



Committee on  
**HOMELAND SECURITY**  
Chairman Peter T. King

**Opening Statement**

February 29, 2012

**Media Contact:** Shane Wolfe

(202) 226-8417

---

**Statement of Chairman Gus Bilirakis (R-FL)  
Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and  
Communications**

**"The President's FY 2013 Budget Request for the Federal Emergency  
Management Agency"**

**February 29, 2012  
Remarks as Prepared**

The Full Committee recently held a hearing on the President's Fiscal Year 2013 budget request for the Department of Homeland Security, at which Secretary Napolitano testified. This Subcommittee will continue that oversight today with a more in depth review of the President's request for the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

Administrator Serino, I believe this is the first time you have appeared before this Subcommittee. Welcome.

The President's Fiscal Year 2013 budget requests \$10 billion for programs and operations at FEMA. Of this amount, the request includes \$789 million for salaries and expenses, nearly \$200 million less than the Fiscal Year 2012 enacted level. Some of this reduction is attributable to account transfers, while some is due to more efficient use of funding, such as rent reductions and improved IT operations. It is important in these difficult budgetary times that all agencies and departments work to streamline waste and

enhance operations. Administrator Serino, I am interested in hearing more about the management efficiencies included in this budget request.

The budget request proposes major changes within the State and Local Programs account, by consolidating a number of homeland security grant programs into a new National Preparedness Grant Program (NPGP). The Subcommittee will be holding a hearing focusing on grants next month, but I am particularly interested in hearing more about this proposal today as the request leaves us with more questions than it provides answers. How would FEMA factor risk when allocating funding under this program? Would high risk urban areas, port authorities, and transit agencies be able to apply directly for funding?

Allocations under N-P-G-P would rely heavily on a State's Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment, THIRA, and yet nearly a year after the THIRA concept was first introduced as part of the Fiscal Year 2011 grant guidance, grantees have yet to receive guidance on how to conduct the THIRA process. Questions also remain as to how local stakeholders would be involved in the THIRA process at the State level. It is essential that the local law enforcement, first responders, and emergency managers who are first on the scene of a terrorist attack, natural disaster, or other emergency be involved this process. They know the threats to their local areas and the capabilities they need to attain to address them best.

These questions, and others, must be answered as this proposal is considered. And as you engage Congress on this proposal, you must also do more to engage the State and local stakeholders that will be impacted by the proposed changes.

A topic I have discussed with Administrator Fugate on several occasions is the importance of mitigation. Studies have indicated that for every dollar that is spent on mitigation activities, there is a \$4 return on investment. That is why I was surprised to see that the President's budget proposes to eliminate the Pre-Disaster Mitigation program. Administrator Serino, I would like to hear more about the rationale behind this proposed elimination and how this budget supports mitigation efforts in other areas.

Finally, I am interested in hearing more about the implementation of Presidential Policy Directive 8. FEMA released the National Preparedness Goal and National Disaster Recovery Framework (NDRF) last Fall. What

feedback have you received from stakeholders on these documents? How has the NDRF been integrated into FEMA's recovery operations? What is the status of the development of the other frameworks required by PPD 8?