

2016 National Earthquake Program Managers Meeting
Long Beach, CA – May 2-3, 2016
Meeting Notes

Monday, May 2, 2016 (Introductions and Updates)

I. Introduction of Participants & Welcoming Remarks, Kate Long

Kate Long from the State of California opened the 2016 NEPM and conducted a round robin introduction of all participants.

Participants were as listed:

Kate Long, California	Beverly Bell, NEMA
Katie Belknap, Arkansas	Jim Wilkinson, CUSEC
Jason Williams, Illinois	Brian Blake, CUSEC
Maximilian Dixon, Washington	Mike Calvert, CUSEC
Jessica Stumpf, South Carolina	Alisa Nave, CUSEC
Dave Love, New Mexico	Ed Fratto, NESEC
Ryan Arba, California	Sula Watermulder, NESEC
Jeff Briggs, Missouri	Johanna Fenton, WSSPC
Nathan Kent, Kentucky	Patti Sutch, WSSPC
Robert White, British Columbia	Ines Pearce, CREW
Danna Weaver, Arkansas	Pascal Schuback, CREW
Janice Lee, Indiana	Veronica Cedillos, ATC
Thomas Redstone, Maine	Jason Ballmann, SCEC
Glorymar Gomez, Puerto Rico	Mark Benthien, SCEC
Zakiya Darby, Alabama	Bill Blanton, FEMA HQ
Bob Carey, Utah	Ed Laatsch, FEMA HQ
John Crofts, Utah	Wendy Phillips, FEMA HQ
Pilar Carbullido, Guam	Mike Tong, FEMA HQ
Kevin Richards, Hawaii	Drew Herseth, FEMA HQ
Tim Bodell, American Samoa	Mike Mahoney, FEMA HQ
Cecil Whaley, Tennessee	Sam Capasso, FEMA Region II
Mark Stephensen, Idaho	Noriko Boston, FEMA Region IV
Matthew Wall, Virginia	Bart Moore, FEMA Region VI
Karen Berry, Colorado	Prince Aryee, FEMA Region VI
Rick Martin, Nevada	Ryan Pietramali, FEMA Region VIII
Ann Gravier, Alaska	Michael Hornick, FEMA Region IX
Dan Belanger, Alaska	Gala Gulacsik, FEMA Region X
Melinda Gibson, Wyoming	Alesia Za Gara, OPP
Althea Rizzo, Oregon	Lee Mueller, OPP

Kate Long noted that they were happy to have NEMA in attendance, and appreciated everyone's participation. Long then moved into the State, Consortia and Partner Update presentations.

II. State, Consortia and Partner Updates

Alaska:

Ann Gravier provided an overview of the earthquake risk in Alaska, highlighted elements of their earthquake program, and discussed ongoing activities. Gravier noted that small earthquakes are

2016 National Earthquake Program Managers Meeting Meeting Notes

occurring consistently in Alaska and earthquake hazard is tied directly to tsunami hazard. The Alaska earthquake program consists of state agencies and federal partners. It is a robust organization and sometimes it is challenging to get the pieces working together. The program purchased a new Quake Simulator in 2011 and they take it to as many events as possible – this has been a successful communication/outreach tool. In partnership with FLASH, Alaska is updating two publications that will be distributed at outreach events. Gravier noted that training is an important component of the earthquake program. They get a lot of training requests and tend to have between 25 and 60 people in each class. Alaska also participated in the “Are You Prepared for the Next Big Earthquake” Workshop with WSSPC, which focused on synergizing activities and promoting cross-state/region collaboration. In addition, Alaska participated with EERI in a Rapid Visual Screening Project of K-12 schools in portions of the state.

American Samoa:

Tim Bodell presented on behalf of Jacinta Brown, who was unable to attend this year’s NEPM. Bodell gave an overview of American Samoa and the features of the territory, including volcanic, earthquake and tsunami risks. Bodell presented on the earthquake risk-related efforts underway, specifically the program’s work to better understand the fracture zones along the Tonga Trench, the volcanic activity in the area, and the related tsunami impact on areas of the islands. The program will also be installing seismic monitors to assist in identifying volcanic/earthquake activity.

