

Introduction

This Investment Justification Template workbook should be used to develop an Investment Justification to request FY 2006 HSGP funding (SHSP, UASI, LETPP, MMRS, and/or CCP) in order to help achieve the Initiatives outlined in the Program and Capability Enhancement Plan.

Overview

This workbook contains 15 sheets for States/Urban Areas to propose Investments for FY 2006 HSGP funding consideration. Worksheets are provided to propose up to 15 Investments per State/Urban Area. States/Urban Areas may propose less than 15 Investments as appropriate, but cannot propose more than 15 Investments.

Each Investment Justification worksheet is broken out into 4 high-level Categories: Background, Regionalization, Impact, and Funding and Implementation Plan. Each Category contains sub-questions that must be answered for each proposed Investment.

Responses to each question must be contained to the space provided to ensure word limitations are met. Each question must be addressed in order for the application to be considered complete. If an application is not complete, scoring may be impacted.

In addition, a "Summary Sheet" is included at the end of the 15 Investment worksheets. This Summary Sheet will be automatically populated by information entered on the individual worksheets. States/Urban Areas are encouraged to review the Summary Sheet after completing all Investment worksheets to ensure thorough and accurate completion of the Investment worksheets.

Instructions

For detailed instructions on how to navigate the Template, and on how to respond to each Investment Justification, please refer to the Investment Justification Users Manual.

If you have further questions, please contact the Centralized Scheduling and Information Desk (CSID) at askcsid@dhs.gov, 1-800-368-6498. CSID hours of operation are from 8:00 a.m. - 7:00 p.m. (EST), Monday-Friday.

INVESTMENT #

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

1

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

\$1,954,800

Investment Name: MOHS/MBHSR Infrastructure

I. BACKGROUND

I.A: Provide a summary description of this Investment and its purpose. (Not to exceed 200 words)

The purpose of this investment is to maintain and enhance the Metro Boston Homeland Security Region's (MBHSR) administrative and operational HS infrastructure. The Mayor's Office of Homeland Security (MOHS), established by Boston's Mayor Thomas M. Menino in April 2004, works with the UASI communities to leverage resources that focus on prevention, preparedness, protection, response, and recovery in the event of a terrorist attack or natural disaster in the Region. MOHS serves as the conduit for the Region's HS investments and the fiduciary for the UASI Region's grant programming. During the past two years, MOHS set up the formal MBHSR governance structure; established MOAs and mutual aid agreements across the Region; developed strategic plans, budgets, progress reports, policies, and procedures; and administered equipment procurements and training and exercise reimbursements for the Region. During the FY2006 grant period, funds will be applied to support staffing continuity to maintain administrative oversight to enhance regional agency cooperation; costs associated with policy guidance and grant administration; and travel costs for staff participation in federal, state, and local meetings, conferences, and seminars.

I.B: Explain how the investment will support the implementation of an Initiative(s) from the Program and Capability Enhancement Plan, and the achievement of goals and objectives from your State/Urban Area homeland security strategy(ies). (Not to exceed 300 words)

This investment directly aligns with all nine of the Commonwealth's initiatives. As the Commonwealth relies heavily on the continued support and participation of the five Regional Homeland Security Councils in meeting statewide goals and objectives, this investment provides the personnel and resources to coordinate MBHSR HS programming. Specifically, the investment assists MOHS in maintaining the programmatic and operational infrastructure necessary to function both locally and regionally, and by continuing to partner with the SAA and state partner agencies in achieving shared HS priorities. It is by and through MOHS that the MBHSR can effectively participate in statewide priorities and initiatives. The partnership between MOHS and the SAA continues to strengthen in order to satisfy not only programming needs, but also the necessary administrative tasks, including meeting federal and state requirements, expanding MBHSR partnerships with other regions and state partners, and overall grant management responsibilities. As MOHS oversees all the MBHSR investments for which FY2006 funds are sought, this investment aligns to each of the goals and objectives outlined in the Urban Area's Homeland Security Strategy. This investment directly aligns to Goal 2, ensuring the MBHSR's ability to effectively protect the Region from terrorist attacks and natural disasters. Objective 2.1 serves to maintain and continue to enhance the MBHSR administrative and operational infrastructure both short and long-term. This investment further supports the achievement of Goal 2, Objective 2.1 through the following steps which the MBHSR continues to implement: establish and expand MOAs and mutual aid agreements among jurisdictions, disciplines, and agencies; expand upon, enhance and formalize private partnerships in the Region; strengthen regional policies and procedures that provide guidance to the Region's partners in alignment with federal, state, and local guidance; and coordinate direction of the Region's HS investments.

I.C: List up to four National Priority(ies) this Investment primarily supports.

Expanded Regional Collaboration

I.D: List up to six Target Capability(ies) from the Target Capabilities List this Investment primarily supports.

Planning
Communications
Risk Management

II. REGIONALIZATION

II.A: Describe the geographic and demographic area(s) this Investment covers. (Not to exceed 275 words)

As MOHS oversees all the MBHSR investments, this investment impacts the entire Region across all disciplines. Boston's UASI Region, approximately 95 square miles, includes the Cities of Boston, Cambridge, Chelsea, Everett, Quincy, Revere, and Somerville, and the Towns of Brookline and Winthrop. The Region was selected in June 2003 based on the following criteria: 1) level of risk faced by a community, based primarily on potential target infrastructure; 2) level and availability of resources a community can bring to bear to assist Boston; 3) a community's role in assisting in an evacuation of Boston in the event of a critical incident; and 4) whether a community is contiguous with Boston. This investment primarily supports Law Enforcement, Fire Services, Emergency Medical Services, Emergency Management, Public Health, and Health Care, and secondarily supports Public Works and General Administration. The resident population of the Region is 1,051,809 according to 2000 US Census Data; however, the daytime population estimates for Boston and Cambridge peg the total regional population as high as 2,560,000 persons. The Region contains a number of critical infrastructures, high-profile targets, and potential threat elements. Several high-profile, annual events draw more than a million spectators and participants into Boston. Major transportation networks exist within the Region. Logan International Airport, a \$6 billion per year critical infrastructure, is located in East Boston. Boston is home to several major transportation hubs, including North Station and South Station. The Port of Boston is the largest container port in New England and is the 22nd largest in the US. In addition, weekly Liquefied Gas (LNG) deliveries transit the Port of Boston and wind up in the Chelsea Creek.

INVESTMENT #

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

1

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

\$1,954,800

Investment Name: MOHS/MBHSR Infrastructure

II.B: Explain how the State/Urban Area is organizing to implement this investment over the identified geographic area(s). (Not to exceed 300 words)

This investment continues to provide the infrastructure established in Spring 2004. The MBHSR process distributes support throughout the Region, as many partners already have full-time jobs. The MOHS staff is grant-funded and works full-time to coordinate, manage, assist, and move forward the MBHSR investments and serves as the fiduciary for the Region's grant programming. MOHS staff works in concert with a central body, the Jurisdictional Point of Contact (JPOC) Committee (the Urban Area Working Group). The JPOC Committee consists of one senior POC from each of the nine jurisdictions, each appointed by their jurisdiction's Chief Executive Officer. Monthly JPOC Committee meetings are organized and run by MOHS, JPOCs, discipline representatives, state agency representatives, and MOHS contractors, as needed. Frequent agenda items include administrative updates, MBHSR investment updates, and discipline updates. Time is also allotted for open discussion. MBHSR Discipline and Project Subcommittees serve to bring together representatives from specific disciplines to discuss, coordinate, develop plans, and guide implementation of initiatives across the Region that impact them. Currently, the MBHSR has six Discipline Subcommittees, including Law Enforcement, Fire Services, EMS, Emergency Management, Public Health, and Health Care, as well as two project subcommittees - Communications Interoperability and Community Outreach and Awareness. Subcommittee meetings are organized and run by the MOHS Discipline Coordinators and Discipline Leads. Agenda items include administrative and investment updates, trainings, exercises, and equipment procurements. To maximize effectiveness of the Subcommittees and to meet programmatic goals and objectives, the Discipline Coordinators are strategically placed in "host" agencies related to their assigned discipline. Additional Project Subcommittees have been and will continue to be established to enhance regional collaboration for other MBHSR investments.

II.C: Discuss the collaboration process you have, or will establish, with other regions and jurisdictions (inter- and intra-State) within or beyond the geographic/demographic area of this investment. Discuss when and how you will engage stakeholders from those regions in specific support of this investment. (Not to exceed 500 words)

MBHSR collaborates formally through monthly JPOC Committee and Discipline and Project Subcommittee meetings. Outside the monthly meetings, collaboration occurs through the MBHSR website, emails, phone calls, informal meetings, working group meetings, and meetings within each jurisdiction. In order to ensure that the administrative responsibilities each investment requires are met, the MOHS Finance Manager continues to work with financial and auditing divisions/agencies throughout the Region. MOHS staff and MBHSR representatives regularly attend the State's Regional Homeland Security Council meetings, held quarterly. This is valuable in order to ensure cross regional collaboration. To date, the MBHSR has continued to communicate with other State Homeland Security Regional Councils on similar projects that serve to meet the Commonwealth's priority HS investments and State Strategy goals and objectives. Regional training opportunities have been made available by other region's, whereby MBHSR first responders have attended. We continue to seek out these additional resources, as well as make similar resources available to others. The MOHS and MBHSR also collaborates with state and federal agencies as needed in development and implementation of the Region's investments. Partnerships have been formed with state agencies and show continued success with the Executive Office of Public Safety; Massachusetts Emergency Management Agency; Massport; Massachusetts State Police; Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (which MOHS staff served on the Regional Transportation Strategy Working Group); and Massport Fire and Rescue. Federal partnerships include the US Coast Guard and the Area Maritime Security Committee, Department of Transportation's Volpe Center, and the Federal Protective Service. Each of these agencies have served as valuable partners in the MBHSR's ability to achieve its HS goals and objectives. As MBHSR investments continue to move beyond planning and become more operational, MOHS and MBHSR partners will seek to develop and strengthen partnerships with surrounding non-UASI communities. Many mutual aid agreements and regional constructs overlap the UASI Region, which require more thorough coordination in several areas such as evacuation and mass care, regional specialized training, interoperable communications, and community outreach. Although much has been accomplished to date, looking forward, the MBHSR will work toward expanding its regional approach in the way of planning and coordination.

III. IMPACT

III.A: Discuss anticipated impacts of this investment and how the requested funding will help attain/achieve expected impacts. Consider the population and areas affected, and other entities (jurisdictions, disciplines) that could leverage the outcomes and impacts of the solution presented by this investment. (Not to exceed 500 words)

The funding of the MOHS/MBHSR infrastructure will provide the continued full-time support of the MOHS staff to execute appropriate planning, programmatic, and budgetary direction and oversight for the Region that meets federal and state guidelines. MOHS will continue to focus on regional collaboration through planning and management of the MBHSR investments, operational support associated with completing the investments, coordination with the MBHSR governance and key stakeholders (JPOC Committee and Discipline and Project Subcommittees), and encouraging MBHSR partners to work toward more overarching and expansive MOAs and mutual aid agreements relevant to preparedness, prevention, response, and recovery. MOHS will also continue to serve as the sole fiduciary for the Region's HS grant programming and management; review, order, and track regional equipment procurement; centralize training and exercises; and process financial reimbursements and other investment-related costs such as contract support for the Region in the complete execution of all investments. FY2006 funding will be applied to directly support MOHS staff salaries, supplies, travel (as needed), training costs, and other MOHS costs that are in direct correlation with the MOHS/MBHSR mission, and in accordance with federal and state allowable grant expenditures. Funds associated with this investment are not limited to MOHS staff, whereby supporting infrastructure costs will be made available to regional agencies in need of financial support to continue their ongoing participation in all MBHSR activities. This includes but is not limited to planning and organizing costs, travel, and supplies. Contractual support may also be provided which corresponds with any staff needs on a short-term basis (ensuring that long-term sustainability will be borne by UASI agencies). All costs used to support this investment have been previously approved by both the SAA and ODP Preparedness Officer. This investment is critically important for the Region to continue and complete all investments outlined within this FY2006 application. It provides the administrative, programmatic, and high level policy support that is fundamental to a Region which is not based on a county structure. In order to ensure the continuity of programming and governance structure, support for this investment is absolutely necessary, as there is no other existing infrastructure to serve this function.

INVESTMENT #

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

1

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

\$1,954,800

Investment Name: MOHS/MBHSR Infrastructure

III.B: Discuss how the implementation of this investment will decrease or mitigate risk. (Not to exceed 500 words)

As MOHS oversees all the MBHSR investments for which FY2006 funds are sought, this investment is inherent in the Region's capacity to decrease or mitigate the risks, and to prevent and prepare for, protect from, respond to, and recover from terrorist attacks and natural disasters. MOHS updated its Urban Area Homeland Security Strategy in September 2005 to ensure the MBHSR investments together support all the National Priorities and many of the Target Capabilities. The other MBHSR investments include the Metro Boston Homeland Security Integration Center, National Incident Management System (NIMS) Training and Compliance, Regional Exercises, Communications Interoperability, Critical Infrastructure/Site Protection, Boston Regional Intelligence Center, Community Awareness and Public Participation, Harbor Security, Regional Trainings, and Regional Evacuation, Mass Care, and Pandemic Flu. The remaining investment justifications identify specific HS risks that will be decreased or mitigated. MOHS is working with the Region's emergency responders to ensure the goals and objectives in the UASI Strategy are successfully implemented.

III.C: Describe what the potential Homeland Security risks of not funding this investment are. (Not to exceed 500 words)

MOHS, on behalf of the MBHSR, continues to provide, support, and implement a strategic vision that serves to prevent and mitigate major incidents that may impact the Region's critical infrastructure and vulnerabilities. As such, the most significant potential negative impact of not funding the MOHS/MBHSR Infrastructure Investment is the loss of a regional governance structure to manage and execute the Region's HS investments, which is critical in achieving this goal. MOHS staff have been fully engaged with the HS grant programming and federal and state policies since as early as 2003. Its dedication and commitment to work with the Region's emergency responder partners and key stakeholders ensures that the collective HS goals and objectives are made a reality. Without the MOHS organizational infrastructure, regional partners would be required to devote more time to execute planning and project development, budget and financial responsibilities, and manage regional collaboration and investment oversight. This would be difficult, as many of the regional partners are full-time emergency responders from fire, police, EMS, emergency management, public health, and other critical disciplines. As the MOHS staff is assigned full-time to the MBHSR, they fill many of the gaps that would be experienced, should already tasked emergency responders be responsible for the comprehensive management and oversight of such a major regional program. All of these scenarios, individually and collectively, will negatively impact the continued success of the MBHSR HS strategies. Without a true regional approach, the MBHSR is less able to effectively prevent and prepare for, protect from, respond to, and recover from terrorist attacks and natural disasters. The existing governance structure consists of key emergency responder executives (chiefs, directors, etc.). MOHS works together with these partners, including Jurisdictional Point of Contacts and Discipline and Project Subcommittees to strengthen and maintain the MBHSR's regional approach. Investment coordination is at the base of the MOHS function, to ensure regionalism and coordination. Should MOHS be unable to continue its mission, the result would be the removal of the central coordinating entity that is tasked to manage and oversee the MBHSR investments. The investments would in turn have to be overseen by the Region's emergency responders, who all have full-time jobs outside their MBHSR role. The investments may suffer, and therefore major goals, objectives, and benchmarks to implement the National Priorities and Target Capabilities will not be reached. In addition, without a non-jurisdiction, non-discipline central body administering HS funding, funds may be spent unwisely (for example focusing jurisdiction or discipline specific needs as opposed to regional priorities).

IV. FUNDING & IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

IV.A: Investment Funding Plan

	FY 2006 Homeland Security Grant Program Request					FY 2006 HSGP Request Total	Other Funding Sources Applied	Grand Total
	SHSP	UASI	LETPP	MMRS	CCP			
Personnel		225,000				\$225,000		\$225,000
Planning		965,800				\$965,800		\$965,800
Organization		400,000				\$400,000		\$400,000
Equipment*		250,000				\$250,000		\$250,000
Training								
Exercises								
M&A		114,000				\$114,000		\$114,000
Total		\$1,954,800				\$1,954,800		\$1,954,800

* If you plan to purchase Interoperable Communications Equipment, your Investment Justification must include discussion on planning, governance, training, policies, procedures, and/or exercises related to the equipment.

