

2009 Homeland Security Program



After Action Report

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	3
Purpose	3
Process Overview	3
Key Dates	4
Process Analysis	5
Improvement Matrix.....	9
Moving Forward: Next Steps.....	12

Executive Summary

The Homeland Security Grant Program is currently managed by the Governor's Office of Homeland Security. Prior to July 2008, all program management functions existed within the Colorado Division of Emergency Management, a division within the Department of Local Affairs. The information within this report is a compilation of data from both management agencies in an attempt to capture a unified perspective of the 2008 grant process.

The Homeland Security Grant Program is comprised of four interconnected grant programs:

- ◆ State Homeland Security Program
- ◆ Urban Areas Security Initiative
- ◆ Metropolitan Medical Response System
- ◆ Citizen Corps Program

The Homeland Security Grant Program implements objectives addressed in a series of post-9/11 laws, strategy documents, plans and Homeland Security Presidential Directives (HSPDs). Federal funding priorities continue to narrow the focus through risk-based funding and the capability-based planning process that the Department of Homeland Security initiated over three years ago.

Purpose

This After Action Review will focus on the various programs that exist within the State Homeland Security Grant Program. Although not all of the programs followed the same process, this review was conducted in an attempt to ensure a coordinated approach related to program development, management and expenditure of grant funds.

The purpose of this document is to provide guidance to staff and stakeholders for the improvement of all aspects of Colorado's regard to the Homeland Security Program grant process.

Process Overview

For purposes of Homeland Security Program planning, training, exercising and grant management, the State of Colorado is divided into nine All-Hazards Emergency Management Regions. The Regions were established in July of 2003 and determined through consideration of existing districts used for planning, emergency management and medical/public health response. The regionalization was implemented to enhance capabilities and maximize resources. It is important to recognize that multiple planning regions for other disciplines also exist and cross some of the All Hazard Emergency Management Regional boundaries.

Each Region conducted an independent grant development process, which varied significantly from Region to Region. Included in this process were the target capability assessment and review, grant project development, grant prioritization and submittal. It

is recommended that each of the Regions conduct and develop its own after action process and report.

Key Dates

September-October: Regional Risk and Capability Assessments were conducted.

November 2008: The State of Colorado received the Federal Homeland Security Grant Guidance.

December 2008: Improvement Planning Conference was conducted.

December 2008: Draft guidance was issued.

December 2008: All statewide Risk and Capability Data finalized.

January 2009: Training and Exercise Planning Workshop was conducted.

January 2009: Final grant guidance was issued along with application template.

February 2009: Regional draft applications were due to the state.

February and March: Investment Justifications were developed and sent to Regions for comment.

February- April 2009: Update Regional Risk Assessment Data

March 2009: State Application was due to the federal government.

April 2009: Staff and subject matter experts from state agency partners provided feedback on draft application.

June 2009: Regional Final applications were due.

June 2009: All projects were provided to the Grant Review Committee (GRC) for review and scoring. Questions regarding application were submitted by GRC and provided to applicants.

July 2009: Grant Review Committee convened.

August 2009: State received federal awards.

August 2009: Senior Advisory Council (SAC) and Governor approved grant awards.

September 2009: Regional award allocations were finalized. Regions submitted revised projects/budgets based on the final, approved award amounts.

Process Analysis

Risk Analysis Process

The Colorado Risk Analysis Tool was modeled from the Federal Data Call instrument released in 2005. Colorado's tool was tailored to meet the specific needs of Colorado's agencies and has been a work in process. The initial implementation of the tool was in 2006, with updates in 2007, a significant revision in August 2008, and additional revisions in 2009 based on input from the After Action conducted in 2008 and input from the Colorado Department of Public Safety.