Arkansas:

Katie Belknap provided an overview of earthquake-related projects underway in Arkansas. Belknap highlighted the Home Depot Project where they distributed hot water heater bracing materials; the event was successful and they distributed all 200 bracing systems early in the day. The Tennis Ball Project was an educational program for 2nd graders designed to encourage awareness of their location relative to a fault, which could cause earthquake activity. Belknap also highlighted Arkansas’ efforts for ShakeOut. They developed ShakeOut Billboards that were posted throughout the state which helped increase participation by 10K. Belknap noted that all states have an association that provides billboards at a reduced cost for public entities, and states should reach out to them if they are interested. Belknap also noted that Arkansas is updating the HAZUS database for the state. They are pulling in data and are about 50% complete. This is a significant project and they hope to have the HAZUS database for use in 2017.

California:

Kate Long provided an update on the state of California’s efforts with NEHRP funding, CalOES funding and other partners/funding. Long highlighted specific projects that could be used by other states/are adaptable, specifically the “Putting Down Roots in EQ Country,” “Seven Steps to Earthquake Resilience” and “Staying Safe When the Earth Shakes” publications. Long also discussed the multi-year project to convert the Disaster Resistant Business Toolkit into an online resource. Long encouraged the states to get involved with other states in NEHRP, identify commonalities and leverage NEHRP funding for multi-

2016 National Earthquake Program Managers Meeting Meeting Notes

state projects. California, with SCEC and OPP, is developing a “Protect Yourselves During an Earthquake” ShakeOut Poster. This is still in draft form and they are open to feedback from the states, Consortia and Partners. Long quickly highlighted other ongoing California programs, including Earthquake Early Warning.

Guam:

Pilar Carbullido presented on Guam’s efforts within their earthquake program. Guam has focused on outreach efforts. They have created two cartoon characters to promote awareness of both earthquake and tsunami risk among middle school-aged students. Tsunami Mikenna and Ginessa Quake are featured in an activity book, developed in partnership with FLASH. They are also developing Finn and Fern puppets. Guam is active in ShakeOut and produced a media campaign to promote ShakeOut this year. The month prior to ShakeOut was full of activities with a community event as the finale, which Guam leadership participated in. Guam also continues to participate in NETAP training courses.

Hawaii:

Hawaii has earthquake, volcanic and tsunami activity. Kevin Richards provided a quick snapshot of what the Hawaii earthquake program is doing. The program works a lot with WSSPC; specifically, they participated in the HETAC/WSSPC Workshop. Workshops work really well for Hawaii. This workshop covered topics related to buildings, scientific developments, earthquake early warning and other topics. Richards also discussed the PlayBook Applications, which would be the topic of a presentation later in the week during the NEC. Hawaii continues to do school outreach, including an earthquake risk presentation for children traveling to Japan. Hawaii participates in ShakeOut and saw a large jump in 2015 participation numbers by getting schools to participate. Richards also highlighted HHARP activities, which is a multi-hazard grassroots program within communities to encourage resiliency. Hawaii has ATC/NETAP Training upcoming, as well as conferences and committee activities.

Oregon:

Althea Rizzo provided an overview of Oregon risk, which includes earthquakes, tsunamis and volcanos. Oregon focuses on education and outreach. One project, the Dark Horse comic “Without Warning,” is working to reach an audience that isn’t as involved in earthquake awareness as others. They are now working to produce a tsunami version, which will take place later this year. The comic book is adaptable for other states if they are interested. Oregon has additional publications in the works. Rizzo also discussed the Tsunami Wayfinding project, which involves improving wayfinding for getting out of the tsunami zone. Oregon has brought the New Zealand blue line project to communities in the tsunami zone. As part of this project, communities participated in walk outs with elected leaders. Safe Haven Hill is another tsunami wayfinding project that has received a lot of support from multiple programs and has pulled in multiple resources. Oregon is also conducting an Up and Out Wayfinding Study. The Oregon Coast Hospitality Outreach continues with an online education module, which features training. The Oregon Tsunami Conference will take place in December.