INVESTMENT #

State/Territory Name:

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

1

FY 2006 Urban Area Name:

Investment Name:

IV.B: Identify potential challenges to the effective implementation of this investment (e.g., stakeholder buy-in, sustainability, aggressive timelines). (Not to exceed 300 words)

The greatest potential challenge to effectively implement this investment is the continued availability of personnel and programming resources to execute the tasks associated with planning, budgeting, regional collaboration, and investment oversight. These tasks cannot be successfully executed without a regional coordinating body that works with the Region's emergency responders. The Mayor's Office of Homeland Security, established by Mayor Thomas M. Menino in April, 2004, has been coordinating all HS programming for the MBHSR for almost two years. As the organization and the regional infrastructure is already in place, the funding associated with this investment will continue to support both the organization and its capacity to successfully execute all regional HS priorities. The need for continued and enhanced support has been voiced throughout the Region for the day to day management and trouble shooting of the UASI programming. Recognizing the existing limitations that are faced with a small full time staff managing the entire Region's investments, MOHS applies funding within this investment to maintain staffing levels, and costs associated with executing MBHSR investments. Long-term sustainability is a challenge for our Region, and MOHS continues to assess how this can be accomplished with limited external resources. Local communities lack the budgets to absorb the costs of a regional organization, and MOHS is committed to identifying existing and future resources that can augment its own existence, working on behalf of the Region. Without the support to the MBHSR's emergency responders, the regional coordinating body would lack the institutional knowledge that MOHS provides to each jurisdiction and their disciplines. As the Region's emergency responders have full-time jobs outside their participation in the MBHSR governance, MOHS, must be appropriately staffed to meet all federal and state guidelines and administer proper oversight over MBHSR investments.

IV.C: Explain how the identified challenges will be addressed and mitigated. (Not to exceed 300 words)

Many of the challenges that the MBHSR has experienced to date have been remedied with the existence of MOHS and the MBHSR governance structure, and support provided by other City of Boston agencies. Given the small management team of MOHS, many costs associated with the overall administrative elements of the investments are being absorbed directly by the City of Boston. MOHS relies heavily on many other City agencies that do not receive or are supported with HS grant funding to execute purchases and fair bidding (Purchasing Division), provide a "second check" of budgeting and contract execution (Auditing Division), assist with legal issues and remedies (Law Department), provide reimbursement to MBHR partner agencies and payment to vendors (Auditing and Treasury), and maintain the MBHSR websites (Management and Information Systems). Further, some emergency responder agencies/departments have assigned staff to support the MOHS staff with the specific investments with their own budgets. Although the MOHS and MBHSR infrastructure is in place to date, the major challenge MOHS faces currently is the inability to continue and maintain this infrastructure. FY2006 funding would mitigate this challenge, by providing the Region the opportunity to both strengthen its oversight and management structure, while at the same time assessing alternative solutions throughout the Region to support its programming. Some MBHSR jurisdictions and agencies have assigned personnel to serve full-time as HS specialists and project managers, funded directly from operating budgets. However, these individuals still remain responsible for previous assignments within their department.

IV.D: Describe the management team, including roles and responsibilities, that will be accountable for the oversight and implementation of this investment, and the overall management approach they will apply for the implementation of this investment. (Not to exceed 300 words)

MOHS's charge is to work with neighboring communities and regional stakeholders to leverage resources to enhance capacities in the prevention of, preparedness for, response to, and recovery from CBRNE attacks across the Region. The MOHS staff is comprised of a Director, two Assistant Directors, a Finance Manager, and five Discipline Coordinators. The Director directs and oversees all aspects of MOHS and manages communication with the Mayor of Boston, the jurisdictions' Chief Executive Officers, and the JPOCs. The Assistant Directors handle investment development, management, and coordination for the MBHSR and oversee the activities of the Discipline Coordinators. The Finance Manager is responsible for the fiscal tasks related to all regional HS grants. The Discipline Coordinators coordinate planning and communication amongst their respective Discipline Subcommittees. As needed, MOHS uses consultants for short-term tasks, including analysis and enhancement of the MBHSR administrative and operational HS infrastructure and to assist MOHS in meeting federal and state guidelines, as required. The Assistant Directors oversee the activities of the consultants. The execution of equipment procurement and training and exercise reimbursement across the jurisdictions requires significant collaboration between MOHS and the MBHSR partners. The Discipline and Project Subcommittees use the JPOCs to sign-off on HS equipment procurements and HS related training and exercise reimbursements. The MOHS Finance Manager coordinates across City of Boston agencies, as fiduciary, including City Auditing, Office of Budget and Management, Purchasing Division, and Management and Information Systems, for administrative support for procurements and reimbursements. In addition, MOHS has partnerships with emergency responder agencies in the Region, both at the accounting and finance and operational levels, to ensure project management, reimbursement, and equipment tracking tasks are handled.

INVESTMENT #

1

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

Investment Name: MOHS/MBHSR Infrastructure

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

\$1,954,800

IV.E: Discuss funding resources beyond FY 2006 HSGP that have been identified and will be leveraged to support the implementation and sustainment of this investment. (Not to exceed 300 words)

Additional funding sources are sought to maintain the MOHS and MBHSR administrative and operational HS infrastructure. Local operating costs within the City of Boston may have to be sought to encourage the continuation of this investment, however due to increasing City costs and decreasing revenue, this continues to be a challenge. In-kind staffing from the Region has been in place, although limited, and may also have to be considered in order to sustain this structure. Already, MOHS solicited support from regional partners in order to continue the work that has been started. Agencies, such as the Brookline Police Department, the Boston EMS department, and others have identified existing staff that serve as primary HS personnel who work with MOHS regularly. MOHS expects the in-kind staffing will continue into the future.

IV.F: Provide a high-level timeline, including milestones and dates, for the implementation of this investment. Possible areas for inclusion are: stakeholder engagement, planning, major acquisitions/purchases, training, exercises, and process/policy updates. Space is provided for up to 10 milestones, but not all 10 spaces may be necessary for the response. ("Milestone" not to exceed 125 characters / approximately 25 words and "Related Activities" not to exceed 500 characters / approximately 100 words)

Milestone #1

Administer equipment procurements and training and exercise reimbursements for the Region.

Start Date: 6/1/06

End Date: 6/30/08

Related Activities

Input procurement and reimbursement information into City's financial system. Work with City of Boston Purchasing to procure equipment. Work with Regional partners to track receipt of equipment. Execute payment to vendor for equipment. Execute payment to jurisdictions' Financial Points of Contacts for training and exercise reimbursements.

Milestone #2

Verify and update budget lines for MBHSR investments.

Start Date: 6/1/06

End Date: 6/30/08

Related Activities

Verify and update budget lines monthly for payroll, benefits, travel, and office expenses. Conduct weekly MOHS status meetings on budget for MBHSR investments. Coordinate with City of Boston Auditing to update budget for MBHSR investments as needed. Input purchase orders for MOHS contracts into City's financial system as needed.

Milestone #3

Submit MBHSR quarterly progress reports to Executive Office of Public Safety.

Start Date: 6/1/06

End Date: 6/30/08

Related Activities

On a quarterly basis, conduct meetings with Discipline and Project Subcommittees to receive updates on accomplishments. Compile paperwork for all financial transactions including procurements and reimbursement. Draft, vet, and finalize reports.

Milestone #4

Submit the MBHSR FY2006 Urban Area Homeland Security Strategy to Executive Office of Public Safety.

Start Date: 7/1/06

End Date: 9/30/06

Related Activities

Conduct meetings to engage MBHSR stakeholders (JPOCs and Discipline and Project Subcommittees) and state agencies in developing FY2006 Strategy. Update FY2005 Urban Area Homeland Security Strategy. Identify any new areas of focus for FY2006 Strategy. Draft, vet, and finalize FY2006 Strategy.

Milestone #5

Submit the UASI FY2007 Grant Application to Executive Office of Public Safety.

Start Date: 12/1/06

End Date: 3/1/07

Related Activities

Review and implement federal guidance. Participate in state meetings as needed. Update FY2006 Urban Area Homeland Security Strategy. Determine investments requiring FY2007 funding. Draft, vet, and finalize FY2007 Grant Application.

INVESTMENT #

1

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

\$1,954,800

Investment Name: MOHS/MBHSR Infrastructure

Milestone #6

Submit the MBHSR FY2007 Urban Area Homeland Security Strategy to Executive Office of Public Safety.

Start Date: 7/1/07

End Date: 9/30/07

Related Activities

Conduct meetings to engage MBHSR stakeholders (JPOCs and Discipline and Project Subcommittees) and state agencies in developing FY2007 Strategy. Update FY2006 Urban Area Homeland Security Strategy. Identify any new areas of focus for FY2007 Strategy. Draft, vet, and finalize FY2007 Strategy.

Milestone #7

Submit the UASI FY2008 Grant Application to Executive Office of Public Safety.

Start Date: 12/1/07

End Date: 3/1/08

Related Activities

Review and implement federal guidance. Participate in state meetings as needed. Update FY2007 Urban Area Homeland Security Strategy. Determine investments requiring FFY2008 funding. Draft, vet, and finalize FY2008 Grant Application.

Milestone #8

Start Date:

End Date:

Related Activities

Milestone #9

Start Date:

End Date:

Related Activities

Milestone #10

Start Date:

End Date:

Related Activities

IV.G: Describe the planned duration for this overall investment. Discuss your long-term sustainability plans for the investment after your FY 2006 HSGP funds have been expended, if applicable. (Not to exceed 300 words)

This Investment will continue in support of the MBHSR and the UASI partners. Because of its mission, MOHS will continue to manage all HS funding resources, both state and federal, as long as funding continues to be provided to the Boston UASI Region. Further, as the Commonwealth of Massachusetts regionalized the state in early 2004, MOHS will serve as the central conduit for policy, administration and operations for the MBHSR. Beyond the FY2006 funding period, MOHS will work diligently to ensure the infrastructure is maintained in order to fully complete all existing and future investments.

INVESTMENT #

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

2

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

\$6,630,000

Investment Name: Metro-Boston Homeland Security Integration Center

I. BACKGROUND

I.A: Provide a summary description of this investment and its purpose. (Not to exceed 200 words)

The purpose of this investment is to develop and implement a regional HS integration center. The Metro Boston Homeland Security Integration Center (MBHSIC) will co-locate emergency operations, intelligence and information sharing, training, and continuity of government capabilities for the MBHS Region (MBHSR). Capability for receipt and management of classified intelligence via secure video teleconferencing will be developed. Regional linkages will be exploited to ensure fast, efficient dissemination of key information across the MBHSR. The MBHSIC will serve as Boston's primary EOC and the back-up EOC for the Region. The MBHSIC will become the hub of HS operations for Metro Boston, similar to DHS's Homeland Security Operations Center. With previous years' funding, the MBHSR conducted operational and technical assessments of existing EOCs in the Region, developed Improvement Plans, and will soon begin implementation of the Plans. The work completed to date will largely inform the development of requirements and a concept of operations for the MBHSIC. FY2006 funding will be utilized to continue enhancements of existing EOCs while simultaneously planning, designing, and creating the MBHSIC.

I.B: Explain how the investment will support the implementation of an initiative(s) from the Program and Capability Enhancement Plan, and the achievement of goals and objectives from your State/Urban Area homeland security strategy(ies). (Not to exceed 300 words)

This investment supports the Commonwealth's Initiatives of Information Sharing, Interoperable Communications, Regional Collaboration, Statewide Pandemic Preparedness, and CBRNE Preparedness, as outlined in the Enhancement and Capabilities Plan. This investment directly aligns to Goal 3, ensure the MBHSR can effectively respond to terrorist attacks and catastrophic events in both the short- and long-term, Objective 3.3, establish and enhance EOC, in the Updated Urban Area Homeland Security Strategy. This investment supports the achievement of Goal 3, Objective 3.3 through the following steps the MBHSR is working to implement: develop and implement a regional HS integration center, co-locating emergency operations, intelligence and information sharing, training, continuity of government capabilities for the MBHSR while also serving as a back-up EOC for all the MBHSR communities; continue to develop and expand decision support and situational awareness capabilities in EOCs throughout the MBHSR; and enhance formal, unified response plans and expand written contingency plans and procedures in responding to a CBRNE WMD event and natural disasters.

I.C: List up to four National Priority(ies) this investment primarily supports.

Strengthen Information Sharing and Collaboration Capabilities

Strengthen Emergency Operations Planning and Citizen Protection

Strengthen Interoperable Communications Capabilities

Strengthen CBRNE Detection, Response, & Decontamination Capabilities

I.D: List up to six Target Capability(ies) from the Target Capabilities List this investment primarily supports.

Communications

Info Gathering & Recognition of Indicators & Warnings

Emergency Operations Center Management

Intelligence/Information Sharing and Dissemination

Economic and Community Recovery

Public Safety and Security Response

II. REGIONALIZATION

II.A: Describe the geographic and demographic area(s) this investment covers. (Not to exceed 275 words)

This investment impacts the entire Region across seven disciplines. Boston's UASI Region, approximately 95 square miles, includes the Cities of Boston, Cambridge, Chelsea, Everett, Quincy, Revere, and Somerville, and the Towns of Brookline and Winthrop. The Region was selected in June 2003 based on the following criteria: 1) level of risk faced by a community, based primarily on potential target infrastructure; 2) level and availability of resources a community can bring to bear to assist Boston; 3) a community's role in assisting in an evacuation of Boston in the event of a critical incident; and 4) whether a community is contiguous with Boston. This investment primarily supports Law Enforcement, Fire Services, Emergency Medical Services, Emergency Management, and Public Health, and peripherally supports Public Works and General Administration. The resident population of the Region is 1,051,809 according to 2000 US Census Data; however, the daytime population estimates for Boston and Cambridge peg the total regional population as high as 2,560,000 persons. The Region contains a number of critical infrastructures, high-profile targets, and potential threat elements. Several high-profile, annual events draw more than a million spectators and participants into Boston. Major transportation networks exist within the Region. Logan International Airport, a \$6 billion per year critical infrastructure, is located in East Boston. Boston is home to several major transportation hubs, including North Station and South Station. The Port of Boston is the largest container port in New England and is the 22nd largest in the US. In addition, weekly Liquefied Gas (LNG) deliveries transit the Port of Boston and wind up in the Chelsea Creek.

INVESTMENT #

State/Territory Name: **Massachusetts**

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

2

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: **Boston**

\$6,630,000

Investment Name: **Metro-Boston Homeland Security Integration Center**

II.B: Explain how the State/Urban Area is organizing to implement this investment over the identified geographic area(s).
(Not to exceed 300 words)

The Mayor's Office of Homeland Security (MOHS) works with the UASI communities and regional stakeholders to leverage resources that enhance capacities in the areas of prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery from CBRNE incidents and major disasters across the Region. MOHS collaborates with the Jurisdictional Point of Contact (JPOC) Committee and the MBHSR Discipline Subcommittees. The JPOC Committee is comprised of one senior point of contact from each of the nine UASI jurisdictions who were appointed by the jurisdiction's Chief Executive Officer. This Committee ensures open and clear communication amongst disciplines in their jurisdiction and represents their jurisdiction's disciplines at the monthly JPOC meetings. The six MBHSR Discipline Subcommittees bring together representatives from Law Enforcement, Fire Services, EMS, Emergency Management, Public Health, and Health Care, to discuss, coordinate, develop plans, and guide implementation of their discipline specific initiatives across the Region. Through the JPOC and Discipline Subcommittee structure, the Region is able to leverage responders across all Regions and disciplines to participate in this investment. For this investment, MOHS is leading implementation, in collaboration with the JPOCs and the Subcommittees as well as additional federal, state, local, and non-governmental organizations' (NGO) stakeholders. MOHS is also partnering with the US Coast Guard (USCG) to ensure key port security situational awareness needs are addressed in the MBHSIC.

II.C: Discuss the collaboration process you have, or will establish, with other regions and jurisdictions (inter- and intra-State) within or beyond the geographic/demographic area of this investment. Discuss when and how you will engage stakeholders from those regions in specific support of this investment. (Not to exceed 500 words)

The MBHSR collaboration processes focus on the distribution of support throughout the Region, as many partners already have full-time jobs. The MBHSR collaborates formally through monthly JPOC Committee and Discipline and Project Subcommittee meetings. Outside the monthly meetings, collaboration occurs through the MBHSR website, emails, phone calls, informal meetings, and meetings within each jurisdiction. MOHS will lead planning, design, and buildout of the MBHSIC. Similar to how the Commonwealth of Massachusetts developed its Fusion Center in collaboration with local, state, regional, and federal public safety agencies, MOHS will develop a diverse Advisory Board comprised of local, state, federal, and NGO stakeholders. The Advisory Board will identify members to serve on planning and integration teams and will oversee the activities of these teams. The Region will likely identify four planning and integration teams based on the component of the Integration Center: 1) Emergency Operations and Communications including MOHS, Homeland Security Operations Center, and representatives from all emergency support functions (regional agencies across disciplines; state agencies, for example the Massachusetts Department of Public Health, Emergency Management, and State Police; federal agencies, for example the USCG, the FBI, and FEMA; and NGO stakeholders, for example the American Red Cross, the Salvation Army, hospitals, and community health centers); 2) Intelligence including MOHS, the Boston Regional Intelligence Center, FBI Joint Terrorism Task Force, and the Massachusetts Fusion Center; 3) Continuity of Operations and Government including regional agencies across disciplines; and 4) Training including training departments from regional agencies across disciplines and the DelValle Institute for Emergency Preparedness. The representatives from the regional agencies will be selected from the Discipline Subcommittees and the Communications Interoperability Subcommittee already in place. The planning and integration teams will meet frequently to initially develop requirements and a concept of operations for their component of the MBHSIC. Following, the planning and integration teams will continue to meet to design and begin buildout of the MBHSIC. As the Region begins implementation, new equipment will need to be procured for the MBHSIC. The MOHS Finance Manager coordinates the execution of equipment procurement across Boston agencies, as fiduciary, including City Auditing, Office of Budget and Management, Purchasing Division, and Management and Information Systems. In addition, MOHS has partnerships with emergency responder agencies in the Region, both at the accounting and finance and operational levels, to ensure project management and equipment tracking tasks are handled.

