



E-PARCC

COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE INITIATIVE

Syracuse University

Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs

Program for the Advancement of Research on Conflict and Collaboration

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT & HOMELAND SECURITY: INTERAGENCY COLLABORATION

EMERGENCY!!

TEACHING NOTE

The City of Alta Madre must deal with interagency conflicts to formulate an emergency management plan. This is a six-party negotiation among public officials to develop a plan to utilize federal funds for emergency preparedness, agree on an on-going working relationship, and develop a press strategy to engage the public in the planning. The objective of the meeting is to develop an interagency memorandum of understanding (MOU) and a joint press strategy. This role play works best if participants already have experience with interest-based negotiation. One of the players must both represent his/her agency and serve as facilitator of the meeting. The role play materials include both general information and confidential information for each of the players.

This simulation was a first place winner in our 2008 “Collaborative Public Management, Collaborative Governance, and Collaborative Problem Solving” teaching case and simulation competition. It was double-blind peer reviewed by a committee of academics and practitioners. It was written by David E. Booher and Adam Sutkus of Center for Collaborative Policy, California State University Sacramento and was edited by Khris Dodson. This simulation is intended for classroom discussion and is not intended to suggest either effective or ineffective handling of the situation depicted. It is brought to you by E-PARCC, part of the Maxwell School of Syracuse University’s Collaborative Governance Initiative, a subset of the Program for the Advancement of Research on Conflict and Collaboration (PARCC). This material may be copied as many times as needed as long as the authors are given full credit for their work.

Background Readings

“Network Structures: Working Differently and Changing Expectations,” (2004) by Robin Keast, et al, Public Administration Review, May/June, pp. 363-371.

“A Manager's Guide for Resolving Conflicts in Collaborative Networks” (2007) by Rosemary O'Leary and Lisa Blomgren Bingham. IBM Center for the Business of Government. Download from:

<http://www.businessofgovernment.org/pdfs/OlearyBinghamReport.pdf>

Networks that Work (2008) by Paul Vandeventer and Myrna Mandel. Los Angeles: Community Partners.

“The IAP2 Public Participation Tool Box,” Download from:

<http://www.iap2.org/associations/4748/files/toolbox.pdf>

Logistics

This role play works best with one student assigned to play each of the roles. Thirty minutes are required to read the background information and prepare for the meeting. The role play works best if students study the materials prior to class. At least two hours should be allotted for the meeting. More time is better. One hour should be provided for the discussion after the role play is concluded. As an additional assignment each student may be asked to prepare their written final version of the interagency memorandum of understanding and the press strategy.

Debriefing Discussion

Begin the debriefing discussion by asking someone from each group to summarize their MOU and press strategy if they reached agreement. Several questions may be useful for the discussion.

1. What happened in the groups that reached agreement and those that did not?
2. What role did the facilitation play in either advancing or hindering agreements? How do the different MOUs compare in terms of how closely the agencies will work together in the future: mere cooperation, more closely linked coordination, or the riskier and more radical collaboration?

3. How well do the provisions of the different MOUs address potential changes in the context and in the management of tensions and conflicts?
4. How did the MOU address the tension between the interests of the different agencies and the need to work together toward a common goal?
5. How did the different groups work through both the immediate need to divide funding and the longer term need of on-going cooperation, coordination, or collaboration?
6. How was the process dynamic affected by the interaction of the two needs?

Summary of Lessons

1. ***The fundamental dilemma of networks.*** Many public managers have found the strategy of creating a voluntary network structure useful to coordinate public policy actions when multiple agencies must cooperate to achieve their individual and collective goals but no single authority is in control to coordinate all the agencies. Managers contemplating a network structure must deal with both the need to address the interests of their agency and the need to work together with other agencies, with potential competing interests, toward a common goal.
2. ***Conflict can be very complex in networks.*** In addition to the fundamental dilemma, for example, different agencies may have more or less power and resources. They may be more or less dependent upon other agencies. They may have different organizational cultures. They may have different stakeholders and funders they have to consider. The managers have to include others in their agency who may have different perspectives. Agencies may have conflicting concerns and goals in dealing with the public. Finally, managers may bring existing interpersonal conflicts with other managers to the contemplated network.
3. ***A network negotiation is focused as much on how the agencies will work together over time to address a problem area as it is about reaching agreement on an immediate dispute.*** In many public policy negotiations the objective is to reach agreement on one or more issues. The participants may or may not have to work together on future problems. A network is useful where the agencies must work together over a longer term to address a problem area where the solutions, or even the nature of the problems, are not yet apparent.