2016 National Earthquake Program Managers Meeting Meeting Notes

Puerto Rico:

Puerto Rico's seismic network engages in earthquake awareness outreach and education, and has a commitment to community. Glorymar Gomez provided an overview of Puerto Rico's seismic network area of responsibility, its work with emergency managers and first responders in this area, and the seismic stations and tide gauges it owns. Gomez highlighted the education and outreach efforts underway, including the development of videos and supporting outreach materials. Puerto Rico is pushing the Tsunami Ready Program, which includes curriculum that complies with Department of Education requirements and can be distributed to schools for teaching. They are now working on earthquake curriculum. Gomez also highlighted their work on "train the trainers," the QuakeSmart Program, recognition of Tsunami Ready communities and an upcoming conference in 2018. Puerto Rico participates in ShakeOut and conducts media campaigns to encourage participation. They are continuing to work to involve more community-based groups and organizations.

Nevada:

Rick Martin provided an overview of ongoing projects in Nevada, including earthquake awareness billboards, URM verification and a post-disaster building inspection app. Nevada worked with WSSPC on the billboard project in Clark County to promote ShakeOut. Martin highlighted the Earthquake Flashcards developed with FLASH, noting that these are great to hand out to communities and that Nevada's Public Information Officer hands them out at all events. Nevada partnered with EERI in Clark County to do a URM inventory project, as well as a Disaster Building Inspection App, which catalogs buildings post-disaster. Martin also highlighted NETAP training for the state, which focused on hospitals. Next year's training will focus on schools. Nevada will be participating in the Vigilant Guard 17, which is a joint exercise that will focus on recovery, exercising core capabilities, and giving the state the opportunity to update its response and recovery materials. NDEM has developed a Daily Situation Report, which Martin highlighted and can make available to the other states if they are interested.

South Carolina:

Jessica Stumpf gave an overview of the activities underway in South Carolina and highlighted the earthquake risk in the area. South Carolina conducted a full-scale earthquake exercise. As a result, they are updating their earthquake plan. In partnership with the College of Charleston, they have developed a GIS storyboard, which discusses South Carolina earthquakes, history of events, preparedness activities, Drop-Cover-Hold On and other important information. Stumpf also highlighted the additional outreach materials in development, including an earthquake awareness brochure that is produced each year.

Utah:

Bob Carey provided an overview of activities conducted in Utah, including a Scenario Report done with EERI for the Wasatch Fault. Activities also included a Probabilities Report, which identified multiple sources for potential earthquake risk. Carey also highlighted the URM Guide. Utah has a significant building stock of URM and the URM Guide has been updated to reflect the latest in URM retrofitting.

2016 National Earthquake Program Managers Meeting Meeting Notes

Using the ATC 20 Construction Module as a guide, Utah does their own training on this topic and it has been successful. Carey noted that ShakeOut in April had the State's biggest turnout on record with 990,000 participants. Utah is also working on a School Inventory Update with a focus on risk; the challenge is finding the funds to fix schools with earthquake risk. Utah also has a joint project with WSSPC and several other states to create an earthquake guide for rural communities, recognizing that they have their own set of challenges.

Wyoming:

Melinda Gibson provided a brief update and highlighted a project Wyoming is working on in partnership with WSSPC – an earthquake card deck aimed at discussing earthquake risk and preparedness.

III. *Announcement of 2017 NEPM Site Location & NEPM Program Chairperson, Katie Belknap*

Katie Belknap announced that the 2017 NEPM would take place in Oklahoma City and Matthew Wall would be taking over as NEPM Program Chairperson.

IV. *NEMA Sub Committee Update, Art Faulkner*

Art Faulkner provided an update of the NEMA Subcommittee via phone. Faulkner regretted that he was unable to attend the conference in person. He noted his appreciation of the hard work of the state program managers and their continued work towards strengthening the organization and structure for state voices. A strong, coordinated state voice is an essential element to be able to push issues to NEMA and help NEMA understand issues that the states face at their level. Faulkner then touched on the NEHRP state assistance funding format. He referenced the NEMA conference in DC during which Roy Wright discussed that FEMA/FIMA is trying to move the state assistance model back to direct funding to the states with the FEMA-required cost match. NEMA is supportive of this approach and is looking for ways to maximize these dollars. NEMA will continue to work with the Consortia as this transition occurs.