III. IMPACT

III.A: Discuss anticipated impacts of this investment and how the requested funding will help attain/achieve expected impacts. Consider the population and areas affected, and other entities (jurisdictions, disciplines) that could leverage the outcomes and impacts of the solution presented by this investment. (Not to exceed 500 words)

With implementation of this investment, the Region will be more effective in preventing and preparing for, responding to, and recovering from terrorist attacks and catastrophic events. The Region will enhance the capabilities of the jurisdictions' EOCs through completing the implementation of the Improvement Plans. All EOCs in the Region will have equal capabilities. The Region will have an Integration Center that focuses on regional cooperation across all disciplines on achieving HS objectives. The Integration Center will provide a better EOC capability for the Region, including better technology and better flow of data and other communications. The Region will have enhanced capabilities in intelligence and information sharing enabling the Region to avoid an incident or intervene to stop and incident from occurring. Intelligence aggregation, analysis, and dissemination (including regional camera system control and access) will be streamlined through implementation of the MBHSIC. The Integration Center will also serve as a HS training facility for the Region, which the Region is currently lacking. The Region will have a well outfitted training space with HS-specific capabilities including a computer lab with more than 20 personal computers, practical space to do dress-out portion of WMD trainings, and models of the Boston UASI cities and towns to do tabletop exercises and simulations. The MBHSIC will provide extensive situational awareness capabilities, or a common way of conducting EOC operations (watch and response management), and region-wide EOC integration of these capabilities resulting in more effective response. Finally, with the implementation of the MBHSIC the Region will establish continuity of government and operations plans capabilities in that this facility will serve as the back-up EOC for the Region's cities and towns. Currently, continuity of government and operations plans is a major issue for the Region. There is little to no off-site capabilities such as office space, data systems with access independent of primary systems, and the ability to keep government running when normal operational systems and locations are out of the picture. The continuity of government and operations plans capabilities results in quicker recovery from an incident.

INVESTMENT #

2

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

Investment Name: Metro-Boston Homeland Security Integration Center

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

\$6,630,000

III.B: Discuss how the implementation of this Investment will decrease or mitigate risk. (Not to exceed 500 words)

The EOC assessments completed found the cities and towns within the MBHSR are individually capable of managing localized or jurisdiction-wide events, but the EOCs in their present state can only minimally support operations, and oftentimes with very little depth. The cities and towns have unequal capabilities (for example in personnel, facilities, telecommunications, information technology, and procedures) that inhibit their ability to operate locally and regionally. Operational gaps in the areas of identification of alternate EOC, documentation, EOC staffing, exercises, reporting, and training were found in many of the jurisdictions. Completing the implementation of Improvement Plans for the EOCs and implementing the MBHSIC would decrease the operational gaps and bring each jurisdiction to a common level. Specifically, Boston's EOC was found inadequate to support emergency operations for a city its size. Implementation of the MBHSIC mitigates the risk of inadequate support as the MBHSIC will serve as Boston's EOC once operational and the current EOC will be enhanced to serve as the back-up. Intelligence aggregation, analysis and dissemination currently take place primarily within one discipline. Co-location of this function in a facility that supports other disciplines decreases the risk of cultural barriers which can stifle information sharing. There is currently no regional focal point for emergency operations, which can lead to disjointed operations during major incidents and ineffective response. Implementation of the MBHSIC creates the regional focal point and creates a back-up EOC capability that all MBHSR jurisdictions as well as state and federal partners can draw upon. Finally, there is currently little or no continuity of government and operations plans for governmental agencies in the MBHSR which risks the ability of the Region to quickly recover from an incident. The level of connectivity, technology, and systems integration envisioned for the MBHSIC ensures that each MBHSR stakeholder would be able to seamlessly rollover operations into the MBHSIC if their primary locations or systems became inoperable or inaccessible.

III.C: Describe what the potential Homeland Security risks of not funding this investment are. (Not to exceed 500 words)

Not funding this Investment risks the Region remaining at its current state situational awareness, information sharing, and emergency operations integration capability. The existing risk is two pronged: first, the existing EOCs can only minimally support localized operations, and oftentimes with very little depth or; second, there is little or no ability to communicate with other regional operations centers – including state and federal operations centers. The cities and towns will continue to have unequal capabilities (for example in personnel, facilities, telecommunications, information technology, and procedures) that inhibit their ability to operate locally and regionally. Operational gaps found in the areas of identification of alternate EOC, documentation, EOC staffing, exercises, reporting, and training will remain. Specifically, Boston's EOC will remain inadequate to support emergency operations for a city its size. Intelligence aggregation, analysis and dissemination will continue to take place primarily within one discipline, stifling information sharing. There Region will continue to lack a regional focal point for emergency operations, which can lead to disjointed operations during major incidents and ineffective response. Finally, the Region will continue to lack effective continuity of government and operations plans capability which risks the ability of the Region to quickly recover from an incident.

IV. FUNDING & IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

IV.A: Investment Funding Plan

	FY 2006 Homeland Security Grant Program Request					FY 2006 HSGP Request Total	Other Funding Sources Applied	Grand Total
	SHSP	UASI	LETPP	MMRS	CCP			
Personnel								
Planning		\$2,305,000				\$2,305,000		\$2,305,000
Organization								
Equipment*		\$4,250,000				\$4,250,000		\$4,250,000
Training		\$50,000				\$50,000		\$50,000
Exercises		\$25,000				\$25,000		\$25,000
M&A								
Total		\$6,630,000				\$6,630,000		\$6,630,000

*If you plan to purchase Interoperable Communications Equipment, your investment Justification must include discussion on planning, governance, training, policies, procedures, and/or exercises related to the equipment.

INVESTMENT #

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

2

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

\$6,630,000

Investment Name: Metro-Boston Homeland Security Integration Center

IV.B: Identify potential challenges to the effective implementation of this investment (e.g., stakeholder buy-in, sustainability, aggressive timelines). (Not to exceed 300 words)

The overall challenge to effective implementation of this Investment is a lack of funding to support planning, design, and creation of the MBHSIC. A related challenge is the sustainability of staffing beyond availability of HS funding. Another challenge is achieving stakeholder buy-in throughout the planning, design and creation of the MBHSIC. A final challenge is locating viable space in the Region to house the MBHSIC that will not require construction.

IV.C: Explain how the identified challenges will be addressed and mitigated. (Not to exceed 300 words)

The funding challenge will be mitigated through FY2006 UASI funding, assistance from the City of Boston for the facility, and in-kind MBHSR emergency responder time and/or financial resources the Region's agencies can provide as available. The MBHSR will work to institutionalize the MBHSIC. Stakeholder buy-in will be addressed through the creation of the Advisory Board and the regional and cross-discipline planning and integration teams. To mitigate the challenge of locating viable space, MOHS will identify a working group to evaluate options and provide a recommendation on site location to the Advisory Group.

IV.D: Describe the management team, including roles and responsibilities, that will be accountable for the oversight and implementation of this investment, and the overall management approach they will apply for the implementation of this investment. (Not to exceed 300 words)

MOHS will lead planning, design, and buildout of the MBHSIC. The MOHS staff is comprised of a Director, two Assistant Directors, a Finance Manager, and five Discipline Coordinators. The Director directs and oversees all aspects of MOHS and manages communication with the Mayor of Boston, the jurisdictions' Chief Executive Officers, and the JPOCs. The Assistant Directors handle investment development, management, and coordination for the MBHSR and oversee the activities of the Discipline Coordinators. The Finance Manager is responsible for the fiscal tasks related to all regional HS grants, which includes administering the procurement of equipment for the jurisdictions. MOHS used contract support for the EOC planning and assessments. MOHS will continue to solicit contract support for planning for the MBHSIC and systems integration. The Assistant Directors oversee the activities of the contractors. Planning and integration teams will manage the day to day work in planning, design, and buildout of the BRIC. The Assistant Directors will oversee the activities of the planning and integration teams.

INVESTMENT #

2

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

\$6,630,000

Investment Name: Metro-Boston Homeland Security Integration Center

IV.E: Discuss funding resources beyond FY 2006 HSGP that have been identified and will be leveraged to support the implementation and sustainment of this investment. (Not to exceed 300 words)

The City of Boston will provide the facility for the MBHSIC. In-kind MBHSR emergency responder time is available for planning and implementation activities. However, it is important to note that many of these individuals have full-time jobs. As such, availability exists, but it is limited.

IV.F: Provide a high-level timeline, including milestones and dates, for the implementation of this investment. Possible areas for inclusion are: stakeholder engagement, planning, major acquisitions/purchases, training, exercises, and process/policy updates. Space is provided for up to 10 milestones, but not all 10 spaces may be necessary for the response. ("Milestone" not to exceed 125 characters / approximately 25 words and "Related Activities" not to exceed 500 characters / approximately 100 words)

Milestone #1	Set up Advisory Board and planning and integration teams.	Start Date: 3/1/06	End Date: 6/30/06
Related Activities	Determine list of stakeholders. Reach out to stakeholders to solicit interest in participation. Identify points of contact for Advisory Board and planning and integration teams. Conduct kick-off meetings to review roles and responsibilities.		
Milestone #2	Complete MBHSIC requirements.	Start Date: 6/1/06	End Date: 8/31/06
Related Activities	Conduct planning and integration team meetings as needed. Draft, vet, and finalize MBHSIC requirements. Conduct meeting with Advisory Board to seek approval for MBHSIC requirements.		
Milestone #3	Complete MBHSIC Concept of Operations.	Start Date: 8/1/06	End Date: 10/31/06
Related Activities	Conduct planning and integration team meetings as needed. Draft, vet, and finalize MBHSIC Concept of Operations. Conduct meeting with Advisory Board to seek approval for MBHSIC Concept of Operations.		
Milestone #4	Complete MBHSIC Implementation Plan.	Start Date: 10/1/06	End Date: 12/31/06
Related Activities	Conduct planning and integration team meetings as needed. Draft, vet, and finalize MBHSIC Implementation Plan. Conduct meeting with Advisory Board to seek approval for Implementation Plan.		
Milestone #5	Select MBHSIC site.	Start Date: 10/1/06	End Date: 12/31/06
Related Activities	Assemble working group. Hold working group meetings. Develop criteria based on MBHSIC requirements and Concept of Operations. Develop list of potential sites. Evaluate potential sites against criteria. Conduct meeting with Advisory Board to present site recommendation.		
	Implement MBHSIC.	Start Date: 1/1/07	

INVESTMENT #

2

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

\$6,830,000

Investment Name: Metro-Boston Homeland Security Integration Center

Milestone #8

End Date: 6/30/08

Related Activities

Conduct planning and integration team meetings as needed. Procure, install, and integrate systems. Test systems. Develop policies and procedures related to all functional areas. Conduct systems and process training for stakeholders. Update Implementation Plan with progress to date. Conduct Advisory meetings to review progress on Implementation Plan.

Milestone #7

Complete implementation of EOC Improvement Plans.

Start Date: 4/1/06

End Date: 3/31/07

Related Activities

Conduct meetings as needed. Procure, install, and integrate systems. Test systems. Develop policies and procedures. Conduct systems and process training for stakeholders. Update Improvement Plans with progress to date.

Milestone #8

Start Date:

End Date:

Related Activities

Milestone #9

Start Date:

End Date:

Related Activities

Milestone #10

Start Date:

End Date:

Related Activities

IV.G: Describe the planned duration for this overall Investment. Discuss your long-term sustainability plans for the investment after your FY 2006 HSGP funds have been expended, if applicable. (Not to exceed 300 words)

MOHS expects to achieve full operational status of the MBHSIC within the FY2006 grant period (24 months). Resources currently directed to the Boston EOC, the Boston Regional Intelligence Center, the DelValle Institute for Emergency Preparedness, and the City of Boston off-site data back-up facilities for the functions that will be co-located in the MBHSIC will serve to ensure sustainment of this Investment.

INVESTMENT #

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

3

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

\$2,100,000

Investment Name: NIMS Training and Planning Compliance

I. BACKGROUND

I.A: Provide a summary description of this investment and its purpose. (Not to exceed 200 words)

The purpose of this Investment is to continue National Incident Management System (NIMS) training and achieve NIMS compliance. The NIMS provides a consistent framework for entities at all jurisdictional levels to work together to implement the National Response Plan (NRP) and manage domestic incidents. To date the Metro Boston Homeland Security Region (MBHSR) developed a framework for what level of responder must complete NIMS training and delivered IS-700: NIMS, An Introduction to more than 4,000 personnel and Incident Command System (ICS)-100: Introduction to ICS to more than 3,000 personnel. FY2006 funds are sought to deliver lecture-based IS-800: National Response Plan to officials with overall emergency management or emergency planning responsibilities, and ICS-200: Basic ICS, ICS-300: Intermediate ICS, and ICS-400: Advanced ICS trainings to targeted Regional emergency responders who are likely to assume a supervisory position within the ICS. Additional funding will be used to provide further planning resources to achieve NIMS compliance for the Region. The resources will be used to incorporate NIMS principles into emergency plans and training in accordance with NIMS Integration Center (NIC) guidance.

I.B: Explain how the investment will support the implementation of an Initiative(s) from the Program and Capability Enhancement Plan, and the achievement of goals and objectives from your State/Urban Area homeland security strategy(ies). (Not to exceed 300 words)

This investment supports the Commonwealth's Initiatives of National Incident Management System Implementation as outlined in the Enhancement and Capabilities Plan. This Investment directly aligns to Goal 1, ensure the MBHSR can actively prevent and deter, as well as prepare for, terrorist attacks and catastrophic events; Objective 1.3, assess and implement sustainable HS training across the Region, in the Updated Urban Homeland Security Strategy. This Investment also directly aligns to Goal 4, ensure the MBHSR has the capability to effectively recover from terrorist attacks and catastrophic events, Objective 4.1, support a regional capacity, integrating governmental, non-governmental, and private resources for protracted response and recovery operations due to a terrorist attack or catastrophic event. This Investment supports the achievement of Goal 1, Objective 1.3 and Goal 4, Objective 4.1 through the implementation of steps 1.3.4 and 4.1.7, complete NIMS implementation by September 30, 2006. Through this Investment the MBHSR will complete training in accordance with NIC guidance, institutionalize the principles of the ICS through the response system, and further incorporate NIMS principles into appropriate policies and procedures in accordance with NIC guidance.

I.C: List up to four National Priority(ies) this investment primarily supports.

- Implement the NIMS and NRP
Expanded Regional Collaboration

I.D: List up to six Target Capability(ies) from the Target Capabilities List this investment primarily supports.

- Public Safety and Security Response
Planning
Critical Resource Logistics and Distribution
Onsite Incident Management
WMD/Hazardous Materials Response & Decontamination
Responder Safety and Health

II. REGIONALIZATION

II.A: Describe the geographic and demographic area(s) this investment covers. (Not to exceed 275 words)

This Investment impacts the entire Region across all disciplines. Boston's UASI Region, approximately 95 square miles, includes the Cities of Boston, Cambridge, Chelsea, Everett, Quincy, Revere, and Somerville, and the Towns of Brookline and Winthrop. The Region was selected in June 2003 based on the following criteria: 1) level of risk faced by a community, based primarily on potential target infrastructure; 2) level and availability of resources a community can bring to bear to assist Boston; 3) a community's role in assisting in an evacuation of Boston in the event of a critical incident; and 4) whether a community is contiguous with Boston. This Investment primarily supports Law Enforcement, Fire Services, Emergency Medical Services, and Emergency Management, and secondarily supports Public Health, Health Care, Public Works, and General Administration. The resident population of the Region is 1,051,809 according to 2000 US Census Data; however, the daytime population estimates for Boston and Cambridge peg the total regional population as high as 2,560,000 persons. The Region contains a number of critical infrastructures, high-profile targets, and potential threat elements. Several high-profile, annual events draw more than a million spectators and participants into Boston. Major transportation networks exist within the Region. Logan International Airport, a \$6 billion per year critical infrastructure, is located in East Boston. Boston is home to several major transportation hubs, including North Station and South Station. The Port of Boston is the largest container port in New England and is the 22nd largest in the US. In addition, weekly Liquefied Gas (LNG) deliveries transit the Port of Boston and wind up in the Chelsea Creek.

