide how they wish to peruse the attackers<sup>1</sup>.

In my opinion the two definitions should look something like the following:  
Terrorism Act of War; An attack on a country's interest or population by an organization or individual acting on behalf/sponsored/ of that organization, with that organization being principally foreign in nature or intent.

These definitions would allow policy makers, military and civilians to place the act in better reality of

the incident itself and to use the correct method to end that organization. These definitions will bring us away from the Cold War mentality of war. This is a mentality that is an oddity in history, and back to the general norm of warfare in history and reality.

---

### FEMA Approves \$2.8 Million in Aid and Grants for Tornado Damage

Staff Report

More than \$2.8 million in federal and state grants has been approved to help the state recover from the April 16 storms and tornadoes, according to a news release from the Federal Emergency Management Agency. The release said that \$2.1 million has been approved from FEMA's Individuals and Households Program for temporary housing and home repairs.

Another \$700,000 was approved in the Other Needs Assistance program, which is a joint state-federal program that helps replace personal property and pay medical, dental, transportation and other serious disaster-related needs not covered by insurance or other aid programs. About 4,700 people in the state have registered for disaster assistance, and 1,100 state residents have visited disaster recovery centers operated jointly by FEMA and the state, with support from the Small Business Administration, the release said.

FEMA also has inspected 2,100 damaged homes in the state, and 2,600 loan packages have been issued in the state by the U.S. Small Business Administration low-interest disaster loan program, which is available to homeowners and renters, as well as businesses and non-profits. In addition, state and federal recovery personnel have opened 11 disaster recovery centers in the state to provide in-person help. More centers are planned.



### Chapter Presidents and Contact Information

American Public University System - Hannah Vick - [hannah.m.vick@gmail.com](mailto:hannah.m.vick@gmail.com)

Arkansas Tech University - Donald Minster - [dminster@atu.edu](mailto:dminster@atu.edu)

Capella University - Justin Shoemate - [jsemt1@hotmail.com](mailto:jsemt1@hotmail.com)

Florida State University - Brian Misner - [bmm09g@fsu.edu](mailto:bmm09g@fsu.edu)

Jacksonville State University - J. Robby Westbrook - [rwestbrook@cherokeega.com](mailto:rwestbrook@cherokeega.com)

John Jay College of Criminal Justice - Dr. Jean-Marie Col - [jcol@jjay.cuny.edu](mailto:jcol@jjay.cuny.edu) (advisor)

Long Island University Homeland Security Management Institute - Robert McAvoy - [quidam@optline.net](mailto:quidam@optline.net)

Massachusetts Maritime Academy - Matthew Hart - [matthew.hart@maritime.edu](mailto:matthew.hart@maritime.edu)

Metropolitan College of New York - Johnny Velez - [johnnyvelez2005@hotmail.com](mailto:johnnyvelez2005@hotmail.com) (advisor)

North Dakota State University - Kevin Hellend - [kevin.hellend.1@ndsu.edu](mailto:kevin.hellend.1@ndsu.edu)

Ohio Christian University - Christina Galvan - [chsanders@ohiochristian.edu](mailto:chsanders@ohiochristian.edu)

Philadelphia University - Jennifer Lord - [jennlord.5@gmail.com](mailto:jennlord.5@gmail.com)

Savannah State University - Devin Everson - [deverson@student.savannahstate.edu](mailto:deverson@student.savannahstate.edu)

University of Akron - Maurice Thomas - [mmt20@uakron.edu](mailto:mmt20@uakron.edu)

University of Central Missouri - Diana Bryant - [bryant@ucmo.edu](mailto:bryant@ucmo.edu) (advisor)

University of Chicago - Tamara Habib - [thabib@uchicago.edu](mailto:thabib@uchicago.edu)

University of Denver - Elizabeth Crawley - [elizabeth.crawley@du.edu](mailto:elizabeth.crawley@du.edu)

University of North Texas - Nicole Candelaria - [nicolecandelaria@my.unt.edu](mailto:nicolecandelaria@my.unt.edu)

University of South Dakota - Kendra Ratcliffe - [kendra.ratcliffe@usd.edu](mailto:kendra.ratcliffe@usd.edu)

Virginia Commonwealth University - Patrick Ashley - [ashleypr@gmail.com](mailto:ashleypr@gmail.com)

---

### Contact Info for the IAEM USA SR Executive Board

President – Nancy Harris - 847.208.9827  
[njharris27@comcast.net](mailto:njharris27@comcast.net)

1<sup>st</sup> VP- Michael Kelley, AEM - 843.441.4668  
[Kg4zre@hotmail.com](mailto:Kg4zre@hotmail.com)

2<sup>nd</sup> VP – Eric Sawyer, AEM - 207.671.5340  
[sawyer.en@gmail.com](mailto:sawyer.en@gmail.com)

Secretary - Jeanette “Jet” Holt, MS – 479-586-9334  
[JHolt2010@gmail.com](mailto:JHolt2010@gmail.com)

Treasurer – Mark Warnick -  
[Mark@thewarnickhouse.com](mailto:Mark@thewarnickhouse.com)

Past President – Brian Silva - 562.897.6677  
[brian.silva@the360c.com](mailto:brian.silva@the360c.com)

If you have articles or ideas based on emergency management, homeland security or other related materials, please submit in 750 words or less. If you have questions you may email

[JHolt2010@gmail.com](mailto:JHolt2010@gmail.com).

---

Email [info@iaem.com](mailto:info@iaem.com) if you do not wish to be on the listserv.