Faulkner thanked Katie Belknap for her accomplishments as NEPM Program Chairperson and thanked Matthew Wall for his upcoming support. The NEMA Earthquake Sub-Committee has had several conference calls, with the next on May 12th. If anyone is interested in participating, see Katie Belknap or Jim Wilkinson. Currently, there are 11 states and three consortiums participating. Faulkner encouraged the other NEHRP agencies and the FEMA Regional PMs to participate, and stated that NEMA was looking at ways to have a FEMA member position in that committee. Faulkner concluded his update with a focus on the need for a concerted, joint effort to look at reauthorization of NEHRP. He encouraged the states to put emphasis on goals and objectives of the program and securing supporting funding. Overall, they need to make sure they are strengthening the connectivity between the Federal Government and partners. Faulkner participated in a brief Q&A with the participants. Kate Long thanked Faulkner for pushing the states to develop the white paper, which was instrumental in bringing back direct state assistance funding. Long also noted that reauthorization is the top priority of the states. Faulkner followed by noting that the states need to be vocal in conveying the importance of what they do to their leadership to gain their support for NEHRP reauthorization.

2016 National Earthquake Program Managers Meeting Meeting Notes

V. FEMA Update

Ed Laatsch kicked off the FEMA update and noted the many changes ongoing within FEMA. Laatsch introduced the new staff members present – Angie Gladwell and Bill Blanton – and explained their roles and how they fit into the new structure. He also introduced the new FEMA Building Science Branch earthquake program team member, Drew Herseth, as well as the rest of FEMA HQ team. Overall, Laatsch noted that there are transitions ongoing within FEMA and they are moving into a dynamic new environment. As part of the reorganization, FEMA is looking strategically at NEHRP and moving quickly to make sure they understand the program requirements, the resources needed and current gaps in resources. They are developing a strategic approach to address these gaps based to ensure a successful NEHRP program. Laatsch noted that they will be doing more work on this and thinking about where the program should be headed. As a result, hopefully the program will see exciting new approaches and address resource needs.

Laatsch then transitioned to the discussion on state assistance. He explained that FEMA will be looking at how they administer state assistance, which will include looking at the current law. This effort is related to reauthorization – if passed, reauthorization could lead to different language regarding the cash-only cost-match requirements. In the meantime, FEMA will continue to administer state assistance as they have been. The process will look the same for FY16 and the cost-match requirements will come into play in FY17.

Laatsch moved into Q&A with the participants. Kate Long directed her question to both Laatsch and Angie Gladwell noting that the main issue the states struggle with is FEMA's small funding. Long asked if this is a result of FEMA not asking for more NEHRP funding and asked how the states can help FEMA put NEHRP on an SES's work plan. Laatsch noted Gladwell's attendance at the conference and that the attention of an SES was there. Melinda Gibson had questions regarding the path forward and timeframe for NEHRP state assistance. Laatsch provided an overview of the FY16 state assistance process, noting that the requests will begin shortly and FY16 will be the same process as last year. FY17 is when the cost-match transition will occur. The states will receive an initial letter request asking if they are intending to meet the cost-match. The process will then break off into parallel tracks for those states that said they can meet the match and those that can't. For those that can meet the match, a cooperative agreement will be signed, a work plan developed and regular reporting required. There will be transparency in the process for both tracks. Consortia partners will provide assistance for those states that can't meet the cost-match. Matthew Wall provided some suggestions regarding opportunities in reauthorization. He noted that it would be beneficial if the NEHRP state assistance process matched the grant process in the Super Circular, specifically the soft-match requirements. Wall also questioned, with the FEMA reorganization, what the main pillars for measurements of success would be. In response, Laatsch noted that the language of the old CFR is included in the current NEHRP authorization and this language drives the cost-match requirements. This won't change until a new law is passed. Laatsch also highlighted the measures of success for NEHRP under the new reorganization. He explained that the Risk Management Directorate brings together a large number of programs, including

2016 National Earthquake Program Managers Meeting Meeting Notes

flood mapping, levee and dam safety, and the Building Science Branch. They are working to identify a common purpose. These programs are being brought together for a reason; they all deal with managing, analyzing and communicating risk. Success includes leveraging the programs and identifying what joint success looks like. The priority is setting the stage for FY17 and FY18, and expressing areas of focus. FEMA appreciates the states' interest in helping FEMA drive how to get there.