INVESTMENT #

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

3

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

\$2,100,000

Investment Name: NIMS Training and Planning Compliance

II.B: Explain how the State/Urban Area is organizing to implement this investment over the identified geographic area(s).
(Not to exceed 300 words)

The Mayor's Office of Homeland Security (MOHS) works with the UASI communities and regional stakeholders to leverage resources that enhance capacities in the areas of prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery from CBRNE incidents and major disasters across the Region. MOHS collaborates with the Jurisdictional Point of Contact (JPOC) Committee and the MBHSR Discipline Subcommittees. The JPOC Committee is comprised of one senior point of contact from each of the nine UASI jurisdictions who were appointed by the jurisdiction's Chief Executive Officer. This Committee ensures open and clear communication amongst disciplines in their jurisdiction and represents their jurisdiction's disciplines at the monthly JPOC meetings. The six MBHSR Discipline Subcommittees bring together representatives from Law Enforcement, Fire Services, EMS, Emergency Management, Public Health, and Health Care, to discuss, coordinate, develop plans, and guide implementation of their discipline specific initiatives across the Region. Through the JPOC and Discipline Subcommittee structure, the Region is able to leverage responders across all Regions and disciplines to participate in this investment.

II.C: Discuss the collaboration process you have, or will establish, with other regions and jurisdictions (Inter- and Intra-State) within or beyond the geographic/demographic area of this investment. Discuss when and how you will engage stakeholders from those regions in specific support of this investment. (Not to exceed 500 words)

The MBHSR collaboration processes focus on the distribution of support throughout the Region, as many partners already have full-time jobs. The MBHSR collaborates formally through monthly JPOC Committee and Discipline Subcommittee meetings. Outside the monthly meetings, collaboration occurs through the MBHSR website, emails, phone calls, informal meetings, and meetings within each jurisdiction. Monthly JPOC Committee meetings are organized and run by MOHS. The meetings are open meetings and are attended by MOHS, the JPOCs, State agency representatives, and MOHS contractors, as needed. Frequent agenda items include administrative updates, MBHSR investment updates, and Discipline updates. As Training is a main focus for the Discipline Subcommittees, an update on IS and ICS trainings completed to date and upcoming IS and ICS trainings for the Region is usually provided at the meeting. The last 30 minutes of the meeting are saved for open discussion. Monthly Discipline Subcommittee meetings are organized and run by the MOHS Discipline Coordinators and the Subcommittee Lead and are attended by MOHS, the jurisdictions' Discipline Representatives, and State agency representatives. In order to maximize effectiveness and output of the Discipline Subcommittees, and to meet programmatic goals and objectives, the MOHS Discipline Coordinators are strategically placed in "host" agencies related to their assigned discipline. Frequent agenda items include discussions of administrative updates, trainings, exercises, equipment procurements, relevant MBHSR investment updates, and project proposals. With the September 2006 deadline for NIMS compliance approaching, progress to date and upcoming NIMS trainings are discussed at the Subcommittee meetings. The MOHS Discipline Coordinators are working closely with the MOHS Assistant Directors to ensure the Region is on target to meet the deadline. The IS and ICS trainings identified for the MBHSR have also been opened to public health and public safety personnel around the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Representatives from private sector and non-governmental partners, state agencies and other HS regions have taken advantage of the offerings. The execution of overtime and backfill reimbursement related to training across the jurisdictions requires significant collaboration between MOHS and the MBHSR partners. The Discipline Subcommittees use the JPOCs to sign-off on appropriate training requests and reimbursements. The MOHS Finance Manager coordinates across City of Boston agencies, as fiduciary, including City Auditing and Office of Budget and Management, for administrative support for reimbursements. In addition, MOHS has partnerships with emergency responder agencies in the Region, both at the accounting and finance and operational levels, to ensure project management and reimbursement tasks are handled.

III. IMPACT

III.A: Discuss anticipated impacts of this investment and how the requested funding will help attain/achieve expected impacts. Consider the population and areas affected, and other entities (jurisdictions, disciplines) that could leverage the outcomes and impacts of the solution presented by this investment. (Not to exceed 500 words)

The overriding impact of this investment is the Region will meet the federal government's FY2007 NIMS compliance requirement. The implementation of NIMS will result in more effective prevention, protection, response, and recovery operations resulting in saved lives, minimized damages, and long-term community recovery and mitigation activities. Achieving NIMS compliance also impacts the Region's ability to receive funding assistance from the federal government in FY2007 and out years. Through this investment the Region's emergency responders will complete the necessary training to achieve NIMS compliance. Through completion of ICS-100, new MBHSR responders will understand the purpose and basic features of ICS, incident commander and command staff functions, general staff functions, ICS facilities, and common responsibilities. Through the completion of IS-700, new MBHSR responders will understand NIMS components, concepts, and principles. Through completion of the ICS-300 and 400 level courses, MBHSR responders with supervisory responsibilities, such as the incident commander or planning section chief, will receive advanced ICS training. Through the completion of IS-800, MBHSR emergency managers will receive training on the key elements of the National Response Plan so that its implementation can be supported at all levels of government. Funding of this investment impacts the ability of MBHSR responders to complete trainings that are not covered under previous year funding and for new responders to complete the same training as their peers. Coordination of NIMS training through MOHS and the MBHSR governance structure underscores unified command concepts across the Region and across disciplines. This level of collaboration in completing training is critical to ensure all agencies are operating in synch with one another before, during, and after an incident. The impact is all MBHSR emergency responders operate from the same baseline and standard terminology and practices are clear to all responders. The funding of resources to focus on NIMS planning for the Region impacts the ability of the Region to have more robust and formalized plans and protocols that comply with NIMS. More formalized plans and protocols, which the Region is currently lacking, result in effective communications and implementation of NIMS across the Region.

INVESTMENT #

3

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

\$2,100,000

Investment Name: NIMS Training and Planning Compliance

III.B: Discuss how the implementation of this investment will decrease or mitigate risk. (Not to exceed 500 words)

The implementation of NIMS training and compliance decreases MBHSR's inability to reach FY2007 NIMS compliance requirements. Achieving NIMS compliance decreases the inability of the Region to effectively prevent, protect, respond, and recover to a major incident. Achieving NIMS compliance also decreases the Region's inability to receive funding assistance from the federal government in FY2007 and out years. The implementation of NIMS training enables new MBHSR responders to complete training to understand ICS and NIMS components, concepts, and principles and MBHSR responders with supervisory responsibilities to complete advanced training. Implementation of this Investment decreases the risk of MBHSR responders completing only a portion of the NIMS training and new personnel not receiving the same NIMS training as their peers. This consistency ensures that incident management will be initiated and conducted using the principles contained in the NIMS and its incident command and coordination structure. Coordination and completion of NIMS training through MOHS and the MBHSR governance structure also decreases the risk of MBHSR agencies operating independently before, during, and after an incident. The implementation of NIMS planning mitigates the risk of MBHSR plans and protocols lacking NIMS compliance, and minimizes inefficiencies in resource use and allocation. NIMS training also decreases the MBHSR's inability to effectively communicate and implement NIMS across the Region.

III.C: Describe what the potential Homeland Security risks of not funding this investment are. (Not to exceed 500 words)

Not funding NIMS training and planning for the MBHSR decreases the Region's ability to reach FY2007 NIMS compliance requirements. If MBHSR does not achieve NIMS compliance, the Region risks ineffective prevention, protection, response, and recovery operations resulting in lost lives, significant damages, and a lack of long-term community recovery and mitigation activities. Additionally, the Region will not be able to receive funding assistance from the federal government in FY2007 and out years. Not funding NIMS training risks MBHSR responders receiving only a portion of NIMS training or no training at all. As a result, the Region risks MBHSR responders not understanding NIMS components, concepts, and principles, reduces the ability to implement and operate under an ICS, and hinders the ability to implement aspects of the NRP when needed. Not funding NIMS planning risks the persistence of non-compliant MBHSR plans and protocols. Agencies may continue to rely on non-optimal plans and protocols which could otherwise have been greatly enhanced through the incorporation of NIMS concepts and principles. Overall, not funding this Investment risks the ability of the MBHSR to effectively operate before, during, and after an incident.

IV. FUNDING & IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

IV.A: Investment Funding Plan

	FY 2006 Homeland Security Grant Program Request					FY 2006 HSGP Request Total	Other Funding Sources Applied	Grand Total
	SHSP	UASI	LETPP	MMRS	CCP			
Personnel								
Planning		\$1,100,000				\$1,100,000		\$1,100,000
Organization								
Equipment*								
Training		\$1,000,000				\$1,000,000		\$1,000,000
Exercises								
M&A								
Total		\$2,100,000				\$2,100,000		\$2,100,000

*If you plan to purchase Interoperable Communications Equipment, your investment justification must include discussion on planning, governance, training, policies, procedures, and/or exercises related to the equipment.

INVESTMENT #

3

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

\$2,100,000

Investment Name: NIMS Training and Planning Compliance

IV.B: Identify potential challenges to the effective implementation of this investment (e.g., stakeholder buy-in, sustainability, aggressive timelines). (Not to exceed 300 words)

The overall challenge to effective implementation of NIMS training and planning across the Region and across disciplines is a lack of funding for reimbursement of overtime and backfill incurred for emergency responders to attend training, and resources to complete planning. Another challenge to the effective implementation of this investment is emergency responders not being familiar with federal incident management guidelines and/or not supporting the MBHSR implementation plan for NIMS compliance. This includes the challenge of achieving stakeholder buy-in on enhanced plans and protocols and ensuring the updated plans and protocols are implemented. A third challenge to effective implementation is agencies working independently to achieve NIMS compliance. A lack of regional focus impacts the ability of the Region's emergency responders to effectively coordinate response to a major event. A final challenge is a lack of support from emergency responders' management for their staff to attend NIMS training.

IV.C: Explain how the identified challenges will be addressed and mitigated. (Not to exceed 300 words)

To date, the above challenges have been addressed and mitigated through use of the UASI funds and the MBHSR governance structure in place. The Region has used a portion of FY2003 and FY2004 HS funding and has budgeted to use a portion of FY2005 UASI funding to support NIMS training and planning for the Region across disciplines. This funding has been and will be used to pay for training courses, to reimburse overtime and backfill for emergency responders to attend training and to support resources to complete planning. The MBHSR governance structure was put in place to ensure collaboration at all levels across the Region and across disciplines. The JPOCs, MOHS, and Discipline Subcommittees will continue to collaborate to achieve NIMS compliance. The JPOCs and Discipline Representatives will also continue to collaborate within their jurisdictions to ensure emergency responders' management understands the implementation plan to achieve NIMS compliance and supports their staff in attending HS training to close the gaps.

IV.D: Describe the management team, including roles and responsibilities, that will be accountable for the oversight and implementation of this investment, and the overall management approach they will apply for the implementation of this investment. (Not to exceed 300 words)

MOHS and the agencies in the Region are responsible for the oversight of federally supported HS training. The MOHS staff is comprised of a Director, two Assistant Directors, a Finance Manager, and five Discipline Coordinators. The Director directs and oversees all aspects of MOHS and manages communication with the Mayor of Boston, the jurisdictions' Chief Executive Officers, and the JPOCs. The Assistant Directors handle investment development, management, and coordination for the MBHSR and oversee the activities of the Discipline Coordinators. The Finance Manager is responsible for the fiscal tasks related to all regional HS grants, which includes processing reimbursements for training to the jurisdictions. The Discipline Coordinators coordinate planning and communication, specifically around training, amongst their respective Discipline Subcommittees, Law Enforcement, Fire Services, Emergency Medical Services, Emergency Management, Public Health, and Health Care. Training personnel in each agency and each jurisdiction constantly assess training needs and discuss the needs at the Discipline Subcommittee meetings.

INVESTMENT #

3

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

\$2,100,000

Investment Name: NIMS Training and Planning Compliance

IV.E: Discuss funding resources beyond FY 2006 HSGP that have been identified and will be leveraged to support the implementation and sustainment of this investment. (Not to exceed 300 words)

Operational monies through agencies, though in place, are limited. Additional resources are continually being sought from other federal agencies. In-kind resources from the MBHSR agencies will be leveraged for NIMS compliance planning and implementation activities.

IV.F: Provide a high-level timeline, including milestones and dates, for the implementation of this investment. Possible areas for inclusion are: stakeholder engagement, planning, major acquisitions/purchases, training, exercises, and process/policy updates. Space is provided for up to 10 milestones, but not all 10 spaces may be necessary for the response. ("Milestone" not to exceed 125 characters / approximately 25 words and "Related Activities" not to exceed 500 characters / approximately 100 words)

Milestone #1

Plan NIMS Training.

Start Date: 6/1/06

End Date: 3/31/07

Related Activities

Determine target audience. Engage vendor to conduct training or develop local train-the-trainer capacity. Market NIMS training to the Region.

Milestone #2

Begin delivery of NIMS training.

Start Date: 6/1/06

End Date: 9/30/07

Related Activities

Deliver ICS-200 and IS-800 courses in accordance with federal guidance for 2006 compliance. Deliver ICS-300 and ICS-400 courses in accordance with federal guidance for 2007 compliance.

Milestone #3

Plan development and enhancement of MBHSR policies and protocols to achieve NIMS compliance.

Start Date: 11/1/06

End Date: 3/31/07

Related Activities

Engage stakeholders. Engage vendor to conduct planning sessions and to aid in policy and protocol development.

Milestone #4

Develop and enhance MBHSR policies and protocols to achieve NIMS compliance.

Start Date: 6/1/06

End Date: 9/30/07

Related Activities

Conduct planning sessions with stakeholder groups. Achieve agreement on key policy and plan elements. Address NIMS compliance issues.

Milestone #5

Start Date:

End Date:

Related Activities

Start Date:

INVESTMENT #

3

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

\$2,100,000

Investment Name: NIMS Training and Planning Compliance

Milestone #8

End Date:

Related Activities

Milestone #7

Start Date:

End Date:

Related Activities

Milestone #8

Start Date:

End Date:

Related Activities

Milestone #9

Start Date:

End Date:

Related Activities

Milestone #10

Start Date:

End Date:

Related Activities

IV.G: Describe the planned duration for this overall investment. Discuss your long-term sustainability plans for the investment after your FY 2006 HSGP funds have been expended, if applicable. (Not to exceed 300 words)

MOHS plans to work with the MBHSR JPOCs and Discipline Subcommittees to implement a yearly review process to ensure all MBHSR personnel receive proper NIMS training. The Region will continue to solicit federal government funding as needed to maintain NIMS compliance.

INVESTMENT #

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

4

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

\$840,000

Investment Name: Integrated Homeland Security Exercise Program

I. BACKGROUND

I.A: Provide a summary description of this investment and its purpose. (Not to exceed 200 words)

The purpose of this investment is to implement HS exercises across the Metro Boston Homeland Security Region (MBHSR). Through previous years' funding, the Region, in coordination with federal, state, and private sector partners, completed Operation Atlas, a simulated hijacking of a commercial jet. The exercise illustrated where the agencies were working effectively, and where more work needed to be done. The Region is planning Operation Poseidon, a direct support exercise being sponsored by DHS in partnership with MBHSR and the Commonwealth's EOPS. The incident will evaluate the Region's ability to respond to terrorism, especially in the areas of intelligence sharing and prevention, incident command, communications interoperability, and radiological detection and response. This investment supports exercises for the Region to strengthen MOAs, mutual aid agreements, continuity of government and operations plans, and other critical elements as outlined in the National Response Plan (NRP). Emphasis will continue to be placed on intelligence and information sharing, communications interoperability, strategic-level decision making, public information and risk communication, and incident command and management.

I.B: Explain how the investment will support the implementation of an initiative(s) from the Program and Capability Enhancement Plan, and the achievement of goals and objectives from your State/Urban Area homeland security strategy(ies). (Not to exceed 300 words)

By exercising the aforementioned functional capacities, this investment supports the Commonwealth's Initiatives of Information Sharing, Interoperable Communications, National Incident Management System Implementation, Regional Collaboration, Statewide Pandemic Preparedness, Improvised Explosive Devices, CBRNE Preparedness, and Cyber Security as outlined in the Enhancement and Capabilities Plan. This investment directly aligns to the Updated Urban Area Homeland Security Strategy. Specifically, this investment aligns with Goal 1, ensure the MBHSR can actively prevent and deter, as well as prepare for, terrorist attacks and catastrophic events. This investment also aligns with Objective 1.4, assess and implement sustainable HS exercises across the Region. This investment supports the achievement of Goal 1, Objective 1.4 through the following steps the MBHSR continues to implement: conduct multi-jurisdictional, interdisciplinary exercises, enabling stakeholders to practice their capabilities under conditions mimicking those that would exist during an actual incident and develop and execute tabletop, functional and full-scale exercises with an all hazards approach toward prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery for the individual disciplines, as needed.

I.C: List up to four National Priority(ies) this investment primarily supports.

Implement the NIMS and NRP

Strengthen Emergency Operations Planning and Citizen Protection

Strengthen CBRNE Detection, Response, & Decontamination Capabilities

Expanded Regional Collaboration

I.D: List up to six Target Capability(ies) from the Target Capabilities List this investment primarily supports.