Sometimes, as in this role play, the agencies must reach agreement both on an immediate issue and on a longer term working relationship. This can create a challenging dynamic. The focus on the more immediate concern can disrupt attention on the longer term relationship. On the other hand, the fact the agencies envision working together in the future can offer the potential for trade-offs and compromise for the immediate dispute.

4. ***A network requires a unique structure.*** A network requires a unique structure to fit the context, agency constraints, and issues. It is not a traditional top down hierarchy with traditional means of accountability and authority. It requires that participants work differently together than is typically the case in a public agency. Since participation is voluntary, majority voting is probably not a viable decision making method because minority voters may defect from the network. Instead consensus may work best for decision making. There is no central control, although some agencies may have more power than others. Agencies in a network may need to devise ways to share their resources toward a common goal. Each network must be structured to fit the unique needs of the situation.
5. ***Facilitation of a network is also unique.*** In many negotiations a group may rely on an independent neutral facilitator to help them with the process. Often in networks one of the managers must both provide for “neutral” facilitation and at the same time represent their own agency’s interests. This requires skills in balancing these roles, assuring transparency in the process, and maintaining the trust of the participants.
6. ***A MOU may be useful as a tool to help structure a network.*** In some networks the managers may envision minimal coordination. In this case an informal (perhaps even oral) agreement among them may provide for such activities as sharing information, communication about future activities, and perhaps convening joint problem solving sessions. In situations where closer cooperation or collaboration are needed the managers may need a more formal and written memorandum of understanding (MOU). This is particularly the case where resources are shared, roles and responsibilities must be clear, joint action is anticipated, and disputes are likely. The MOU may be important for clarity, transparency, and accountability of the participants to each other. In this role play the MOU is between agencies of the same city and the city council will ratify it. In other cases, where agencies from different jurisdictions are participating, each of the agencies may have its own procedures for considering and approving a document like a MOU. Although each network MOU is

unique, many typically address such issues as:

- The purpose and goals
 - The participants
 - How resources are to be shared and/or allocated
 - Roles and responsibilities
 - Communication procedures
 - Decision making rules
 - Dispute resolution process
 - Revision and repeal of the MOU
 - Addition and deletion of members
-
- ***7. Involving the public may be important for a network to address a problem area.*** In many situations, such as this role play, the public will play a critical role in achieving success. If a catastrophic earthquake or flood strikes or the pandemic influenza arrives, minimizing loss of life may depend on the actions the public is prepared to take. Many other issues also require public actions for long term success. Examples include climate change, water conservation, and public education. In a network the agencies must decide on the need for public involvement and address that need in the context of their individual agency's existing process for public involvement. A network needs to address explicitly the goals and strategy for public involvement and reach agreement on the methods that will be used. At a minimum they need to agree on a message and strategy for communicating with the press. There are many methods available for the various levels of public involvement that may be considered.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT & HOMELAND SECURITY: INTERAGENCY COLLABORATION

EMERGENCY!!

General Information

The City of Alta Madre in the State of Pacifica has been struggling with conflicts among its public safety departments over how to provide emergency preparedness and response. Alta Madre is a suburban city of 300,000 located in Mammoth County in a major metropolitan region in the United States. Since the reported breakdown in emergency response by various agencies for the Katrina catastrophe in the U.S. Gulf Coast in 2005, the public and city leaders are anxious not to have a similar breakdown in Alta Madre.