Data was collected at the local level and then combined at the Regional level and submitted to the State. The Colorado Department of Public Safety served in an oversight/data validation capacity and helped to ensure consistent and accurate data. Additionally some data was provided by the Colorado Department of Public Safety and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Target Capabilities Assessment Process

The Target Capability Assessment was initially implemented in 2005 and was modeled from the Federal Pilot Assessment. The assessments are conducted annually and are completed at the Regional level, with input from local and other partner agencies.

In 2008, the tool was revised and moved from the 5 point Woodbury Scale to a 10-point Scale to enable more accurate identification of capability levels. For the 15 Priority Capability Areas, subject matter experts provided detail on capability measure in order to establish scoring anchors. This was done to assist stakeholders in the identification of capability levels.

The 2009 Assessment Process was focused primarily on the 15 Priority Capabilities. Members from the University of Colorado Team and staff from the Governor's Office of Homeland Security attended every Regional Capability Assessment to assist in the process and help to norm the data to ensure consistency between Regional scoring processes.

Homeland Security Strategy Revision

The Colorado State Homeland Security Strategy was revised during early 2008 with regional and state agency input. The Strategy was revised to ensure alignment with the revised National Strategy. A Statewide Regional Tour was conducted by GOHS staff and the University of Colorado team during 2007 to gather input and ideas from across the State related to the Strategy.

A State Subject Matter Expert meeting was held in October 2007 and various planning sessions occurred during November 2007. The resulting strategy had a wide variety of stakeholder input and directly tied to the National Strategy.

The revised Colorado State Homeland Security Strategy has 5 Goals and 37 Objectives. Each goal has a State Goal Champion that is assigned to the implementation of the particular goal. Additionally, a Goal Leader is assigned to every capability area and will be tasked with convening Capability Working Groups to assist in strategy implementation and capabilities-based planning.

Recommendations from GOHS were provided to the SAC related to strategy updates. The SAC approved the changes. These changes included the addition of the Denver Urban Areas Security Initiative and Tribal representation on the SAC.

State Preparedness Report

In November 2007, an SPR Task Force was formed to contribute to the development of the SPR. With the release of the federal 2008 Homeland Security Grant Program Guidance, it was made very apparent that future Investment Justifications would need to directly relate to the SPR. Therefore, Colorado’s SPR was revised substantially. A wide range of subject matter experts convened for a full day in March 2008 to review and revise the Initiatives, 3- year Targets and Resources Requirements. This worked to ensure a better connection between the Investment Justifications and the State Preparedness Report.

For 2009, participants of the State Improvement Planning Conference gathered information from subject matter experts regarding the progress of specific goals/objectives within SPR. This information was compiled by the Governor’s Office of Homeland Security and the CU Staff for an update to the SPR. Updates included progress made on 3-year targets and projected completion dates. The final SPR updates were submitted to DHS.

Homeland Security Program and Capability Review

The annual Program and Capability Review was conducted in September and October 2008, with Regions, State Agencies and Goal Leaders to establish the State Priorities. The group identified priorities related to the National Planning Scenarios, the Target Capabilities, the Initiatives and the Investment Justifications.

The following priority areas resulted from the Program and Capability Review Process:

State Planning Scenarios	State Capability Areas	State Investment Justifications
Improvised Explosive Device	Community Preparedness*	Communications
Pandemic Influenza	Planning*	Strengthen Preparedness Planning
Foreign animal Disease	Intelligence/Info Sharing*	Community Preparedness
Food Contamination	Responder Health and Safety*	IED Protection and Response Planning/Operations
	Communications*	Info Sharing/Counter Terror Operations
	Critical Infrastructure Protection*	Medical Preparedness
	Counter-Terror Investigations and Law Enforcement	
	CBRNE Detection	
	Explosive Device Response Operations	
	WMD/Hazmat Response and Decon	
	Citizen Evacuation and Shelter in Place	
	Emergency Public Information and Warning	
	Medical Surge	
	Mass Prophylaxis	
	Mass Care	

Homeland Security Grant Application Process

Grant Guidance and Application

Application templates were created based on the Federal Investment Justifications. Draft applications were due to assist in the development of the Investment Justifications. Feedback regarding these applications was provided by both GOHS staff and subject

matter experts from state agency partners. This feedback focused on both allowability issues and alignment with the State Homeland Security overall goals and objectives.