Communications

Firefighting Operations/Support

Critical Resource Logistics and Distribution

Law Enforcement Investigation and Operations

Explosive Device Response Operations

Medical Supplies Management and Distribution

II. REGIONALIZATION

II.A: Describe the geographic and demographic area(s) this investment covers. (Not to exceed 275 words)

This investment impacts the entire Region across six disciplines. Boston's UASI Region, approximately 95 square miles, includes the Cities of Boston, Cambridge, Chelsea, Everett, Quincy, Revere, and Somerville, and the Towns of Brookline and Winthrop. The Region was selected in June 2003 based on the following criteria: 1) level of risk faced by a community, based primarily on potential target infrastructure; 2) level and availability of resources a community can bring to bear to assist Boston; 3) a community's role in assisting in an evacuation of Boston in the event of a critical incident; and 4) whether a community is contiguous with Boston. This investment primarily supports Law Enforcement, Fire Services, Emergency Medical Services, and Emergency Management, and secondarily supports Public Health and Health Care. The resident population of the Region is 1,051,809 according to 2000 US Census Data; however, the daytime population estimates for Boston and Cambridge peg the total regional population as high as 2,560,000 persons. The Region contains a number of critical infrastructures, high-profile targets, and potential threat elements. Several high-profile, annual events draw more than a million spectators and participants into Boston. Major transportation networks exist within the Region. Logan International Airport, a \$6 billion per year critical infrastructure, is located in East Boston. Boston is home to several major transportation hubs, including North Station and South Station. The Port of Boston is the largest container port in New England and is the 22nd largest in the US. In addition, weekly Liquefied Gas (LNG) deliveries transit the Port of Boston and wind up in the Chelsea Creek.

INVESTMENT #

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

4

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

\$840,000

Investment Name: Integrated Homeland Security Exercise Program

II.B: Explain how the State/Urban Area is organizing to implement this investment over the identified geographic area(s).
(Not to exceed 300 words)

The Mayor's Office of Homeland Security's (MOHS) works with the UASI communities and regional stakeholders to leverage MBHSR resources that enhance capacities in the areas of prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery from CBRNE incidents and major disasters across the Region. The MOHS staff is grant-funded and works full-time to coordinate, manage, assist, and move forward the MBHSR Investments and to serve as the fiduciary for the Region's HS grant programming. In planning and executing HS exercises, the MOHS staff works in concert with the Jurisdictional Point of Contact (JPOC) Committee and Discipline Subcommittees. The JPOC Committee is comprised of one senior point of contact from each of the nine jurisdictions. The JPOCs were appointed by the jurisdiction's Chief Executive Officer. The JPOCs ensure open and clear communication amongst disciplines in their city or town and represent their jurisdiction's disciplines at the monthly JPOC meetings run by MOHS. MBHSR Discipline Subcommittees were established to bring together representatives from each discipline to discuss, coordinate, develop plans, and guide implementation of their jurisdiction's initiatives across the Region. MOHS has worked with its partners to establish six Discipline Subcommittees including Law Enforcement, Fire Services, EMS, Emergency Management, Public Health, and Health Care. Each JPOC appointed representatives from his community to serve on the Discipline Subcommittees. The Subcommittee Representative represents the discipline on behalf of his or her jurisdiction to the Subcommittee through participation in the development and implementation of HS Investments that impact the Region. Exercise Planning Committees are formed as needed. The Committees are comprised of MBHSR functional leads from each of the Discipline Subcommittees; state partners from transportation, emergency management, law enforcement, and intelligence; and federal partners from the USCG, law enforcement, and emergency management.

II.C: Discuss the collaboration process you have, or will establish, with other regions and jurisdictions (inter- and intra-State) within or beyond the geographic/demographic area of this investment. Discuss when and how you will engage stakeholders from those regions in specific support of this investment. (Not to exceed 500 words)

The MBHSR collaboration processes focus on the distribution of support throughout the Region, as many partners already have full-time jobs. The MBHSR collaborates formally through monthly JPOC Committee and Discipline Subcommittee meetings. Outside the monthly meetings, collaboration occurs through the MBHSR website, emails, phone calls, informal meetings, and meetings within each jurisdiction. Monthly JPOC Committee meetings are organized and run by MOHS. The meetings are open meetings and are attended by MOHS, the JPOCs, State agency representatives, and MOHS contractors, as needed. Frequent agenda items include administrative updates, MBHSR investment updates, and Discipline updates. As Exercises is one of the MBHSR investments and is a main focus for the Discipline Subcommittees, an update on exercises completed to date and upcoming large-scale exercises for the Region is usually provided at the meeting. Monthly Discipline Subcommittee meetings are organized and run by the MOHS Discipline Coordinators and the Subcommittee Lead and are attended by MOHS, the jurisdictions' Discipline Representatives, and State agency representatives. In order to maximize effectiveness and output of the Discipline Subcommittees, and to meet programmatic goals and objectives, the MOHS Discipline Coordinators are strategically placed in "host" agencies related to their assigned discipline. Frequent agenda items include discussions of administrative updates, trainings, exercises, equipment procurements, relevant MBHSR investment updates, and project proposals. Each of the Subcommittees discusses potential involvement in the Region's large-scale exercises and collaborates on discipline-specific exercises. Following discussions on discipline-specific exercises, the Subcommittees reach consensus and develop and submit proposals for the identified exercise to MOHS for approval. Following receipt of approval by MOHS, the Subcommittees coordinate and execute the exercise within the jurisdictions. Exercise Planning Committees, comprising of representations from all levels of government, form to plan and execute large-scale exercises, such as Operation Atlas and Poseidon. The Exercise Planning Committees meet as needed. Usually there are at least three meetings preceding each exercise component: Initial Planning Conference, Mid-Term Planning Conference, and the Final Planning Conference. The group assembles following the exercise to develop after action reports and improvement plans. The Discipline Subcommittees use the JPOCs to sign-off on appropriate exercise requests and reimbursements. The MOHS Finance Manager coordinates the execution of reimbursement for overtime and backfill related to exercises across Boston agencies, as fiduciary, including City Auditing and Office of Budget and Management, for administrative support for reimbursements.

III. IMPACT

III.A: Discuss anticipated impacts of this investment and how the requested funding will help attain/achieve expected impacts. Consider the population and areas affected, and other entities (jurisdictions, disciplines) that could leverage the outcomes and impacts of the solution presented by this investment. (Not to exceed 500 words)

This investment ultimately impacts the ability of the Region to avoid an incident or intervene to stop an incident from occurring and to respond effectively to an incident. With the availability of UASI funding for exercises, Discipline Subcommittees will continue to collaborate through the monthly meetings and plan and execute regional exercises. The planning and execution of HS exercises throughout the Region and across disciplines provides the opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of training provided to HS emergency responders. It also provides the opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of training, policies, procedures, and protocols. And it provides the opportunity to evaluate the use of specialized teams and equipment. Through exercises and subsequent After Action Reports, the Region is able to determine capabilities and identify areas for improvement in a no-fault, low-risk environment. Through the implementation of Improvement Plans critical enhancements are made, especially in the realm of responder capabilities, MOAs, mutual aid agreements, continuity of operations plans, as well as other critical response elements outlined in the NRP. Exercises also help to familiarize the Region's emergency responders with shared resources available for mutual aid.

INVESTMENT #

4

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

Investment Name: Integrated Homeland Security Exercise Program

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

\$840,000

III.B: Discuss how the implementation of this investment will decrease or mitigate risk. (Not to exceed 500 words)

With the availability of UASI funding for HS exercises, the MBHSR and other state and federal partners will continue to collaborate through monthly meetings and Exercise Planning Committee meetings to plan and execute HS exercises to examine capabilities and identify areas for improvement. Overall, implementation of this Investment decreases the risk of an incident or an inability to stop an incident from occurring and decreases the risk of ineffective response. Through these exercises, emergency responders across the Region learn how best to work together to prevent and respond to a terrorist attack, major disaster, or other emergency while applying their training in a real-world environment. Implementation of this Investment also decreases the risk of gaps in emergency responder capabilities, MOAs, mutual aid agreements, continuity of government and operations plans, and other critical response elements as outlined in the NRP in the areas of intelligence and information sharing, communications interoperability, strategic-level decision-making, public information and risk communication, and field operations.

III.C: Describe what the potential Homeland Security risks of not funding this investment are. (Not to exceed 500 words)

The Region risks losing the current level of collaboration between the MBHSR and other state and federal partners through the JPOC and Discipline Subcommittee and Exercise Planning Committee if the MBHSR Exercise Investment is not funded. A significant portion of the Discipline Subcommittees' accomplishments revolve around identifying, planning, and completing HS exercises for the Region. The Discipline Subcommittees may stop conducting exercises if funding to plan and execute them were not available. This presents the risk that emergency responders in the Region could not, with sufficient frequency and structure, evaluate capabilities, policies, procedures, protocols, specialized teams, and equipment in the areas of intelligence and information sharing, communications interoperability, strategic-level decision-making, public information and risk communication, and field operations. This could result in the Region's emergency responders misusing or not using knowledge learned in training; regional policies, procedures, and protocols; and specialized teams and equipment. Additionally, disciplines and jurisdictions may revert to "protecting their turf" rather than joining together to enhance cooperation. The result could be "business card exchanging" during an emergency as opposed to knowing regional partners and their expectations going in to an incident. Ultimately, not funding this Investment risks eroding the substantial gains made in prevention and response.

IV. FUNDING & IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

IV.A: Investment Funding Plan

	FY 2006 Homeland Security Grant Program Request					FY 2006 HSGP Request Total	Other Funding Sources Applied	Grand Total
	SHSP	UASI	LETPP	MMRS	CCP			
Personnel								
Planning		\$440,000				\$440,000		\$440,000
Organization								
Equipment*								
Training								
Exercises		\$400,000				\$400,000		\$400,000
M&A								
Total		\$840,000				\$840,000		\$840,000

*If you plan to purchase interoperable Communications Equipment, your investment justification must include discussion on planning, governance, training, policies, procedures, and/or exercises related to the equipment.

INVESTMENT #

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

4

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

\$840,000

Investment Name: Integrated Homeland Security Exercise Program

IV.B: Identify potential challenges to the effective implementation of this investment (e.g., stakeholder buy-in, sustainability, aggressive timelines). (Not to exceed 300 words)

The overall challenge to effective implementation of HS exercises across the Region and across disciplines is ensuring adequate funding to reimburse overtime and backfill incurred for emergency responders to participate in exercises. Another challenge is ensuring that emergency responders focus on regional collaboration, as opposed to jurisdiction and discipline specific needs. A lack of regional focus in exercises diminishes the ability of the Region's emergency responders to effectively coordinate response to a major event. A related challenge is ensuring all disciplines have an opportunity to exercise their key objectives. Exercises can easily become overwhelming in scope if participants are not challenged to keep scope manageable. A successful way to maintain stakeholder commitment and buy in when an objective is out of scope is to table it for inclusion in a future exercise – yet another reason why this investment is critical. A fourth challenge to effective implementation is a lack of support from emergency responder management for their staff to participate in HS exercises. Finally, realism must always be ensured in exercises. This can be especially challenging when trying to simulate the flow of intelligence from federal law enforcement agencies.

IV.C: Explain how the identified challenges will be addressed and mitigated. (Not to exceed 300 words)

To date, many of the above challenges have been addressed and mitigated through use of the UASI funds and the MBSHR governance structure in place. The Region has used a portion of FY2003 and FY2004 and has budgeted to use a portion of FY2005 UASI funding to support HS exercises for the Region across disciplines. This funding has been and will be used to reimburse overtime and backfill for emergency responders to participate in exercises. The MBHSR governance structure was put in place to ensure collaboration at all levels across the Region and across disciplines. The JPOCs, MOHS, Discipline Subcommittees, and Exercise Planning Committees will continue to collaborate to plan and execute exercises across the Region and all disciplines. The JPOCs and Discipline Representatives will also continue to collaborate within their jurisdictions to ensure emergency responders' management understands the need for the exercises in planning and supports their staff to participate. Finally, in the planning sessions for the HS exercises, through the involvement of MBHSR emergency responders and other HS resources, the Region attempts to make the situation as real as possible. To ensure the realism of intelligence flow, MBHSR has included the JTTF and the US Attorney's Office in its exercise planning and execution.

IV.D: Describe the management team, including roles and responsibilities, that will be accountable for the oversight and implementation of this investment, and the overall management approach they will apply for the implementation of this investment. (Not to exceed 300 words)

MOHS is responsible for the oversight of HS exercises across the Region. The MOHS staff is comprised of a Director, two Assistant Directors, a Finance Manager, and five Discipline Coordinators. The Director directs and oversees all aspects of MOHS and manages communication with the Mayor of Boston, the jurisdictions' Chief Executive Officers, and the JPOCs. The Assistant Directors handle investment development, management, and coordination for the MBHSR and oversee the activities of the Discipline Coordinators. The Finance Manager is responsible for the fiscal tasks related to all regional HS grants, which includes processing reimbursements for overtime and backfill related to exercises to the jurisdictions. The Discipline Coordinators coordinate planning and communication, specifically around exercises as they're in the planning stages, amongst their respective Discipline Subcommittees, Law Enforcement, Fire Services, Emergency Medical Services, Emergency Management, Public Health, and Health Care. For large-scale exercise, Exercise Planning Committees are put in place comprising of federal, state, and local participations to lead planning and execution of the exercise.

INVESTMENT #

State/Territory Name:

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

4

FY 2006 Urban Area Name:

Investment Name:

IV.E: Discuss funding resources beyond FY 2006 HSGP that have been identified and will be leveraged to support the implementation and sustaniment of this investment. (Not to exceed 300 words)

Emergency responder agencies provide substantial in-kind contribution of time for planning and implementation activities. These responders, many of them high-ranking chief officers, have full-time operational roles and responsibilities. Availability exists, but is limited, which is a key reason why support resources are so valuable in ensuring strong planning and implementation of key initiatives.

IV.F: Provide a high-level timeline, including milestones and dates, for the implementation of this investment. Possible areas for inclusion are: stakeholder engagement, planning, major acquisitions/purchases, training, exercises, and process/policy updates. Space is provided for up to 10 milestones, but not all 10 spaces may be necessary for the response. ("Milestone" not to exceed 125 characters / approximately 25 words and "Related Activities" not to exceed 500 characters / approximately 100 words)

Milestone #1	<input type="text" value="Complete weapons of mass destruction operational response full-scale exercise."/>	Start Date: <input type="text" value="7/1/06"/>
		End Date: <input type="text" value="5/31/07"/>
Related Activities	<input type="text" value="Conduct stakeholder meetings to plan weapons of mass destruction operational response full-scale exercise. Conduct exercise. Develop After Action Report. Develop Improvement Plan."/>	

Milestone #2	<input type="text" value="Complete biological, isolation and quarantine, and emergency dispensing tabletop exercises."/>	Start Date: <input type="text" value="1/1/07"/>
		End Date: <input type="text" value="11/30/07"/>
Related Activities	<input type="text" value="Conduct stakeholder meetings to plan biological, isolation and quarantine, and emergency dispensing tabletop exercises. Conduct biological, isolation and quarantine, and emergency dispensing tabletop exercises."/>	

Milestone #3	<input type="text" value="Complete radiological decontamination full-scale exercise."/>	Start Date: <input type="text" value="3/1/07"/>
		End Date: <input type="text" value="1/31/08"/>
Related Activities	<input type="text" value="Conduct stakeholders meetings to plan radiological decontamination full-scale exercise. Conduct exercise. Develop After Action Report. Develop Improvement Plan."/>	

Milestone #4	<input type="text" value="Complete weapons of mass destruction operational response full-scale exercise."/>	Start Date: <input type="text" value="7/1/07"/>
		End Date: <input type="text" value="5/31/08"/>
Related Activities	<input type="text" value="Conduct stakeholders meetings to plan weapons of mass destruction operational response full-scale exercise. Conduct exercise. Develop After Action Report. Develop Improvement Plan."/>	

Milestone #5	<input type="text" value="Execute discipline-specific exercises."/>	Start Date: <input type="text" value="6/1/06"/>
		End Date: <input type="text" value="6/30/08"/>
Related Activities	<input type="text" value="Conduct Discipline Subcommittee meetings to discuss discipline-specific exercises. Develop and submit proposals to MOHS for approval. Plan approved exercises. Conduct exercises. Develop After Action Reports. Develop Improvement Plans."/>	

		Start Date: <input type="text"/>
--	--	---

INVESTMENT #

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

4

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

\$840,000

Investment Name: Integrated Homeland Security Exercise Program

Milestone #8

End Date:

Related Activities

Milestone #7

Start Date:

End Date:

Related Activities

Milestone #8

Start Date:

End Date:

Related Activities

Milestone #9

Start Date:

End Date:

Related Activities

Milestone #10

Start Date:

End Date:

Related Activities

IV.G: Describe the planned duration for this overall investment. Discuss your long-term sustainability plans for the investment after your FY 2006 HSGP funds have been expended, if applicable. (Not to exceed 300 words)

The planned duration for this investment is the FY2006 grant period (24 months). For the longer-term, the Region will continue to conduct exercises with whatever resources are available. HS resources enable more realistic, inclusive scenarios that stretch capabilities.