Jim Wilkinson of CUSEC provided a brief comment regarding FEMA's information request for the states' abilities to meet the cost-match. Wilkinson suggested that the request for the ability to meet cost-match be sent to the state representatives on the NEMA Earthquake Subcommittee, since that hits at the Director level. This would be the best staff level to hit within each state so they can provide a clear response.

FEMA Update – Presentation on Region IV Approach, Noriko Boston

FEMA Region IV Program Manager, Noriko Boston, presented on efforts underway within her Region to conduct the New Madrid Seismic Zone Update. Boston sits in the Planning section. This is beneficial because the Planner position has many touch points related to earthquakes and also has a strong relationship with the Regional Administrator in Region IV. Region IV has conducted an earthquake roundtable, with the goal to raise the visibility of all earthquake-related activities in the Region. The roundtable meets quarterly and Boston hopes that this will be shared as a best practice for all Regions to follow. The New Madrid Seismic Zone Plan Update includes response, recovery and mitigation. It covers a multi-Region area and also has HQ support. All states involved will be members of the core planning team and State Directors will be members of the Senior Leadership Steering Committee.

Boston fielded Q&A from the participants. There were numerous questions about incorporating the National Disaster Recovery Framework (NDRF) into this process. Boston noted that NDRF has been identified in the planning effort. Jim Wilkinson noted that in all emergency and response planning efforts, it's important that the scenario being planned for is uniform across all entities because it is a regional risk.

FEMA Update – Regional Roles and Responsibilities, Wendy Phillips

Wendy Phillips presented on FEMA's development of their Roles and Responsibilities template for Regional earthquake program managers. Phillips explained that FEMA was highlighting this document with the states to offer it as a guide for developing roles and responsibilities templates for the state earthquake programs. Phillips explained that FEMA developed the document to support transitions in Regional staffing, and to identify skill sets and training needed to have effective Regional earthquake program managers for NEHRP. The document can also be used to identify gaps and resource needs. Phillips encouraged the states to consider what types of information state program managers would need to be effective and to pull this information into a similar document.

Phillips opened the discussion for Q&A. Beverly Bell of NEMA suggested that the Federal agencies and the states review the NEHRP Strategic Plan, since this would be helpful in determining where the

2016 National Earthquake Program Managers Meeting Meeting Notes

program is going, identifying areas for collaboration, and communicating priorities and resource needs. Matthew Wall noted that the document was a good boiler plate for Regions to trickle down to their states and that it can also help with the interconnectivity amongst Regions, especially related to events and impacts. Wall also suggested that the document not include any reference to contractors, since this could be viewed as a conflict of interest in respect to contract law.

Ed Laatsch took this opportunity to highlight the purpose of the presentation – to provide support for the states and to encourage them to develop a template for a successful state earthquake program. This document could be shared throughout the state network and could assist states with new program managers and/or programs where staff is coming and going. Laatsch suggested creating a state working group that could create a template. Overall, this was meant to demonstrate an opportunity for a tool.

Ann Gravier highlighted the challenges related to horizontal and vertical stove-piping within state earthquake programs. She suggested an interagency working group to break vertical and horizontal stove-piping, and challenged everyone to think about an interagency, multi-level steering committee that could build collective perspective and priorities. Laatsch noted that this could be a discussion point for the FEMA-State-Regional Quarterly Calls.

END OF DAY ONE

2016 National Earthquake Program Managers Meeting Meeting Notes

Tuesday, May 3, 2016 (Work-Day)

I. Building Codes Training, Mike Griffin, P.E.

Wendy Phillips introduced Mike Griffin to the group, noting the importance of building codes and the thought process behind this training. Phillips stated that as an Emergency Manager, it is beneficial to have basic building codes knowledge to inform your daily interactions. In addition, you will be better equipped to inform recovery actions. Phillips noted that this is a possible course for NETAP training. This is a pilot and they welcome participant feedback on the course.

