Omaha UASI Meeting
January 29, 2010
Jesse Lowe Conference Room
3rd Floor Omaha-Douglas Civic Center, Omaha, NE

Meeting called to order at 9:01 a.m. by Douglas County Emergency Management Director Paul Johnson. Agenda presented for review.

1. **Update on status of Homeland Security Awards**. Attendees were referred to handout (attached to agenda) that listed status of FY07-FY10 grant awards, award amounts and obligations, and status of project development and approval.

2. **Proposed Interlocal Agreement**. A diagram summarizing a new Interlocal Agreement was distributed to attendees by Whitney Shipley and briefly explained by Paul Johnson.

   A Power Point presentation was made and explained of a newly proposed Interlocal Agreement.

   Whitney Shipley agreed to distribute copies of the proposed Interlocal Agreement to meeting attendees. Attendees were asked to submit comments to Paul Johnson by or before February 10 for incorporation into a revised draft.

   Paul explained that working group membership was not listed in the slides and handouts provided here but was contained in the proposed document that would be provided to attendees after the meeting. Interim chairs have been identified that would serve until the end of the year in order to provide continuity until details are better developed.

   All expenditures would have to go through M&A; there would be no process by which entities in the community would be doing direct buys.

3. **Procedures for Making Project Expenditures**. Scott Crites distributed a handout representing a screen print of the FY07 Grant Management System (GMS) and explained that, while checklists and revised processes are forthcoming, all processes developed and utilized must result in a process that matches GMS. Using a screen print of the FY07 GMS, Scott explained that Investment Justifications (IJs) that are entered and approved by the Nebraska Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) appear in GMS as projects highlighted in purple. Once proof of encumbrance has been demonstrated (e.g. purchase order issued), project is highlighted in green, indicating that the purchase is on order and is waiting to be received. Once the item and invoice are received, the project is highlighted in yellow. Once the purchase is finalized and NEMA agrees on our submission, then NEMA issues payment.

   Scott explained that the serial numbers and physical storage location must be recorded and tracked for equipment purchases over $5,000. (Mark Desler asked if this requirement applies to a single-item purchase, and Scott replied in the affirmative.) Scott explained that, in order to make the process easy, the City of Omaha Finance Department has obtained the approval and commitment of the City of Omaha's Purchasing Department to utilize the City's Oracle system to facilitate this process. City Finance will provide users a form that will be used to capture the information necessary to enter the expenditure into the Oracle system. The equipment would be shipped directly to the use and the invoice sent directly to City Finance for issuance of payment. This will allow the City to be invoiced directly without the user having to complete any additional paperwork. Scott indicated that City Finance would issue more specific details once the process is finalized and approved.

   Scott explained that expenditures related to services rendered or travel can be sent to Scott at City Finance for reimbursement, but need to meet specific requirements that apply (e.g. providing meeting

minutes produce minutes and sign-in sheets when applying for reimbursement for costs associated with meetings, workshops, etc.). The worksheet that Scott will apply will capture that information up front, which is necessary to demonstrate to the State that we are making progress in expending grant funds rather than leaving too many of our expenditures to the end of the grant period.

4. **FY05 and FY06 Program Update**. Gail distributed the NEMA Monitoring Report Form that will need to be completed prior to the FY06 audit. She noted that OMMRS will be undergoing this process on Monday (February 1, 2009) and that we'll be able to learn from that process.

   Gail indicated that it is necessary for the City to know the location of all equipment purchased with FY06 funds. Working chairs will need to have this information compiled and forwarded to City Finance so that, as the fiscal agent, the City has time to prepare for an audit that is expected before June and could come with as little as a week's notice, as OMMRS's did.

   Scott reminded the group that this information must be related back to what's in the GMS.

   Gail called attention to the last page of the NEMA Monitoring Report Form, which is an inventory equipment list that she intends to distribute to all on the working group list and is expected to be completed by NEMA. She indicated that working group chairs should expect to receive an e-mail from her with those the monitoring form and inventory list attached.

Next Steps. Paul explained that one new change is that meetings of working group chairs would be moving to the second Friday of each month at 9:00 to give chairs time to have decisions made and captured by the end of the month and to avoid conflicts with other due dates that occur at the end of the month.