INVESTMENT #

5

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

Investment Name: Communications Interoperability

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

\$13,680,000

I. BACKGROUND

I.A: Provide a summary description of this Investment and its purpose. (Not to exceed 200 words)

The purpose of this Investment is to continue implementation of the Metro Boston Homeland Security Region (MBHSR) Communications Interoperability Strategic Plan. This Investment will help ensure data and voice interoperability amongst the Region's first responders, and maintain common standards to ensure future investments are consistent with regional interoperability goals and requirements. Specific outcomes will include: 1) improved performance, capacity, and redundancy of existing communications systems; 2) new communications interoperability capabilities including equipment, supporting MOUs and SOPs, moving Fire Departments on VHF to UHF to ensure interoperability with other MBHSR agencies, implementing VHF/UHF/800 crossband repeat capabilities to ensure interoperability with non-MBHSR agencies, and enhancing interoperability between MBHSR agencies and the Massachusetts Bay Transit Authority (MBTA) for better response capabilities in the subway system; 3) improved data interoperability capabilities; 4) strengthening the Region's Communications Interoperability Governance Structure; and 5) interoperability training to ensure effective utilization of the capabilities.

I.B: Explain how the Investment will support the Implementation of an Initiative(s) from the Program and Capability Enhancement Plan, and the achievement of goals and objectives from your State/Urban Area homeland security strategy(ies). (Not to exceed 300 words)

This Investment aligns with the Commonwealth's Interoperable Communications Initiative as outlined in the Enhancement and Capabilities Plan. Members of this Investment's governance body, the Communications Interoperability Subcommittee, actively participate on the Commonwealth's governance body, the State Interoperability Committee. This Investment directly aligns to Goal 3, ensure the MBHSR can effectively respond to terrorist attacks and catastrophic events in both the short and long-term, Objective 3.1, establish and maintain a regional interoperable communications infrastructure in the Updated Urban Area Homeland Security Strategy. This Investment supports the achievement of Goal 3, Objective 3.1 through the following steps the MBHSR is working to implement: work to develop interdisciplinary and cross jurisdictional interoperable communications solutions; develop individual back-up plans for dispatch communications centers and systems; ensure each community's municipal chief executives have access to government emergency phone services and satellite phones as needed; and procure necessary equipment.

I.C: List up to four National Priority(ies) this investment primarily supports.

Strengthen Interoperable Communications Capabilities

Strengthen Emergency Operations Planning and Citizen Protection

Expanded Regional Collaboration

Strengthen Information Sharing and Collaboration Capabilities

I.D: List up to six Target Capability(ies) from the Target Capabilities List this Investment primarily supports.

Communications

Law Enforcement Investigation and Operations

Onsite Incident Management

Intelligence/Information Sharing and Dissemination

Public Safety and Security Response

II. REGIONALIZATION

II.A: Describe the geographic and demographic area(s) this Investment covers. (Not to exceed 275 words)

This Investment impacts the entire Region across the Law Enforcement, Fire Services, Emergency Medical Services, and Emergency Management disciplines. Boston's UASI Region, approximately 95 square miles, includes the Cities of Boston, Cambridge, Chelsea, Everett, Quincy, Revere, and Somerville, and the Towns of Brookline and Winthrop. The Region was selected in June 2003 based on the following criteria: 1) level of risk faced by a community, based primarily on potential target infrastructure; 2) level and availability of resources a community can bring to bear to assist Boston; 3) a community's role in assisting in an evacuation of Boston in the event of a critical incident; and 4) whether a community is contiguous with Boston. The resident population of the Region is 1,051,809 according to 2000 US Census Data; however, the daytime population estimates for Boston and Cambridge peg the total regional population as high as 2,560,000 persons. The Region contains a number of critical infrastructures, high-profile targets, and potential threat elements. Several high-profile, annual events draw more than a million spectators and participants into Boston. Major transportation networks exist within the Region. Logan International Airport, a \$6 billion per year critical infrastructure, is located in East Boston. Boston is home to several major transportation hubs, including North Station and South Station. The Port of Boston is the largest container port in New England and is the 22nd largest in the US. In addition, weekly Liquefied Gas (LNG) deliveries transit the Port of Boston and wind up in the Chelsea Creek.

INVESTMENT #

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

5

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

\$13,680,000

Investment Name: Communications Interoperability

II.B: Explain how the State/Urban Area is organizing to implement this investment over the identified geographic area(s).
(Not to exceed 300 words)

After being designated a high-threat urban area in July 2003, the Mayor's Office of Homeland Security (MOHS) was created to integrate and manage all HS activities across the MBHSR. MOHS led the creation of a 5-Year Communications Interoperability Strategic Plan which took a regional approach to addressing the complex problem of public safety interoperable communications. The Strategic Plan engaged over 21 MBHSR public safety agencies as well as discipline specific organizations and state HS bodies. This regional collaboration was formalized by the creation of the MBHSR Communications Interoperability Governance Structure. This investment will be implemented utilizing the existing governance bodies, outlined below, which meet regularly to coordinate interoperability planning. The MOHS works in concert with a central governing body, the Jurisdictional Point of Contact (JPOC) Committee to address homeland security issues. The JPOC Committee is comprised of one senior point of contact from each of the nine MBHSR jurisdictions. The JPOCs ensure open and clear communication amongst disciplines in their city or town and represent their jurisdiction's disciplines at the monthly JPOC meetings run by MOHS. From this body, the Communications Interoperability Subcommittee (CIS) was established to specifically address interoperability issues. CIS representation includes Law Enforcement, Fire Services, Emergency Medical Services, and Emergency Management from the nine jurisdictions as well as state organizations and regional consortia. The CIS meets monthly and establishes practitioner working groups to discuss emerging issues and provide research and recommendations. Each aspect of this investment will be implemented utilizing the governance structure described above. This practitioner driven approach will ensure regional collaboration, enhance cross discipline communication, and increase statewide coordination.

II.C: Discuss the collaboration process you have, or will establish, with other regions and jurisdictions (inter- and intra-State) within or beyond the geographic/demographic area of this investment. Discuss when and how you will engage stakeholders from those regions in specific support of this investment. (Not to exceed 500 words)

As outlined above, governance structures exist within the MBHSR which coordinate stakeholder participation on HS issues across the Region. Monthly JPOC Committee meetings, organized and run by MOHS, are open meetings attended by MOHS, the JPOCs, and State agency representatives. All Homeland Security policies, plans, and projects are reviewed and approved by the JPOCs. As such, decisions on the implementation of this investment will be reviewed regularly by the JPOCs. On a monthly basis the CIS also meets formally to collaborate and discuss projects that will help the MBHSR enhance its communications interoperability and improve the efficiency and effectiveness of its overall response capabilities. Membership of the CIS includes agencies both within and beyond the MBHSR Region. Specifically, membership includes Law Enforcement, Fire Services, Emergency Medical Services, and Emergency Management from each of the nine jurisdictions in the MBHSR. In addition, coordination with other regions is enhanced by the participation of stakeholders from several regional mutual aid organizations such as MetroFire and the Greater Boston Police Council. Agencies that operate across the state and provide stakeholder input include the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA), the Massachusetts State Police, and the Massachusetts Port Authority (Massport). As needed, the CIS assembles Working Groups to address specific interoperable communications projects. To date, the CIS has assembled Working Groups to collaborate on MBHSR Radio Spectrum needs, Minimum Equipment Standards, Communications Enhancement and Sustainability, Data Interoperability and Regional Channel Plans. In keeping with these established governance practices, the implementation of this investment will be driven by the participation of the CIS and Working Group members.

III. IMPACT

III.A: Discuss anticipated impacts of this investment and how the requested funding will help attain/achieve expected impacts. Consider the population and areas affected, and other entities (jurisdictions, disciplines) that could leverage the outcomes and impacts of the solution presented by this investment. (Not to exceed 500 words)

Since completion of the Strategic Plan that MBHSR created in August 2005, key steps have been taken and significant progress has been made. Standards were created to ensure commonality of equipment capabilities, radio functions, and channel assignments. Minimum equipment capabilities were created to ensure that new radios procured accommodate all of the shared and interoperability channels included in the regional channel plan, and can be upgraded to meet interoperability standards such as P25. The regional channel plan is almost complete and will ensure that radios are programmed to take advantage of all options for interoperable communications. MOUs have been developed to institutionalize the necessary agreements among jurisdictions, and SOPs have been developed for use of shared channels. Subscriber equipment was purchased to replace equipment that could not effectively accommodate the regional channel plan. This investment will build on this progress by: 1) improving redundancy, survivability, and sustainability of the communications systems, responders will have critical communications capabilities that can withstand the loss of key links, sites, and/or facilities. This ensures that the MBHSR is better able to maintain the communications necessary to respond to terrorist attacks/disasters. 2) By improving coverage, performance, and capacity of existing discipline-specific shared systems, the responders in the MBHSR can more effectively utilize capabilities already in-place. 3) By moving fire departments currently on VHF to UHF (which the majority of agencies are on), fire departments can communicate in a mutual aid response without requiring extra equipment and without tying up multiple channels required by crossband repeaters. 4) By creating links between discipline specific systems, providing equipment that allows access to multiple systems and developing corresponding MOUs and SOPs, multi-agency/jurisdiction communications can occur when needed. This will give incident commanders significantly more options in deploying/managing resources. 5) By building the capability to link disparate communications systems, the MBHSR agencies will be better able to interact with responders from other local agencies such as the Massachusetts State Police, MBTA personnel within the subway system, and MassPort, as well as responders from outside the region to support a major incident. 6) By enhancing secure, broadband data capabilities, data can be shared more effectively providing critical detailed information as needed to responders. 7) By institutionalizing the MBHSR's Communications Interoperability Governance Structure collaboration between jurisdictions and regional approaches will continue to be a priority. 8) By developing interoperability training and exercises, MBHSR personnel will more effectively utilize the resources and capabilities as described in the preceding items.

INVESTMENT #

5

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

Investment Name: Communications Interoperability

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

\$13,680,000

III.B: Discuss how the implementation of this investment will decrease or mitigate risk. (Not to exceed 500 words)

Communications interoperability is key to effective incident response; the ability of responders to relay critical information cannot be limited by their agency, discipline, jurisdiction, the frequency band on which their radios operate, their protocols, the format in which their data is maintained, and so on. At its most innocuous, lack of interoperability drains critical resources from other aspects of incident response, at its most serious, lack of interoperability can put responders' and the public's safety at risk. As part of the Strategic Plan development, the MBHSR identified a number of specific technology and operational gaps between their existing capabilities and the capabilities needed to provide effective interoperable communications in the region. These gaps included: 1) Lack of cross discipline/jurisdiction radio programming; 2) Age, condition, and upkeep of subscriber units and infrastructure; 3) Lack of radio coverage, capacity, and spectrum; 4) Limited regional mutual aid radio system capacity; 5) Disparate frequency bands between agencies; 6) Lack of MBHSR interoperability with Massachusetts State Police and various federal agencies; 7) Lack of data interoperability; 8) Lack of communications specific SOPs/MOUs; and 9) Lack of communications specific training. Work to date has made significant improvements in addressing issues 1, 2, and 8 in the list above. The investment request is to develop and implement solutions that mitigate the risks associated with the remaining gaps. To address the lack of coverage, capacity, and spectrum, and limited regional mutual aid radio system capacity, the investment will develop and implement capabilities to enhance the performance of existing discipline specific shared systems (e.g., BAPERN, Metrofire, BAMA). To address the disparate frequency bands between fire departments, the investment will move the three departments currently on VHF to UHF. To address the lack of MBHSR interoperability with the Massachusetts State Police and various federal agencies, whether as part of daily operations, to support a major event, or as incident response, the investment will implement VHF/UHF/800 crossband repeat capabilities. Specific capabilities will be implemented to enhance the ability of MBHSR agencies to interoperate with MBTA personnel in the subways. To address the lack of data interoperability, the investment will provide secure, broadband capabilities among jurisdictions with wireless access for responders in the field. To address the lack of communications specific training, the investment will develop training capabilities to ensure that MBHSR personnel will be able to effectively utilize the implemented interoperable communications capabilities. Finally, the investment will enhance the ability to sustain critical communications between dispatch, command staff, and emergency responders in the event of the loss of power, facilities, and/or access due to disaster or destruction associated with a major incident.

III.C: Describe what the potential Homeland Security risks of not funding this investment are. (Not to exceed 500 words)

Without this funding, Fire Departments in the Region that are currently operating on VHF systems will continue to require separate specific equipment to interoperate with the departments in the Region that are currently operating on UHF systems. Deployment of crossband equipment will be required for direct communication in mutual aid scenarios. The VHF departments will be limited in their ability to take advantage of the discipline specific shared systems that operate on UHF channels. Incident commanders will need to account for the limitations of the VHF users in responding to major incidents in the region, possibly by having to deploy radios during an incident while attempting to provide just-in-time training on the equipment. Without this funding, buildout of national interoperability channels will be limited. Situations in which responders from outside the region participate in the response will either require extensive (and expensive) pre-planning or the ability of incoming responders to support the response effort will be severely limited. Without this funding there will not be a permanent crossband capability that will allow emergency responders arriving at an incident to communicate regardless of whether they have VHF, UHF, or 800 MHz radios. Specialized equipment will need to be brought to a scene, delaying effective response for hours or longer. Without this funding, the effectiveness of the existing shared systems will be limited. Coverage and capacity issues will limit the effectiveness of responders. Existing communications capabilities will be vulnerable to major disasters or coordinated attack. While existing systems have been engineered to provide sustained communications in the face of minor issues (short-term power outages, for example), the lessons of the past several years have indicated that more creative and aggressive solutions are needed to ensure sustained interoperable communications in the face of catastrophic events. Without this funding, the interoperable communications capability of the Region remains vulnerable. Critical data will not be made available to the responders who need it in a timely manner and the capabilities and equipment put in place to date will not be used in an optimal manner due to inadequate training and SOP development. The MBHSR to date has made significant progress in developing more effective communications across disciplines and jurisdictions. The development of a regional channel plan provides an effective foundation for ensuring that future investment in communications capabilities serves a common goal for the Region.

IV. FUNDING & IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

IV.A: Investment Funding Plan

	FY 2006 Homeland Security Grant Program Request					FY 2006 HSGP Request Total	Other Funding Sources Applied	Grand Total
	SHSP	UASI	LETPP	MMRS	CCP			
Personnel								
Planning		\$4,580,000				\$4,580,000		\$4,580,000
Organization								
Equipment*		\$9,000,000				\$9,000,000		\$9,000,000
Training		\$100,000				\$100,000		\$100,000
Exercises								
M&A								
Total		\$13,680,000				\$13,680,000		\$13,680,000

*If you plan to purchase interoperable Communications Equipment, your investment justification must include discussion on planning, governance, training, policies, procedures, and/or exercises related to the equipment.

INVESTMENT #

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

5

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

\$13,680,000

Investment Name: Communications Interoperability

IV.B: Identify potential challenges to the effective implementation of this Investment (e.g., stakeholder buy-in, sustainability, aggressive timelines). (Not to exceed 300 words)

The criticality of improving communications interoperability, and the momentum created by establishing new working relationships among stakeholders, has created an important sense of urgency in completing the numerous objectives proposed for this Investment; as a consequence, the timelines for completion are aggressive, particularly with respect to engagement of the stakeholders. One of the hallmarks of the progress to date in the MBHSR has been the time and energy of key stakeholders in the decision making process. Given the goal of achieving key capabilities as quickly as possible, a key consideration is maintaining stakeholder involvement without overwhelming their primary responsibilities to their agencies. Another challenge is the complex interrelationship of the projects. For example, subscriber equipment purchases may depend on related infrastructure buildout which depends on licensing of spectrum which requires completion of system design. Also, sustainability capabilities for existing systems may not be cost effective if the systems will be replaced in the near-term. Maintaining an efficient implementation approach while still meeting goals in a timely manner requires careful and effective management of these things. A final challenge is availability of spectrum. Optimum implementation of the proposed projects requires additional spectrum. MBHSR has already begun taking steps to investigate alternative approaches to obtaining needed spectrum, including options beyond the traditional Part 90 frequencies and careful planning to take advantage of spectrum which may be made available as part of the overall Strategic Plan.

IV.C: Explain how the identified challenges will be addressed and mitigated. (Not to exceed 300 words)

To meet the above challenges, the MOHS has instituted several procedures to; ensure effective management of Investment funding, maximize stakeholder engagement, achieve timely results, and manage the complexity of the project dependencies. For example, the CIS Working Groups described in Section II provide a means for MBSHR stakeholders to prioritize and address issues and develop solutions on behalf of the Region. The Working Groups report progress back to the CIS on a monthly basis. The CIS voting members vote on major decision on behalf of the region. Working Group activities include a combination of in-person meetings and teleconferences using collaborative workgroup software to ensure that the groups can address key issues with a minimum impact to their primary agency job responsibilities. MOHS contractor support provides meeting organization and facilitation, knowledge capture, project status monitoring, and detailed technical research and engineering to all Working Groups and the CIS at large. To ensure management of the interdependent projects, status of the individual projects and the dependencies is tracked using project trackers. This information is reviewed with the CIS at monthly meetings to ensure that the stakeholders are informed about progress, and reprioritization as projects evolve can occur in a timely manner. To pursue spectrum, the MBHSR is pursuing spectrum currently regulated under 47 CFR 22 that requires a waiver for public safety use.