Alta Madre city representatives are about to meet again for this year's discussion on fiscal year funding just allocated to the city for homeland security and emergency management. In the U.S., each of the 50 individual states received funds from a large program sponsored by the federal government for homeland security and emergency preparedness. These federal funds are distributed to the states and, in turn, to local governments within each state. In Pacifica, the yearly allocation of homeland security and emergency preparedness funding is distributed to each of the counties in the state based on population numbers. The counties, in turn, allocate funds to individual cities or county programs based on local needs for emergency preparedness. It is at this level that the detailed negotiation and priority setting must occur between key city stakeholders at the local level. Because of the difficulties encountered last year in Alta Madre—when discussions broke down and a decision for funding decisions was made unilaterally by the City Manager and approved by the Council—the City Manager has made it clear that she and the Council do not want to see a repeat of last year's public conflict. The City Manager has directed the various departments to meet and come up with a consensus recommendation for the allocation of funding. In addition she has asked the department leaders to develop a long term structure and process to assure collaboration in the operation of homeland security and emergency preparedness/response activities and programs. And finally, she wants the group to draft a press release about the agreement for the City to issue. She has asked the

Emergency Management Director from Mammoth County to serve as a facilitator to assist the city's department leaders in reaching agreement on funding, on a memorandum of understanding (MOU) for future collaboration, and on a press strategy, beginning with a press release, to keep the public informed. The city has a very short period of time—30 days—to submit a „spending plan“ to the county, who will then aggregate all the individual city spending plans within the county and forward the completed county package to the State of Pacifica which is considering all of the emergency management and homeland security programs being funded this fiscal year throughout the state. Once approved at the end of the review period by the state, the city will then be allocated the requested funds. During the 30 days the City Council must also review and approve the spending plan and the MOU. But the City Manager has indicated that if a consensus recommendation is offered she will support it and expects the City Council to approve it as well.

Funding and MOU Issues

In Pacifica, similar to other states, there are two major sources of funding for emergency services and homeland security. First, the State Office of Homeland Security (OHS) receives annual funding from the federal Department of Homeland Security in Washington, D.C. The congressionally allocated funding has come to the state level with several requirements attached, and the OHS has, in turn, allocated the funding programs to counties in the state. The county has the requirement to receive the funding from the state, and to distribute it to the cities in their jurisdiction as they see best. In Mammoth County, each of the cities has received a population-based grant program total, and this is what Alta Madre has received as their share. Second, the State Health and Human Services Agency has been granted funds directly from the federal Health and Human Services (HHS), through the federal Centers for Disease Control (CDC) for bioterrorism and pandemic flu planning. The funding is being sub-granted by population base to each county in by the state Department of Health Services. Alta Madre is getting its share of the state's bio/pan flu planning through the local city health officer.

The city has been allocated three grant programs totaling \$2.1 million. Great latitude has been allowed this year by cities and counties to determine their own spending priorities, as long as they stay consistent with basic principles of public safety handed down by the Federal Department of Homeland Security. All equipment acquisitions and training programs fall easily into the general parameters given, so that is not an issue at this juncture. The three funding sources are:

Emergency Management Performance Grants (EMPG). EMPG grants are traditionally an all-hazard funding program that existed prior to the terrorism attacks on 9/11, and allows for spending on „staff“ to carry out preparedness programs. Fund grant authority has been given to the Emergency Management Director. Total to city: \$200,000.

Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP). HSGP is a grant program for homeland security efforts that is restrictive—in that it only allows for 10% of funding to pay for ‘staff’—but has been used in the past to buy equipment such as: fire engines, hazardous materials response suits, high-technology security infrared scopes, etc. Fund grant authority has been delegated to the Emergency Management Director. Total to city: \$1 million.

Bioterrorism/Pandemic Flu Grants (Bio/Pan Flu). A grant for emergency medical and public health preparedness and response that comes from the federal Health and Human Services Agency, Centers for Disease Control. Bio/Pan Flu grant authority has been given to the City Public Health Director. Total to the city: \$900,000.