Mike Griffin provided a robust slide presentation on building codes, specifically highlighting the history of building codes, how they are developed and incorporated into standards, the organizations and processes that dictate the updating of building codes, lessons learned from events and how they are applied to building code updates, and the challenges and opportunities related to increasing the number of state and/or communities that adopt building codes. Griffin highlighted that building codes are a life safety code – a minimum set of standards for life safety, not for property protection. There is often a misunderstanding regarding the additional cost to construction to add building code-compliant features. Griffin noted that it generally adds less than 2%. The participants engaged in discussion regarding “building code costs” and expressed the need for studies to back up this 2% number so it can be promoted. Participants discussed the Memphis Study by NIST and the ATC 2014 Study, which will be shared by FEMA after the conference.

Discussion continued on the data needed to support the encouragement of designing to a higher building code. Ed Laatsch discussed FEMA’s efforts to make suggestions for increased levels of risk reduction, for example “one more foot of freeboard, makes you this much safer.” Mike Mahoney followed with a discussion on risk categories and performance metrics. Participants also discussed the variations in state law requirements related to building code adoption, as well as enforcement. Laatsch noted that the adoption and enforcement of building codes remains at the state level and it is within a state’s power to carry this out as it sees fit. FEMA tracks building code adoption through the ISO database. Kate Long commented on the study done by Keith Porter regarding the building stock in Northridge following the earthquake. Mahoney cautioned using this study in discussions on building codes, specifically the importance of understanding the year of the code being applied. Mahoney has the paper and will share with the group.

Discussion continued on the importance of code enforcement and referenced a study done by State Farm that shows that the enforcement process does not place that much of a burden on local code officials. Discussion also focused on using the Seismic Hazard Map to drive building code outreach efforts. In addition, participants recommended looking at historic changes of seismic hazard and drawing a correlation with the need to update building codes. Participants highlighted the need to demonstrate that building codes help promote community resiliency and economic growth.

Wendy Phillips wrapped up the training by engaging the participants in a discussion on ways to increase outreach related to building codes. Feedback included adding building code information to the “Seven

2016 National Earthquake Program Managers Meeting Meeting Notes

Steps to Earthquake Safety” and QuakeSmart Toolkit, developing standalone outreach materials on the importance of building codes, and working with State Hazard Mitigation Officers (SHMOs). Matthew Wall noted an opportunity to cross-reference construction against the tax base to identify areas of risk, and prioritize outreach and inspection. Wall also suggested encouraging HUD programs to allow homeowners to leverage funds to do retrofitting. Maximilian Dixon recommended including in this discussion city planners and universities with Planning degrees, as well as historical preservation groups.

Phillips turned the discussion to “internal” sources, such as the FEMA Preparedness Branch and Risk MAP, as well as local, regional and state mitigation plans. Kevin Richards noted that SHMOs are important, but they really need to coordinate with those that are giving permits and approving applications. This led the discussion to “external” sources, such as Design Professionals. Pascal Schuback presented the idea of building an incentive for seismic upgrades for old homes – where can retrofitting be promoted? Discussion continued to the National Building Rating System. Mike Mahoney noted that FEMA has developed P50: Residential Rating System and CEA is using this to develop training for home inspectors. Webinars will be happening on the topic.

Phillips prompted the group with one more question – How would you use this information? Participants were supportive of turning the presentation into a NETAP training. Ed Fratto noted that resistance to the implementation of building codes is high and suggested exploring the use of social scientists to understand the drivers behind the resistance. Kate Long noted that there are concerns with the National Building Rating System, but this is the best vehicle to monetize the implementation of building codes. Jason Williams noted the importance to create a public demand and the need to push education.

To close, Phillips requested that everyone fill out and submit the Trainee Evaluation Form.

II. What makes a good state assistance request? Ed Laatsch

Ed Laatsch presented on the state assistance projects process and what makes a good state assistance request. Laatsch provided an overview of the eligible activities and the additional criteria used to evaluate projects. Laatsch highlighted the importance of identifying opportunities to propose multi-state projects. Laatsch then provided an overview of the project submission and selection process. FEMA will be requesting state assistance project submissions from the states by the end of May. The states will submit their project requests to the Regional PMs, and copy Wendy Phillips and contract support. FEMA needs to review the project requests and turn around approved projects by the end of June. There will be a group comprised of FEMA team members reviewing the project request submissions. If needed, FEMA will reach out to the states for additional clarifying information. Laatsch recommended that the states identify which Consortia and/or Partner they would like to work with. FEMA will do its best to honor this request based on the partner’s capacity, which needs to be considered.