Baseline Funding

The Colorado Regional funding formula was modeled on the Department of Homeland Security Risk-Based Grant Methodology. The decision was made to have 80% of the funds allocated based on a Risk Formula. This funding portion was established as the target baseline allocation for each Region. The remaining 20% of the funds was marked as competitive. Each Region was provided a baseline amount, as well as a maximum application amount, which was based on the maximum possible amount for the state grant application.

All projects funded within the baseline were required to link to the fifteen priority target capabilities. However, the baseline funding was focused on regional and local priorities and was intended to support programs that were of great importance to local agencies.

The remaining 20% of funding was considered competitive and was focused on overall statewide priorities. These projects were scored by the Grant Review Committee.

For state agency applicants, all funding was awarded on a competitive basis. Recommendations for state agency funding were provided to GOHS by the Grant Review Committee and then reviewed by both the Senior Advisory Council and the Governor.

Development of Scoring Criteria

As part of the 2008 After Action Process, the Grant Review Committee was tasked with determining scoring criteria by which to assess the 2009 projects. For each of the criterion identified, specific metrics were also developed and utilized. Additionally, each of the criterion was weighted based on its overall importance or significance to the program.

The following is a breakdown of the scoring criteria and the weighting associated with each of them (The specific metrics may be found in the 2009 Colorado Homeland Security Program Governor's Office of homeland Security Grant Guidance and Requirements document located at <http://www.colorado.gov/homelandsecurity>):

- ◆ The project's impact relative to its most applicable capability area (25%)
- ◆ The project's alignment to the State Homeland Security Strategy (20%)
- ◆ The linkage of the project to the identified priority capabilities (15%)
- ◆ The project's linkage to the priority planning scenarios (15%)
- ◆ The ability of the requesting jurisdiction to sustain the project (15%)
- ◆ The collaboration exhibited in the project submission (10%)

Each project was scored by the Grant Review Committee members prior to the formal meeting. Once presentations were given and discussion had occurred, GRC members were given the opportunity to modify their initial scores.

In instances where scores were drastically modified, an explanation was required.

Grant Review Process and Allocations

The Grant Review Committee was comprised of 17 members. One representative was present from each of the Regions, as well as state agency representatives from applicant agencies, and one representative per Tribal Nation. Additionally, a representative was present from both the Denver Urban Areas Security Initiative and the Colorado Department of Corrections to serve in a non-voting member capacity:

- ✓ North Central Region
- ✓ Northeast Region
- ✓ Northwest Region
- ✓ San Luis Valley Region
- ✓ South Region
- ✓ Southeast Region
- ✓ South Central Region
- ✓ Southwest Region
- ✓ West Region
- ✓ Ute Mountain Ute Tribe
- ✓ Southern Ute Tribe
- ✓ Department of Public Safety
- ✓ Department of Local Affairs
- ✓ Department of Human Services
- ✓ Department of Agriculture
- ✓ Governor's Office of Information Technology
- ✓ Department of Public Health and Environment
- ✓ Denver Urban Areas Security Initiative (non-voting member)
- ✓ Department of Corrections (non-voting member)

Improvement Matrix

The following matrix includes an overview of various improvement areas identified during the 2009 Homeland Security Grant Program and Process. Information was gathered during the Grant Review Committee Hot-wash meeting, the formal 2009 After Action Meeting, and finally through additional stakeholder review and comment. For each of the improvement areas, specific tasks have been assigned to assist in the implementation of recommendations. GOHS staff will review the matrix during the development of grant and program guidance to ensure effective implementation.