The County Emergency Management Director has also been asked to assist city officials at the negotiation/mediation. Since there were problems in the past, and the County has to aggregate all the city requests into a coordinated package of all grant requests for the entire County, the Director has been invited by the City Manager to provide perspective from the county with the effort in order to avoid problems later on, and to help facilitate the dialogue.

The focus of this negotiation is to reach agreement on how to spend the money that has come into the city for emergency management, homeland security, and public health programs and craft a memorandum of understanding (MOU) among the agencies for future collaboration. In essence the decisions will revolve around:

- How much funding (and therefore priority) will be applied to the fields of: law enforcement, fire/rescue, public education, and emergency medical programs?
- What are the best interests of the city, taken as a whole right now?
- What short term gains now might jeopardize long-term strategy positions of the departments involved?

- What are the key provisions that should be included in the MOU?

At least, the MOU would address working relationships, joint goals for city-wide emergency preparedness, communications, decision making, accountability, resource allocation, and structure for meeting and coordinating. The MOU does not yet exist; the concept of designing it has been circulating among the parties and this will be the first time all potential members will be at the table to discuss what it will ultimately contain.

The Press Strategy

In addition to a funding agreement and MOU the City Manager has asked the group to draft a press strategy, including a press release, for the City to issue explaining the decisions and pointing out the new paradigm for integrated homeland security and emergency preparedness/response in Alta Madre. The press strategy will address on-going communications with the public about emergency planning activities in the City.

The Participants

The City Manager has asked that the following department leaders participate in the negotiation and drafting of the MOU, funding priorities, and the press strategy: the Fire Chief, Police Chief, Emergency Medical Public Health Officer, City Emergency Management Director, and the city staff member who acts as liaison to business and voluntary organizations. In addition the County Emergency Management Director has agreed to facilitate the negotiations, as well as provide guidance.

The group is meeting in advance of the City Council meeting scheduled in two weeks. They must come up with a recommendation for the City Manager to review and then post prior to the City Council meeting. The City Manager expects to receive the funding proposal and draft MOU by the end of the day.

Confidential Advice to the Fire Chief

You want more recognition of the key role the fire services play for everyday emergency response for all types of disasters. You would like to have more money for training and exercises for your firefighters. You want to make sure the police department respects, or at least does not try to move in, upon your oversight of the Incident Command System (ICS) that is the accepted coordination process for the entire state of Pacifica. The Fire Services in Pacifica created ICS back in the 1970s and it has gone nationwide—lately, with the focus on „national security“ the law enforcement field has been trying to change this long standing protocol in the state to be more focused upon security, rather than all hazard response.

Since both the fire department and the police department report directly to the city manager, you are concerned about the power balance of law and fire in the city. You want to make sure the police don't get too much money or that they think they can dominate policy decisions.

You see the effects of medical problems and rescue every day. You can live with the emergency medical director getting some funding.

You are naturally wary of the police chief; he has not been a close ally and indeed has been a threat at times for funding and focus on fire programs. You don't want to negotiate much to benefit the law chief as you think that will be seen as 'weak' and he has not been supportive of you in the past.

You are supportive of the MOU concept, as long as there are safeguards in place that protects your interests.

If you cannot achieve the funding proposal or MOU you need you can take your concerns to the City Council. You could publicly argue for authority to get the funds that support training and programs for your staff, as well as recognition of the primary role of the fire services in all-hazard response. However, it's not clear how a direct appeal would play out. The City Council and City Manager were very upset about the conflict last year, and have made it clear that they want better collaboration. If you take the conflict back to them you want to make sure that you can blame the Police Chief for the failure, while showing that you did everything you could to seek an agreement.

Confidential Advice to the Police Chief

You want more funding to buy new, complex security devices, such as bomb-sniffing movable computers, a mobile command center vehicle, and additional tactical weapons. The funding for equipment is important to you and the staff feels it validates their mission of security. You cannot understand why the police department has not been given the whole amount of, at least, the homeland security funding. The concept of ‘all hazard’ (fire, flood, earthquake, terrorism, etc.) is lost on you—everything should be spent on security and anti-terrorism programs.