Participants engaged in discussion on the state assistance process. Kate Long requested communication from FEMA if they plan to skip over a state’s prioritized project based on funding constraints. Long requested that FEMA send the state a note that this is happening so the state has the opportunity to

2016 National Earthquake Program Managers Meeting Meeting Notes

scale back the budget and not have a project overlooked. Gala Gulacsik suggested that if a state wants to pursue a large project, they break it out into phases over several funding cycles. Long also requested for FEMA to share all state assistance project requests, so the states can see what everyone else is doing in case this changes their priorities. Laatsch recommended that the states set up a venue to share their state assistance project requests amongst themselves. Katie Belknap committed to adding this to the State Break-Out discussion. Althea Rizzo requested that FEMA distribute the list of projects funded in the past for the states to review. Long highlighted a discussion happening regarding Consortia partner overhead rates. Long would like to see consistent overhead rates across all partners. FEMA and the Consortia and/or Partners committed to taking this as an action item for their breakout session.

III. *EQProgram.net Update, Brian Blake*

Brian Blake highlighted the EQProgram.net website and areas of the site that were consistently updated, including the Annual NEPM Meeting and Earthquake Program Contacts sections. If a state earthquake program manager is new, it is recommended that they check this list and make sure their state POC is correct. If not, follow up with Matthew Wall and Brian Blake. The FEMA Regional Support page is out of date; FEMA agreed to review and provide updated information. Blake also highlighted the efforts underway to develop new content for the website, including the EQ Program Resources available for states and Tools and Training, which will include the NETAP training catalog and other agency resources. States can distribute surveys through EQProgram.net as well.

IV. *ESRI Collector App, Brian Blake*

Brian Blake presented on CUSEC's efforts on the ESRI Collector App. Blake provided an overview of the history behind the development of the app and its purpose. CUSEC is working to roll the app out to states that have interest. Based on previous inspection processes, inspectors needed ways to import data from their assessments. CUSEC wanted to make sure they developed a tool that saves time/money, integrates with current systems, improves situational awareness and that is easy to install. These requirements led them to the ESRI Collector App. The Missouri Save Coalition did the first field test for the app. They tested mobile data collection and just-in-time training. This test went well. People went out into the field and inputted data in the ArcGIS Operations Dashboard, and they could see all the inspections coming in. The next steps are to get this app plugged into response plans, conduct training and see if it can be incorporated into FEMA-154. Blake fielded participant Q&A on how inspectors could access the app. The response entity can login in to ESRI, create identities, request logins and provide to inspectors. The app will be featured at CUSEC's booth all week.

V. *ShakeOut Briefing, Mark Benthien*

Mark Benthien gave a presentation about ShakeOut participation and what drives preparedness and social behaviors. The presentation focused on ShakeOut survey results and how this information can be used to inform ongoing outreach efforts. SCEC is looking at expanding beyond the basic Drop-Cover-Hold On message. For example, they are developing a poster that showcases how to act in a variety of different situations. The poster will be up all week for states and partners to provide comments on. The

2016 National Earthquake Program Managers Meeting Meeting Notes

Drop-Cover-Hold On message can be complicated when regional differences are taken into account. The challenge is coming up with regionally-appropriate proactive messages.

Benthien highlighted a variety of survey results, including participant satisfaction information. This was a worldwide survey; however, participation was mainly from the U.S. Benthien noted challenges with requiring registration each year, but this is needed because sometimes a state can lose a champion of ShakeOut and that can have a big impact. Benthien highlighted motivational factors captured in the survey feedback and this is informing future program activities and outreach. For example, SCEC is exploring a higher education outreach program. They are also seeking to increase the diversity in both survey respondents and ShakeOut participants. Discussion with participants encouraged SCEC to explore partnering with emergency alert broadcasting networks and time an alert with the ShakeOut drill. The path forward for ShakeOut over the next three to five years focuses on customized websites to promote ShakeOut internationally and to build Spanish capabilities. SCEC really views ShakeOut becoming a communication infrastructure for promoting earthquake preparedness and mitigation.