IV.D: Describe the management team, including roles and responsibilities, that will be accountable for the oversight and implementation of this Investment, and the overall management approach they will apply for the implementation of this Investment. (Not to exceed 300 words)

MOHS will lead implementation of this Investment. The MOHS staff is comprised of a Director, two Assistant Directors, a Finance Manager, and five Discipline Coordinators. The Director directs and oversees all aspects of MOHS and manages communication with the Mayor of Boston, the jurisdictions' Chief Executive Officers, and the JPOCs. The Assistant Directors handle Investment development, management, and coordination for the MBHSR and oversee the activities of the Discipline Coordinators. The Finance Manager is responsible for the fiscal tasks related to all regional HS grants, which includes administering the procurement of equipment for the jurisdictions. MOHS uses contract support for Communications Interoperability planning and implementation.

INVESTMENT #

5

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

\$13,680,000

Investment Name: Communications Interoperability

IV.E: Discuss funding resources beyond FY 2006 HSGP that have been identified and will be leveraged to support the implementation and sustainment of this investment. (Not to exceed 300 words)

Emergency responder agencies provide substantial in-kind contribution of time for planning and implementation activities. These responders, many of them high-ranking chief officers, have full-time operational roles and responsibilities. Availability exists, but is limited, which is a key reason why support resources are so valuable in ensuring strong planning and implementation of key projects. The MBHSR will continue to seek additional grant opportunities to support implementation of projects identified in the Communications Interoperability Strategic Plan. Recently, an Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program was used to procure equipment to enhance Boston Fire communications interoperability capabilities.

IV.F: Provide a high-level timeline, including milestones and dates, for the implementation of this investment. Possible areas for inclusion are: stakeholder engagement, planning, major acquisitions/purchases, training, exercises, and process/policy updates. Space is provided for up to 10 milestones, but not all 10 spaces may be necessary for the response. ("Milestone" not to exceed 125 characters / approximately 25 words and "Related Activities" not to exceed 500 characters / approximately 100 words)

Milestone #1 Move Chelsea, Revere, and Everett Fire Depts to UHF. Start Date: 7/1/06 End Date: 6/30/07

Related Activities Design UHF system solution. File frequency applications. Procure and install equipment. Test new system. Cut-over to new system.

Milestone #2 Build out crossband VHF/UHF/800 MHz repeaters in Region. Start Date: 10/1/06 End Date: 12/31/07

Related Activities Design system engineering solution. File frequency applications, as needed. Develop regional SOPs and MOUs for new repeated channels. Procure and install equipment. Test new system.

Milestone #3 Complete enhancements to improve sustainability of communications. Start Date: 4/1/06 End Date: 6/30/07

Related Activities Procure equipment for BAPERN back-up. Install and test BAPERN equipment. Identify back-up location for MetroFire and BAMA. Procure equipment for MetroFire and BAMA back-up. Install and test MetroFire and BAMA equipment.

Milestone #4 Complete enhancements to existing shared systems. Start Date: 7/1/06 End Date: 9/30/07

Related Activities Finalize regional requirements. Design system engineering solutions. Procure and install equipment. Test system enhancements.

Milestone #5 Complete enhanced secure inter-jurisdiction communications backbone. Start Date: 10/1/06 End Date: 9/30/07

Related Activities Finalize regional requirements. Design system engineering solutions. Develop regional SOPs and MOUs for new communications backbone. Procure and install equipment. Test regional network. Roll-out new network.

Buildout capabilities and complete MoUs and SOPs to enhance Start Date: 9/1/06

INVESTMENT #

5

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

\$13,680,000

Investment Name: Communications Interoperability

Milestone #6 interoperability between MBHSR agencies and MBTA. End Date: 9/30/07

Related Activities

Implement engineering solution. Procure and install equipment. Test interoperability in MBTA tunnels. Enhance SOPs and MOUs for communications in MBTA tunnels.

Milestone #7 Develop interoperable communications training. Start Date: 4/1/06 End Date: 12/31/07

Related Activities

Define training requirements for command staff, technical support, and emergency responders. Develop training curriculum and materials. Develop dissemination plan. Roll-out communications training.

Milestone #8 Start Date: End Date:

Related Activities

Milestone #9 Start Date: End Date:

Related Activities

Milestone #10 Start Date: End Date:

Related Activities

IV.G: Describe the planned duration for this overall investment. Discuss your long-term sustainability plans for the investment after your FY 2006 HSGP funds have been expended, if applicable. (Not to exceed 300 words)

As noted in the milestones above, the proposed investment would cover activities through December 2007. The expected life span of the infrastructure components, including UHF radio systems for the Fire Departments, crossband repeaters, sustainability enhancements, and so on, is 10-15 years. Part of the process that has been established for the purchase of equipment is review by the JPOC. Part of that review involves reviewing the maintenance and recurring costs (if any) of items to be procured. Long-term management, maintenance, and upgrade of the capabilities to be procured in this investment will be most effective with a continuation and institutionalization of the existing governance structure. The key is to build on the governance structure of the CIS and JPOCs. The CIS provides a forum for the jurisdictions to perform a number of key functions to ensure the continuing progress in achieving interoperability:

- Maintain and update the standards being developed on topics such as minimum equipment capabilities.
- Maintain and update the regional channel plan.
- Maintain and update MoUs and SOPs.
- Pursue opportunities for additional funding.

The projects proposed in this Investment Justification are designed to be completed within the schedule and budget of the investment, and no critical milestones are projected to be outside the grant period.

INVESTMENT #

State/Territory Name:

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

6

FY 2006 Urban Area Name:

Investment Name:

I. BACKGROUND

I.A: Provide a summary description of this investment and its purpose. (Not to exceed 200 words)

This purpose of this investment is to assess the vulnerability of and harden critical infrastructure (CI) against terrorist attacks and other hazards across the Metro Boston Homeland Security Region (MBHSR), as required under the Nation Priority "Implement the Interim NIPP." To date, 40 MBHSR stakeholders across disciplines have been trained to conduct CI assessments using a FEMA-prescribed methodology. Fifteen critical municipal sites were evaluated by teams comprised of the MBHSR stakeholders and site security subject matter experts. The sites house either capabilities and/or systems critical to ensuring operational readiness and response capacity or are of public significance such that they might be attractive targets for terrorism. The teams developed Protective Measures Plans (PMPs) for the 15 sites, which identify and provide vulnerabilities, risks, and mitigation solutions; how to deter, devalue, detect, and defend the sites; associated project costs; and templates to prepare plans and procedures for security and emergency response. FY2006 funds are sought for implementation of key prioritized elements of the PMPs for the 15 sites.

I.B: Explain how the investment will support the implementation of an initiative(s) from the Program and Capability Enhancement Plan, and the achievement of goals and objectives from your State/Urban Area homeland security strategy(ies). (Not to exceed 300 words)

This investment supports the Commonwealth's Initiatives of Information Sharing, Interoperable Communications, Improved Explosive Devices, CBRNE Preparedness, and Disaster Recovery as outlined in the Enhancement and Capabilities Plan. This investment directly aligns to Goal 2, ensure the MBHSR can effectively protect the Region from terrorist attacks and catastrophic events, Objective 2.2, assess the vulnerability of and harden critical infrastructure, in the Updated Urban Area Homeland Security Strategy. This investment supports the achievement of Goal 2 Objective 2.2 through the following steps: implement appropriate target-hardening enhancements to critical sites throughout the Region including active and passive measures such as equipment, policies, procedures, and training; develop a uniform system to secure the vulnerability of each discipline's respective agency infrastructure, vehicles, and personnel equipment; and continue to develop plans and activities that will secure major regional assets.

I.C: List up to four National Priority(ies) this investment primarily supports.

I.D: List up to six Target Capability(ies) from the Target Capabilities List this investment primarily supports.

II. REGIONALIZATION

II.A: Describe the geographic and demographic area(s) this investment covers. (Not to exceed 275 words)

The 15 sites identified for hardening under this investment are located throughout the Region; therefore this investment impacts the entire Region. Boston's UASI Region, approximately 95 square miles, includes the Cities of Boston, Cambridge, Chelsea, Everett, Quincy, Revere, and Somerville, and the Towns of Brookline and Winthrop. The Region was selected in June 2003 based on the following criteria: 1) level of risk faced by a community, based primarily on potential target infrastructure; 2) level and availability of resources a community can bring to bear to assist Boston; 3) a community's role in assisting in an evacuation of Boston in the event of a critical incident; and 4) whether a community is contiguous with Boston. This investment primarily supports Law Enforcement, Fire Services, Emergency Medical Services, and peripherally supports Emergency Management. The resident population of the Region is 1,051,809 according to 2000 US Census Data; however, the daytime population estimates for Boston and Cambridge peg the total regional population as high as 2,560,000 persons. The Region contains a number of critical infrastructures, high-profile targets, and potential threat elements. Several high-profile, annual events draw more than a million spectators and participants into Boston. Major transportation networks exist within the Region. Logan International Airport, a \$6 billion per year critical infrastructure, is located in East Boston. Boston is home to several major transportation hubs, including North Station and South Station. The Port of Boston is the largest container port in New England and is the 22nd largest in the US. In addition, weekly Liquefied Gas (LNG) deliveries transit the Port of Boston and wind up in the Chelsea Creek.

INVESTMENT #

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

6

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

\$4,800,000

Investment Name: Critical Infrastructure/Site Protection Project

II.B: Explain how the State/Urban Area is organizing to implement this investment over the identified geographic area(s).
(Not to exceed 300 words)

The Mayor's Office of Homeland Security's (MOHS) works with the UASI communities and regional stakeholders to leverage MBHSR resources that enhance capacities in the areas of prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery from CBRNE incidents and major disasters across the Region. The MOHS staff is grant-funded and works full-time to coordinate, manage, assist, and move forward the MBHSR Investments and to serve as the fiduciary for the Region's HS grant programming. To identify sites for this investment, the MOHS staff worked in concert with a central body, the Jurisdictional Point of Contact (JPOC) Committee. The JPOC Committee is comprised of one senior point of contact from each of the nine jurisdictions. The JPOCs were appointed by the jurisdiction's Chief Executive Officer. The JPOCs ensure open and clear communication amongst disciplines in their city or town and represent their jurisdiction's disciplines at the monthly JPOC meetings run by MOHS. Utilizing FY2006 funds, MOHS will expand this investment to include key state assets located in the Region.

II.C: Discuss the collaboration process you have, or will establish, with other regions and jurisdictions (inter- and intra-State) within or beyond the geographic/demographic area of this investment. Discuss when and how you will engage stakeholders from those regions in specific support of this investment. (Not to exceed 500 words)

The MBHSR collaboration processes focus on the distribution of support throughout the Region, as many partners already have full-time jobs. The MBHSR collaborates formally through monthly JPOC Committee meetings. Outside the monthly meetings, collaboration occurs through the MBHSR website, emails, phone calls, informal meetings, and meetings within each jurisdiction. Monthly JPOC Committee meetings are organized and run by MOHS. The meetings are open meetings and are attended by MOHS, the JPOCs, State agency representatives, and MOHS contractors, as needed. Frequent agenda items include administrative updates, MBHSR investment updates, and Discipline updates. As the JPOCs are the coordinating body for the Critical Infrastructure and Site Protection Investment, this investment is frequently discussed at the JPOC meetings. The last 30 minutes of the meeting are saved for open discussion. MOHS worked initially with the JPOCs to identify key sites for evaluation and institution of countermeasures. After choosing the sites, MOHS worked with the JPOCs to identify MBHSR stakeholders to work with site security subject matter experts to conduct the assessments of the 15 sites. The stakeholders and subject matter experts used the assessment methodology identified by DHS/FEMA Publication 452 "A How-To Guide to Mitigate Potential Terrorist Attacks Against Buildings" expanded to an all-hazards approach. Implementing DHS's published methods illustrates the commitment of the MBHSR to accept and collaborate with DHS. Further, using this approach the MBHSR sets the foundation for additional assessments to be performed in a manner that provides thorough, consistent, and comparable risk assessments to evaluate and mitigate critical infrastructure sites throughout the Region. MOHS will follow a similar process to expand this investment to key state assets in the Region. As the Region begins implementation of the Protective Measure Plans, new equipment will need to be procured. The execution of equipment procurement across the jurisdictions requires significant collaboration between MOHS and the MBHSR partners. The JPOCs sign-off on HS equipment procurements for their jurisdiction. The MOHS Finance Manager coordinates across City of Boston agencies, as fiduciary, including City Auditing, Office of Budget and Management, Purchasing Division, and Management and Information Systems, for administrative support for procurements. In addition, MOHS has partnerships with emergency responder agencies in the Region, both at the accounting and finance and operational levels, to ensure project management and equipment tracking tasks are handled.

III. IMPACT

III.A: Discuss anticipated impacts of this investment and how the requested funding will help attain/achieve expected impacts. Consider the population and areas affected, and other entities (jurisdictions, disciplines) that could leverage the outcomes and impacts of the solution presented by this investment. (Not to exceed 500 words)

The Critical Infrastructure Site Protection investment results in the hardening of potential targets against threats and hazards, by addressing physical, cyber, and human elements. With the implementation of the Protective Measure Plans, improved surveillance and security operations will be in place at sites identified as potential targets throughout the Region. This results in critical capabilities and systems across the Region being protected and better enables the Region to avoid an incident, intervene to stop an incident and protect the resources and personnel necessary to respond to an incident. Through the site assessments the MBHSR develops an understanding of threats and vulnerabilities related to critical facilities, systems, and functions. As mitigation measures are instituted, vulnerability of critical infrastructure to deter, mitigate, or neutralize terrorist attacks, major disasters, and other emergencies is reduced.

INVESTMENT #

6

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

\$4,800,000

Investment Name: Critical Infrastructure/Site Protection Project

III.B: Discuss how the implementation of this investment will decrease or mitigate risk. (Not to exceed 500 words)

Overall, the successful implementation of this investment ensures critical sites are hardened against threats and hazards and effective security of critical infrastructures, which decreases the likelihood of a terrorist attack. Through implementation of the Protective Measure Plans critical capabilities and systems will be protected, which decreases the likelihood of physical damage to structural and non-structural components of buildings and related infrastructures and casualties resulting from a terrorist attack, major disaster, or other emergency. Vulnerability of critical infrastructure is decreased as mitigation measures are instituted. A few examples of the proposed protective measures that reduce the vulnerability to multiple threats/hazards for multiple functions include:

- Updating, replacing, providing security access controls, lighting, cameras, monitoring stations, and security procedures to reduce vulnerability to explosive blast (from vehicle or individuals), to detect and deter armed attackers, to reduce vulnerability to civil disruption, and to detect and reduce vulnerability to the placement/release of CBR agents to all functions at each site
- Modifying building HVAC controls at central systems to allow single-point/emergency shut down of air intakes, providing positive pressure environments to key functional areas, installation of filters, and installing sensors on air intakes reduces the risk to most or all functions within a building for certain CBR events.
- Developing and documenting shelter-in-place and emergency response procedures (including identification of ICS roles) reduces vulnerability by improving emergency response to blast, CBR, and natural hazard events for all functions at each site.
- Protecting glazing (glass windows and doors) with fragment retention films, replacing standard glazing with ballistic resistant systems, and provide blast curtains behind windows reduces vulnerability to explosive blast and to armed attack for the functions at the facilities that are located along the perimeter of the building or adjacent windows.
- Expanding perimeter hardening by enhancing buffer zones, fencing, and structural integrity.
- Providing lateral bracing of IT/Com/Data Servers reduces vulnerability to displacement and damage of this equipment from blast and seismic events.

Finally, the collaboration in place between MOHS, the JPOCs, MBHSR stakeholders, and state stakeholders decreases the risk of resource ineffectiveness. Together MBHSR and state stakeholders will collaborate to ensure the most efficient use of stakeholders' time and available funding.

III.C: Describe what the potential Homeland Security risks of not funding this investment are. (Not to exceed 500 words)

Not funding this investment will result in critical sites remaining at their baseline level of risk and vulnerability. The Region would not be able to fully implement the Protective Measure Plans for the 15 identified sites. In the event of a terrorist attack, major disaster, or other emergency, critical sites may be destroyed or their capacities may become severely diminished. As many of the facilities are government buildings, if destroyed or diminished, critical response capabilities would be eliminated or limited and the public's trust in the government's ability to protect them would be undermined. Without the collaboration in place between MOHS, the JPOCs, MBHSR stakeholders, and State stakeholders, resources, including stakeholders' time and available funding, may not be used most efficiently. The stakeholders would not leverage each other's knowledge and experiences and approaches to harden critical sites would vary.