You actually need the support of the fire services and the public health officer in upcoming budget talks on long-term personnel with the city council. You have had a string of high-profile law suits against the department, and you don’t want to lose your job or lose face with the labor coalitions. You are willing to ‘share the pie’ to get their support in the future—as long as this sharing of resources does not hamper your core mission of public safety, or make you look weak to rank and file officers under your leadership.

You are relatively new to the job (3 years) and are now feeling comfortable enough that you would like to build some more rapport with the other representatives—you now understand that you may have been a bit harsh in the past.

You have used MOUs in the past and they have worked OK; you are not against the MOU process and would support moving in that direction.

If you can’t agree on a funding proposal and MOU you are prepared to go straight to the city manager and council to ask for the funding desired, and to begin a negative campaign against the fire services and others for ‘getting in the way of security’ for the city. However, the City Manager has made it clear to you she wants to see more collaboration among city departments. If you are identified as being the “problem” it may result in a negative performance review. You would then only have one more year to correct the false perception that you prevented the collaboration before your contract is up for review.

Confidential Advice to the Emergency Medical Public Health Officer

You have enough money directed to public health, so the funding is a by-product of the situation—what you really want is an equal seat at the table with the “homeland security crowd” of law and fire, to participate actively in all facets of emergency/homeland preparations for the city, and to be involved with county activities as well. You cannot believe you have to work this hard to have other parties see the threat of mass health crises looming as the most important risk for the city. You know some of the others think you’re overly concerned with health issues at the expense of other preparedness activities, but you don’t want to give up your core belief that this is the key to safety for Alta Madre.

You have been excluded from discussions about public health priorities before and now that you have money under your control, you have a chance to raise the awareness of public health and medical issues in the city. You want to see these as primary, even above „security“ if possible—but equal involvement is your minimum goal.

You need the support of the police department as a priority for emergency quarantine enforcement—the police department has not really understood this need in case of a major bioterrorism event. Should a terrorist event occur with a bio-agent (anthrax, smallpox, salmonella, etc.), you will be the responsible official that will need to isolate large areas of the city’s population to protect others from the outbreak. You need training for the officers and focus given to the powers of the public health officer in order to enforce a quarantine perimeter during a highly-toxic chemical agent terrorist event. You are willing to pay for it as well.

The County Emergency Management Director has been an ally and you know how hard he works; you support giving him staff so the interests of the city can be supported and the emergency department can remain a focused supporter of integrating fire, law, and emergency medical into a comprehensive program for the city. Your pushy and „scientific“ approach has somewhat alienated the law and fire chiefs... you get along well with the emergency manager and hope to co-opt him in the future to further your goals, both personally and professionally.

You are indifferent to the MOU, but since the City Manager has asked for it you don’t have a problem with negotiating an MOU as long as it recognizes the important role of your agency. In fact, if it provides a vehicle for acceptance by the others of your role it would be very advantageous.

Confidential Advice to the City Emergency Management Director

You are tasked by the City Manager to get agreement on how to spend the money in the jurisdiction; the city is under strong pressure to address emergency preparedness in an integrated fashion. You just want an agreement—anything that allows overall preparedness to move forward comprehensively; you don't have a preconceived idea of exactly how the funding is spent, just as long as one agency does not clearly lose out to another through „bullying”—you also want and need some funding for additional staff help in your own department to process all of the grant applications, so you can get back to doing „preparedness” rather than just paperwork. You have been dealing with pressure from the law enforcement and fire services due to the new terrorism focus on “homeland security” since 9/11, without much recognition that all-hazard emergency management has been around long before.

Your job is on the line with the City Manager if an agreement is not reached on spending priorities. Last year's debacle was (unfairly in your eyes) blamed on you and that is why you're not unhappy the City Manager asked the County Emergency Management Director to serve as a facilitator.

You are willing to approve of almost all potential combinations of funding, as long as no one department ends up with vast amounts more than others (at least \$100,000 to each agency).

You are pushing for “joint use” equipment and programs—exercises that test ALL agencies capabilities together, and equipment that can be used across jurisdictional lines to avoid the ‘ownership’ problems. If that means your department adding staff to become the neutral ‘owner’ to broker the use of the new equipment, that is OK as well.