VI. State and FEMA-Partner Break-Outs Brief-Out, Matthew Wall and Bill Blanton

Matthew Wall provided the State break-out summary. Wall noted that the states are considering having both a new Chairperson and a Vice Chairperson to facilitate the transition and support the workload. The states will identify who the co-Chair will be, possibly Katie Belknap. The states recognized the importance of supporting the state earthquake program manager network, and related training and development. Training opportunities should be posted on EQProgram.net and mentorship opportunities will be explored to match new state program managers with more tenured state earthquake staff. Wall also noted that coordination of communication is very important and there is an opportunity with the FEMA Regional partners to strengthen this network. Overall, the program needs to demonstrate a return on investment in terms of overall resiliency for communities, including economic continuity. Wall noted that the states preferred the state-facilitated meeting. The states will be having quarterly conference calls so state earthquake program managers need to make sure their contact information is up to date on EQProgram.net. In terms of the state assistance support discussion, Wall noted that the states support direct funding and requested more lead time on project requests for FY16 and the states' ability to meet the cost-match in FY17. Wall noted that the states are going to share their project requests with each other via EQProgram.net and they have formed a committee to work with EQProgram.net.

Bill Blanton provided a summary of the FEMA and Partners break-out. Blanton noted that FEMA and Partners discussed the state assistance projects request process for FY16 and identified working groups to review the project request submissions. Blanton also noted that they discussed the FY17 state assistance process, making note of changes in the process and how to prepare. As promised, FEMA and Partners discussed overhead issues related to the state assistance projects fulfilled by Consortia and/or Partners and have taken an action item to discuss the issue further. Blanton also noted the discussion regarding the FEMA-State-Partners Quarterly call and that FEMA will be exploring tech-savvy

2016 National Earthquake Program Managers Meeting Meeting Notes

communication tools to enhance this communication structure and allow for a more ongoing feedback loop.

END OF DAY TWO

2016 National Earthquake Program Managers Meeting

Meeting Notes

2016 NEPM Action Items

- Anyone interested in participating the NEMA earthquake subcommittee meeting on May 12th – see Katie Belknap or Jim Wilkinson
- Overarching action item on joint efforts related to pushing for NEHRP Reauthorization
- When soliciting information from the states on cost-match, recommendation to make request to NEMA earthquake subcommittee
- Share information on NEHRP program-wide strategic plan
- Explore development of interagency, multi-level steering committee to encourage development of earthquake program priorities
 - Discuss development of steering committee and identify potential members at FEMA-State-Partners Quarterly conference call
- Building Codes Training Action Items:
 - FEMA to share studies referenced in “building code costs” and discussed later by group, specifically Memphis study by NIST and ATC 2014 study
 - FEMA – Mike Mahoney to share Heath Porter study following Northridge earthquake
 - FEMA – Mike Mahoney to share ASCE 7 and provided notice when Tsunami Design is publicized at the end of the year
 - FEMA to update SHMO webpage
 - Share information on P50: Residential Rating System webinars
 - Explore ways to engage social scientists to explore resistance to building code adoption
 - All participants requested to fill out and return Trainee Evaluation Form
- FEMA State Assistance Presentation Action Items:
 - Distribute state assistance overview electronically
 - FEMA will be sending out project request email in near future for turn around by end of May
 - States to discuss and propose platform for the states to share project requests for opportunity to identify commonalities/multi-state project opportunities
 - FEMA/OPP to share master spreadsheet of FY15 state assistance projects
 - FEMA and Partner break-out session to discuss how overhead should be factored into project costs
 - FEMA to send out Consortia and Partners capabilities summary
- EQProgram.net Action Items:
 - State earthquake program managers to review EQprogram.net state contact list to make sure it is up to date – follow up with Brian Blake and Matthew Wall if not correct
 - FEMA to review FEMA Regional Support POC page and provide updates
 - NETAP Training Catalog for the year will be available soon – will be distributed
 - State break-out session to further discuss EQprogram.net and organize committee to build out other website features
- Request for all participants to review SCEC/OPP Drop-Cover-Hold On draft poster and provide comments/feedback
- FEMA-State-Partners Quarterly Calls – Gather feedback from states on the structure of the call and explore use of communications tools (Slack, Base Camp) to enhance