Paul then invited questions regarding the proposed Interlocal Agreement.

a. Question: Mark Conrey noted that the public service utilities did not appear to be represented in this document nor did it represent all the needs to be encompassed. He asked who would lead PET (planning, exercise, and training program), noting that it appeared to be Emergency Management and that, if so, could it be presumed that folks that were not at the table would not be playing in the exercises. He asked for clarification of how that would work under the new structure.
   Answer: Paul indicated that representation would be achieved through the inclusivity of the working groups, the structures of which were not shown here and were being revised to incorporated incoming feedback regarding the proposed governance structure. Paul also noted that some of the groups to which Mark referred would be accommodated through the establishment and work of a new CIKR (Critical Infrastructure and Key Resources) working group that has not existed in the past.
   Comment: Greg Hollingsead elaborated that one of the biggest challenges from our previous UASI program was putting together a risk management framework. From a risk management standpoint, he explained that it was difficult to identify and prioritize risk when we worked in different directions, as was our previous approach. He expressed that a broadly-represented group working on CIKR would allow the UASI to bring private sector partners into the process whose capabilities and local resources we could learn more about and potentially incorporate in strategy. He conveyed that the group should not look just at CIKR from the standpoint of its pieces, but also from the potential impact on resiliency and urged that the group should look at how the public response, hospitals, etc. feed into the system that allows the group to identify where the biggest needs are. He called the groups attention to activities at the state level that need to be worked into the Omaha UASI, such as the state's private-sector collaboration that needs to be incorporated at the local level and also the Fusion Center. Greg told the group that his agency was in the process of establishing National Guard teams to conduct assessments

to evaluate resiliency and vulnerabilities of cities and helping them integrate special events into CIKR activities to see where risks are. This process would be used for evaluating local facilities, hospitals, IT systems, natural gas utilities, etc. to help DHS identify where risk is in the UASI metro area, supporting data calls and justifying why Omaha needs to remain on the UASI list. He explained that the old UASI process didn't result in enough information sharing to determine where risk lay in Nebraska. This process needs to be resolved if we are going to be able to better demonstrate justification for UASI funding and determine where funding needs to be focused. This will help identify information that is necessary that we don't have now.

Comment: Paul noted that that determination of the composition of the working groups had been a difficult process and a sensitive topic.

b. Question: Mark Conrey asked how we will move forward and how strategies would be identified
Answer: Paul answered that M&A would start the process. He noted that there was a lot to get done and reminded the group that there would be no luxury of consultants to assist us this time.

c. Question: Gail Braun asked if it was necessary that a new strategy be written.
Answer: Paul answered that doing so would involve balancing the need for our strategy to be accurate with what we're trying to do with the need for the process to be easy. In addition, the strategy would need to be consistent with whatever changes have occurred to the state strategy as it has adopted new priorities.

d. Question: Mark asked if he was correct in his interpretation of the Governance Structure diagram that Douglas County EMA would be both the M&A entity and also involved in the Emergency Management working group?
Answer: Paul explained that all groups have projects that come forward. He asked Mark to take a look at the governance document and make recommendations. Paul commented to all present that now was the time for any who are interested in the process to get an electronic copy of the document and make recommendations or, preferably, ask questions.

e. Question: (Bill Meyer expressed that he believed Mark's question regarded the PET working group.)
Answer: Paul explained that those entities that didn't fit in other groups would be part of the PET working group and that their opportunity to generate projects would be as part of the PET working group.

f. Question: Mark Desler asked what the deadline was for comments.
Answer: Paul indicated a deadline of February 10.
Comment: Larry Lavelle told the group that his board had received a copy of the governance document this week to review and that the review is not done but is close. He affirmed to the group that all groups that were previously seen but that don't appear to be in the new working groups are represented in the PET working group. He explained that his agency intends to present the document to its county attorney and board chair and expects the process to move forward. He urged the group not to feel bad that they hadn't seen the governance document yet, that his agency was just seeing it, too. Regarding working groups, he commented that there was no way for the group to get around CIKR, assured the group that there were places in the new structure for all parties to be involved, and expressed that at this point there was need to include federal partners this new structure. He explained that there would intermingling among groups, particularly related to PET activities and assured the group that process of developing this structure is being worked repeatedly to make sure that everyone is involved.

g. Question: Kevin Pokorny asked where the revised version will go.
Answer: Paul answered that the information would come back and that then there would be a mingling of comments that would get incorporated into a final document. That document would then become the so-called final draft that would be presented for approval.

h. Question: Mark Conrey asked if this process could be completed before summer.
Answer: Paul answered that it would be completed as soon as possible, and asked Whitney Shipley to send interested parties (later determined to be all attendees) an electronic copy of the draft document. Paul asked that, in making comments and suggestions, reviewers may certain to reference the exact part of the document to which they are referring.