Improvement Matrix

Function	Improvement Area	Improvement Suggestions
Risk Assessment Tool	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ A variety of data sources were utilized causing difficulty in comparing risk levels across Regions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ State should continue to move towards the implementation of ACAMS to assist in standardization
Risk Assessment Formula	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ ICE cases may not have a direct correlation to terrorism ◆ Sustainment funding portion (26.66%) is a significant portion of formula 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ The risk formula should be reviewed and determination made as to whether ICE cases are meaningful and to reduce the weighting if necessary ◆ Risk formula should be reviewed and sustainment portion is recommended to be reduced
Capability Assessment Tool	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Many capability measures are specific to state functions and are difficult for locals to assess 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ State measures should be pulled out of local assessments; however, coordination still needs to occur ◆ More information on how the state agency arrives at its measure should also be given to the locals. ◆ The creation of a true “gap analysis” would be a helpful tool along side the Capability assessment to better identify planning scenarios and areas that require improvement.
Capability Assessment Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Lack of consistency across regions and local agencies ◆ Not all Regions require the same level of capability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ SAA should issue guidance to assist in standardization efforts ◆ Different capability level requirements should be identified for each Region
Improvement Planning Conference	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Many of the planning scenarios and capability areas were selected arbitrarily 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Empirical data and a more fact-based methodology should be utilized
Training and Exercise Planning Workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Lack of local multi-year plans made it difficult to develop statewide priorities and schedules ◆ Lack of multi-regional coordination that caused schedule and resource conflicts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ All Regions should conduct an annual TEPW to provide input into statewide TEPW ◆ All Regions should allow for multi-regional representation at local TEPWs

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Local TEPWs that were conducted occurred prior to the IPC, leading to disorganized training and exercise planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ The IPC should occur prior to local TEPWs so that guidance is consistent
State Preparedness Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ The SPR update was disconnected from the grant process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ More integration is needed to incorporate local input into the SPR updates
State Strategy Update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Lack of local and Regional input 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Feedback should be solicited from all partners
State Grant Guidance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Additional guidance is needed related to the credentialing program ◆ Training and exercise projects were submitted differently by each Region 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ In coordination with the goal leader and OIT, more specific guidance should be issued ◆ Guidance should be provided regarding whether T and E projects are submitted under appropriate capability areas or planning
Draft Application Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Feedback provided to grant applicants was difficult to read and follow 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Feedback should be provided in a more user-friendly format
Regional Grant Application Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ There was a wide variation with regard to grant applications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Additional technical assistance should be provided to sub-grantees
Scoring Criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ The impact section focused heavily on quantitative improvements ◆ Impact section lacked guidance with regard to whether improvement was local, regional or statewide ◆ Budget reasonableness is not currently included in the scoring criteria but is important ◆ Sustainability is difficult to define 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Impact should include both qualitative and quantitative measures ◆ Impact scoring metrics should be expanded upon to clearly identify at what level improvements are being made ◆ Budget reasonableness should be included as a scoring criteria ◆ Sustainability should continue to be included but should be more clearly defined
Grant Review Committee Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ UASI and MMRS applications were not provided to GRC for informational purposes and to enhance coordination ◆ Applicant presentations were inconsistent and did not significantly contribute to project review. ◆ Grant Review Committee Members were not all aware of overall process ◆ Not all scoring was consistent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ UASI and MMRS grant applications should be provided to GRC for informational purposes only ◆ Presentations should be omitted or included as a scoring area. ◆ Training should be provided to all new members of the Grant Review Committee ◆ A sample project should be scored to assist to norm the scoring process

Overall Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ National Planning Scenarios are not directly connected to the overall process ◆ Lack of identification of actual needs from across the state 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ National Planning scenarios should be included throughout the process; including both grant requests and as part of the risk tool ◆ Need to get statewide working groups up and running to issue guidance and coordination
-----------------	---	---

Moving Forward:

Suggestions and feedback identified in this report will be utilized to enhance future program cycles and funding processes. An After Action Report will be conducted annually to capture significant improvement opportunities for program maintenance and sustainability.