You feel that the county emergency management director has abandoned you on this task and has not supported you the way that you would have expected and hoped for. You get along fine with the others—you feel for the position of the volunteer coordinator and also the public health officer; you like them and respect their strong ethic of public service.

You have much pent-up frustration toward the county emergency management director and the state and federal programs for not working harder to recognize ‘emergency management’ as the core, all-hazard program for emergency/disaster preparedness and response. The antiterrorism

approach of all these grant programs since 9/11 have systematically avoided giving staff and focus to general emergency services coordination, instead the money has gone to security-based programs and front line responders—primarily law enforcement and fire services—even though the outcomes of any disaster event will need your centralized coordinating services for preparedness, response work, and recovery activities.

You want to show the leadership in not only reaching agreement on the grants, but at least start the process of developing an MOU—one where you are in the „brokering“ role.

If the group cannot reach agreement, you will have to try to cut individual deals with each principal in the other departments, and sell it to the City Manager as the only way to reach agreement—at the risk of having backlash from one or several of the others who might feel they didn't get as much as 'the other guy'. Hopefully, this time around more blame will be placed on the County's Emergency Management Director since he is facilitating. On the other hand the City Manager may decide “new leadership” is required.

Confidential Advice to the Business/Voluntary Agency Liaison

You want to see respect given to the hard-working volunteer groups in the jurisdiction, as well as to the business interests who want to participate but have not been given the right guidance by the city. Money is a good indication of recognition, and you want to see some funding go to these focus areas, whatever the total is.

You want to eventually get a job outside the city, and you feel that if you can 'deliver' funding to the business interests in town and the active volunteer organizations, you have a good chance of landing an offer.

You generally feel that these outside partners in the city have not been given the right attention or recognition for what they can do for the city in times of emergency. Business has the private stocks of food and other materials; voluntary groups can mobilize thousands of people to assist and also handle those 'spontaneous' volunteers that, although well meaning, get in the way during a disaster. You want to make sure they finally get some resources to do their job. Any money will do.

You have been fighting for recognition of your programs for a long time, and have become somewhat bitter toward those that don't allow you the respect you wish. The city emergency manager understands your position better than the others, which you personally appreciate—the 'hard' disciplines of law and fire give perfunctory support to using volunteers and the private sector but they are not truly considered key players to help you.

You'd love to see an MOU written also—one that includes you and your groups in the decision making, and ideally integrates volunteers and business interests into the fabric of emergency preparedness, response and recovery for the city.

If agreement isn't reached you may have to quietly advise the business interests and the volunteer groups that the city excluded them from consideration of potential planning and receipt of funding for emergency management programs. This will lead to pressure on the Council from the businesses and volunteer groups prominent in the city, which might force a decision in your favor. However, you'll have to be very careful. If it got out that you had set in motion the pressure on the city council by business and volunteer groups your job would be on the line.

Confidential Advice to the County Emergency Management Director

You want to see agreement as fast as possible, and are flexible as to how it occurs. You have a history of working closely with the Fire Chief in the past, and you have become friends throughout the years. As the emergency manager of the county, you support the overall position of the city emergency manager with regards to coordinating among many different disciplines to get work done— however, you cannot help but blame the city emergency manager for the difficulties of last year and you are cool to him and not particularly helpful. However, since you have agreed to facilitate you will have to put the past behind you and try not to let your feelings interfere with your facilitation. You know the City's Emergency Management Director holds some animosity toward you as a result of last year. You will have to decide how to handle this tension as part of the facilitation.

You think the idea of an MOU is excellent. You hope if you get credit for helping to make it happen, your career prospects will be greatly improved. You are frankly a little dissatisfied with working for the County and would like to identify an opportunity to move up in the field. This might be a golden opportunity to show how capable you are at negotiating among homeland security and emergency preparedness agencies. You feel a position at the state homeland security office would suit you well, and delivering a successful MOU and funding proposal for the city would allow you a victory you can claim with key statewide officials.