5. Summary. Gail Braun thanked Lauren Pascale for the time she's put in on the UASI project and for helping close out the FY05 and FY06 grants. Paul reminded the group that the process of managing these grants is not an easy process and that those that were doing it were doing so as a collateral duty that involved working with a lot of different stakeholders, generating a lot of additional work.

Gail told the group that she would be seeking out working group chairs individually for followup work related to FY05 and FY06 awards.

Paul asked the groups to do their group-specific work between the chairs meeting and come to the chairs meeting with consensus opinions regarding their working groups, as would be necessary to adhere to the rigid timelines established at the federal level.

Ken Pokorny asked what the progress was on project development for FY09 and FY10 funds. Mark Desler and Kevin expressed that it as a concern to them because they needed to move forward as quickly as possible, particularly given the strategy that needs to be developed for the FY10 UASI. Lynn Marshall reiterated that FY09 and FY10 are under critical timelines and need to be placed on a high priority. He expressed that time is our worst enemy and that the details associated with these grants need to be dealt with. Paul agreed to circulate timelines along with the governance document when they go out.

Motion to Adjourn: Scott McIntyre
Motion Seconded: Gail Braun
Motion Carried.

Attendance – Omaha UASI Meeting, January 29, 2010
Jesse Lowe Conference Room, Omaha-Douglas Civic Center
9:00 AM – 10:00 AM

		JAN 29, 2010	FEB 12, 2010	MAR 12, 2010	APR 9, 2010	MAY 14, 2010	JUN 11, 2010	JUL 9, 2010	AUG 13, 2010	SEP 10, 2010	OCT 8, 2010	NOV 12, 2010	DEC 10, 2010
Book, Tim	Omaha Fire Department (OFD)	X											
Braun, Gail	Omaha Mayor's Office	X											
Brazelton, Phil	Washington County 911	X											
Conrey, Mark	Douglas County 911	X											
Crites, Scott	City of Omaha, Finance Department	X											
Desler, Mark	Omaha Police Department (OPD)	X											
Dutton, Phyllis	Omaha Metropolitan Medical Response System (OMMRS)	X											
Herbert, Eric	Sarpy County Geographic Information Systems	X											
Holaday, Bill	Omaha Police Department Terrorist Early Warning Group (TEW)	X											
Hollingsead, Greg	Department of Homeland Security	X											
Johnson, Paul	Douglas County Emergency Management (DCEMA)	X											
Lamb, Tom	Washington County Sheriff's Office	X											
Lavelle, Larry	Sarpy County Emergency Management Agency, E911	X											
Maher, Barry	Dot.Comm	X											
Marshall, Lynn	Sarpy County Emergency Management Agency	X											
McIntyre, Scott	Omaha Public Works	X											
Meyer, Bill	Nebraska Emergency Management Agency (NEMA)	X											
Muller, Tom	Omaha Police Department (OPD)	X											
Neddo, Pete	Metropolitan Utilities District (MUD)	X											
Orchard, Orin	Papillion Police Department	X											
Pascale, Lauren	Omaha Mayor's Office	X											
Plautz, Eric	Douglas County Emergency Management (DCEMA)	X											
Plautz, Eric	Douglas County Emergency Management (DCEMA)	X											
Points, Dave	Washington County Sheriff's Office	X											
Pokorny, Kevin	LaVista Police Department	X											
Ruhe, Phillip	Omaha Mayor's Office	X											
Shipley, Whitney	Douglas County Emergency Management (DCEMA)	X											
Vlasik, Karisa	Omaha Public Power District (OPPD)	X											
Zeeb, Russ	Sarpy County Sheriff's Department	X											