IV. FUNDING & IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

IV.A: Investment Funding Plan

	FY 2006 Homeland Security Grant Program Request					FY 2006 HSGP Request Total	Other Funding Sources Applied	Grand Total
	SHSP	UASI	LETPP	MMRS	CCP			
Personnel								
Planning								
Organization								
Equipment*		\$4,800,000				\$4,800,000		\$4,800,000
Training								
Exercises								
M&A								
Total		\$4,800,000				\$4,800,000		\$4,800,000

*If you plan to purchase Interoperable Communications Equipment, your investment justification must include discussion on planning, governance, training, policies, procedures, and/or exercises related to the equipment.

INVESTMENT #

6

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

\$4,800,000

Investment Name: Critical Infrastructure/Site Protection Project

IV.B: Identify potential challenges to the effective implementation of this investment (e.g., stakeholder buy-in, sustainability, aggressive timelines). (Not to exceed 300 words)

The overall challenge to effective implementation of this investment is a lack of funding for subject matter expert support to assist in conducting site assessments and developing and implementing Protective Measure Plans. In addition, funding availability is critical to procure necessary equipment to harden the identified sites. Another challenge to effective implementation is achieving stakeholder buy-in on the Protective Measure Plans. Following buy-in, the Region then faces the challenge of prioritization of Protective Measure Plans implementation based on available funds and cost benefit analysis. Physical security changes are easy to implement; however many of the sites may require changes in operational policies and procedures or may require increased staffing which requires significant time, buy-in, and funding to successfully implement.

IV.C: Explain how the identified challenges will be addressed and mitigated. (Not to exceed 300 words)

To date, the funding challenge has been mitigated through use of the UASI funds. Additional funding will be sought from the identified sites and additional grant programs supporting the protection of critical infrastructure assets. Stakeholder buy-in has been addressed with the creation of teams comprised of MBHSR resources and security subject matter experts to identify and assess sites and to develop and implement Protective Measure Plans. All sites will be called upon to ensure that their commitment to decreasing risk and vulnerability at the site is strong and that willingness to implement policy changes is established up-front.

IV.D: Describe the management team, including roles and responsibilities, that will be accountable for the oversight and implementation of this investment, and the overall management approach they will apply for the implementation of this investment. (Not to exceed 300 words)

MOHS is leading implementation of this investment. The MOHS staff is comprised of a Director, two Assistant Directors, a Finance Manager, and five Discipline Coordinators. The Director directs and oversees all aspects of MOHS and manages communication with the Mayor of Boston, the jurisdictions' Chief Executive Officers, and the JPOCs. The Assistant Directors handle investment development, management, and coordination for the MBHSR and oversee the activities of the Discipline Coordinators. The Finance Manager is responsible for the fiscal tasks related to all regional HS grants, which includes administering the procurement of equipment for the jurisdictions. MOHS worked initially with the JPOCs to identify key sites for evaluation and institution of countermeasures. After choosing the sites, MOHS worked with the JPOCs to identify MBHSR stakeholders to conduct the assessments of the 15 sites. MOHS also solicited contract support to work with the MBHSR stakeholders to conduct the assessments. Contract support will also be used to integrate protective measures and enhance policies and procedures. The Assistant Directors oversee the activities of the contractors.

INVESTMENT #

6

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

\$4,800,000

Investment Name: Critical Infrastructure/Site Protection Project

IV.E: Discuss funding resources beyond FY 2006 HSGP that have been identified and will be leveraged to support the implementation and sustainment of this investment. (Not to exceed 300 words)

Additional funding will be sought from the identified sites and grant programs supporting the protection of critical infrastructure assets (to be identified in the DHS Preparedness Directorate guidance later this year). Additional staffing support will be sought from the identified sites.

IV.F: Provide a high-level timeline, including milestones and dates, for the implementation of this investment. Possible areas for inclusion are: stakeholder engagement, planning, major acquisitions/purchases, training, exercises, and process/policy updates. Space is provided for up to 10 milestones, but not all 10 spaces may be necessary for the response. ("Milestone" not to exceed 125 characters / approximately 25 words and "Related Activities" not to exceed 500 characters / approximately 100 words)

Milestone #1

Complete FEMA 452 training – Methodology for Preparing Threat Assessments for Commercial Buildings.

Start Date: 10/1/06

End Date: 10/31/06

Related Activities

Identify stakeholders who require FEMA 452 training.

Milestone #2

Complete implementation of Critical Infrastructure Site Protection Phase 1 Protective Measure Plans.

Start Date: 6/1/06

End Date: 5/31/08

Related Activities

Conduct stakeholder meetings to discuss progress on implementation of Protective Measure Plans. Track progress on implementation of Protective Measure Plans. Procure necessary equipment to implement Protective Measure Plans.

Milestone #3

Start Date:

End Date:

Related Activities

Milestone #4

Start Date:

End Date:

Related Activities

Milestone #5

Start Date:

End Date:

Related Activities

Start Date:

INVESTMENT #

6

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

\$4,800,000

Investment Name: Critical Infrastructure/Site Protection Project

Milestone #8

End Date:

Related Activities

Milestone #7

Start Date:

End Date:

Related Activities

Milestone #8

Start Date:

End Date:

Related Activities

Milestone #9

Start Date:

End Date:

Related Activities

Milestone #10

Start Date:

End Date:

Related Activities

IV.G: Describe the planned duration for this overall investment. Discuss your long-term sustainability plans for the investment after your FY 2006 HSGP funds have been expended, if applicable. (Not to exceed 300 words)

This investment will span the full FY2006 grant period (24 months). Physical security sustainability and strategies to ensure sustainability of staff and policy and procedure enhancements will be key elements of the Protective Measure Plans developed for the sites.

INVESTMENT #

7

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

\$5,724,000

Investment Name: Metro Boston Regional Intelligence Center

I. BACKGROUND

I.A: Provide a summary description of this investment and its purpose. (Not to exceed 200 words)

This investment continues the development of the Metro Boston Regional Intelligence Center (BRIC), providing a regional infrastructure for intelligence sharing on WMD threats and terrorism. The BRIC will ensure that systems are in place for intelligence collection, information sharing, and communication flow across jurisdictions and disciplines. Investment priorities include: expanding the Boston Police Department's (BPD) secure website for intelligence gathering and sharing; enhancing regional response capabilities during an incident; and establishing classification procedures and methods to maximize the timeliness of information sharing. Costs associated with this investment include planning and consultant costs, infrastructure and equipment enhancements (software/hardware); planning; overtime and backfill for training and exercises; and staff augmentation. A direct link between the BRIC and the Commonwealth's statewide fusion process, with a direct link to the Massachusetts State Police Fusion Center is also a significant deliverable of this investment. The build out of the BRIC will also serve to manage the flow of information and intelligence across multiple layers of public and private sector entities throughout the Region.

I.B: Explain how the investment will support the implementation of an initiative(s) from the Program and Capability Enhancement Plan, and the achievement of goals and objectives from your State/Urban Area homeland security strategy(ies). (Not to exceed 300 words)

This investment aligns with the Commonwealth's Information Sharing Initiative as outlined in the Enhancement and Capabilities Plan. The BRIC, serving as the primary information collection and intelligence analysis function for the Metro Boston Homeland Security (MBHSR), will link into the Commonwealth's fusion process. Policies established at the state level will be adopted by the BRIC, ensuring that information can flow both up and down, as well as across the five statewide HS regions. This investment corresponds to three of the five State strategic goals, and supports the achievement of Urban Area Homeland Security Strategy Goal 1 Objective 1.2, ensuring the MBHSR can actively prevent and deter, as well as prepare for, terrorist attacks and catastrophic events. By establishing and streamlining information sharing and collection processes relating to terrorism intelligence/early warning systems across the Region, the MBHSR is better equipped to deter incidents or terrorism. The MBHSR continues to implement this investment through the development of and implementation of a formal regional infrastructure for intelligence collection and information sharing on WMD threats and terrorism, in compliance with state established policies, HSPD-8 and other federal statutes, across the communities and disciplines, improving upon existing organizational relationships between local, state, and federal government; and committing to operational training and exercises associated with intelligence activities.

I.C: List up to four National Priority(ies) this investment primarily supports.

Strengthen Information Sharing and Collaboration Capabilities

Strengthen CBRNE Detection, Response, & Decontamination Capabilities

I.D: List up to six Target Capability(ies) from the Target Capabilities List this investment primarily supports.

Info Gathering & Recognition of Indicators & Warnings

Intelligence Analysis and Production

Intelligence/Information Sharing and Dissemination

Law Enforcement Investigation and Operations

CBRNE Detection

Communications

II. REGIONALIZATION

II.A: Describe the geographic and demographic area(s) this investment covers. (Not to exceed 275 words)

This investment impacts the Region across law enforcement agencies including sworn personnel, geospatial information specialists, crime analysts, and intelligence officers. During the FY2005 grant period, and continuing into FY2006, outreach will be provided to emergency responder agencies, including Fire Services, EMS, and Public Health. Boston's UASI Region, approximately 95 square miles, includes the Cities of Boston, Cambridge, Chelsea, Everett, Quincy, Revere, and Somerville, and the Towns of Brookline and Winthrop. The Region was selected in June 2003 based on the following criteria: 1) level of risk faced by a community, based primarily on potential target infrastructure; 2) level and availability of resources a community can bring to bear to assist Boston; 3) a community's role in assisting in an evacuation of Boston in the event of a critical incident; and 4) whether a community is contiguous with Boston. The resident population of the Region is 1,051,809 according to 2000 US Census Data; however, the daytime population estimates for Boston and Cambridge peg the total regional population as high as 2,560,000 persons. The Region contains a number of critical infrastructures, high-profile targets, and potential threat elements. Several high-profile, annual events draw more than a million spectators and participants into Boston. Major transportation networks exist within the Region. Logan International Airport, a \$6 billion per year critical infrastructure, is located in East Boston. Boston is home to several major transportation hubs, including North Station and South Station. The Port of Boston is the largest container port in New England and is the 22nd largest in the US. In addition, weekly Liquefied Gas (LNG) deliveries transit the Port of Boston and wind up in the Chelsea Creek.

INVESTMENT #

7

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

\$5,724,000

Investment Name: Metro Boston Regional Intelligence Center

II.B: Explain how the State/Urban Area is organizing to implement this Investment over the Identified geographic area(s).
(Not to exceed 300 words)

The Mayor's Office of Homeland Security (MOHS) works with the UASI communities and regional stakeholders to leverage resources that enhance capacities in the areas of prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery from CBRNE incidents and major disasters across the Region. MOHS collaborates with the Jurisdictional Point of Contact (JPOC) Committee and the MBHSR Discipline Subcommittees. The JPOC Committee is comprised of one senior point of contact from each of the nine UASI jurisdictions who were appointed by the jurisdiction's Chief Executive Officer. This Committee ensures open and clear communication amongst disciplines in their jurisdiction and represents their jurisdiction's disciplines at the monthly JPOC meetings. The six MBHSR Discipline Subcommittees bring together representatives from Law Enforcement, Fire Services, EMS, Emergency Management, Public Health, and Health Care, to discuss, coordinate, develop plans, and guide implementation of their discipline specific initiatives across the Region. Through the JPOC and Discipline Subcommittee structure, the Region is able to leverage responders across all Regions and disciplines to participate in this Investment. Direct oversight of the development and implementation of the BRIC is managed primarily by the BPD, with policy and administrative oversight provided by MOHS. The newly established Regional Intelligence Advisory Board will also provide high level direction and guidance on the continued development of the BRIC policies. MOHS staff works with BRIC personnel to oversee and coordinate the procurement and installation of BRIC equipment, and serves as the central point of contact for OGT training associated with intelligence and information sharing, as allowed by the grant program. State partners have been assigned to the BRIC, including the MBTA Police, Massachusetts State Police, and corrections. The MBHSR Law Enforcement Subcommittee is also actively involved in BRIC activities, ensuring an additional layer of participation and feedback.

II.C: Discuss the collaboration process you have, or will establish, with other regions and jurisdictions (inter- and intra-State) within or beyond the geographic/demographic area of this Investment. Discuss when and how you will engage stakeholders from those regions in specific support of this Investment. (Not to exceed 500 words)

The BRIC has been developed with the clear understanding that information sharing cannot be limited to the nine communities that comprise the MBHSR. Permanent stakeholders of the BRIC are the municipalities within the UASI region: Boston, Brookline, Cambridge, Chelsea, Everett, Quincy, Revere, Somerville, and Winthrop. The BRIC is connected to the Massachusetts State Police's Fusion Center, a 24 hour statewide information sharing center among local, state, and federal public safety agencies and private sector organizations, to connect intelligence infrastructures and will continue to explore other statewide HS regions and their capabilities to a fused intelligence infrastructure. Other government stakeholders include the CFC, The FBI Joint Terrorism Task Force and DHS. Within each municipality, stakeholders include executive level decision makers, public safety (police and fire) public health, schools and transportation departments. Just recently, the BPD assigned staff to work in DHS's Homeland Security Operations Center in Washington D.C., which enables information to flow between the Metro Boston area and the federal level. Decision makers utilize intelligence provided by the BRIC to determine resource allocation for preparedness and prevention. Public safety emergency responders within municipal police, fire, and public health departments are positioned to provide enhanced collection and are the primary recipients of timely actionable intelligence products. Further, municipal school and transportation departments are also important intelligence collection conduits and would, in the case of a critical incident, be heavily impacted. In addition to public sector entities, a growing category of stakeholders within the UASI Region includes members of the private sector. Sectors that have been identified and which are active participants in the process include the financial sector, health care, biotech, education, private and public transportation, property management, private security, and the hotel industry. These private sector entities are valuable resources for generating vulnerability and potential target information and are heavily impacted by public safety conditions. In the event of an evolving critical incident, members of these sectors could provide early warning on crisis development and would be an important factor in recovery efforts.

III. IMPACT

III.A: Discuss anticipated impacts of this Investment and how the requested funding will help attain/achieve expected impacts. Consider the population and areas affected, and other entities (jurisdictions, disciplines) that could leverage the outcomes and impacts of the solution presented by this Investment. (Not to exceed 500 words)

Effective terrorism prevention, protection, response, and recovery efforts depend on timely, accurate information. Utilizing previous FY UASI funding and other available MBHSR resources, the Region has developed plans for the regional intelligence center to enhance MBHSR capabilities to gather, analyze, disseminate, and use information regarding threats, vulnerabilities, and consequences, to support prevention, investigations, and response efforts. The development of the BRIC will be done in coordination with the State's ongoing development of the statewide fusion center process, and will be connected to the Massachusetts State Police's Fusion Center and other state HS regions. The intelligence cycle involves translating raw information into finished intelligence products for use in decision making and formulating policies and actions. The intelligence process for the BRIC includes developing requirements, planning and direction, collection, processing and exploitation, analysis and production, dissemination, and evaluation/reevaluation. FY2006 UASI funding and other resources will be utilized to complete planning for the BRIC and to implement the BRIC information sharing and intelligence operations, which includes procuring and installing a strong technology infrastructure and associated equipment internally, as well as outside the BRIC (within MBHSR departments), and completing regional training to improve the regional intelligence and information collection operations. This Investment will also impact the ability of the Region to properly staff the BRIC. Personnel from each jurisdiction will be assigned to the BRIC and will work in a coordinated fashion to deter any possible attacks. Funding under this Investment will ensure staff receives adequate training in areas such as intelligence analysis, geospatial analysis, computer forensics, linking organized crime and terrorism, and extremist groups. Providing a regional approach to this Investment is critically necessary for all law enforcement agencies, as shared information is the most effective means to prevent possible incidents of terrorism. Each MBHSR law enforcement partner will be directly involved in day to day information sharing and collection. A common operating picture of the Region's potential risk to major incidents will be further provided to rank and file personnel on the streets through the information and intelligence gathered by BRIC staff.

INVESTMENT #

7

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

Investment Name: Metro Boston Regional Intelligence Center

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

\$5,724,000

III.B: Discuss how the implementation of this Investment will decrease or mitigate risk. (Not to exceed 500 words)

The implementation of this Investment is specifically designed to decrease the risk of a potential terrorist attack or the impact of a terrorist attack, through increased intelligence capabilities across the Region to gather, analyze, disseminate, and use information regarding threats, vulnerabilities, and consequences. BRIC enhancements to the current infrastructure include: 1) Portable Voice/Data Communication Box, a portable communications rack that contains all the telecommunications equipment required to enable or enhance voice and data communications for any desired location. This configuration would be utilized to enable locations as command and control centers as needed; 2) Virtual Private Network, providing a wireless access point allowing both BPD and other state, local, and federal partners to wirelessly connect to the BRIC network for electronic data exchange and information sharing; 3) Direct Internet Point of Presence (POP), providing the telecommunications equipment and network connections that would connect the BPD Wide Area Network (WAN) to the Internet backbone. This connection would also provide redundancy to the single Internet connection currently used via Boston City Hall; and 4) a full upgrade to the BPD Local Area Network/WAN Infrastructure, enabling applications, such as the video surveillance cameras under the Harbor Security Investment, to run over the BRIC infrastructure. All of these technological enhancements serve to connect the Region's communities and State partners with real time information. Staffing is a critical element, where qualified individuals are assigned to the BRIC on a functional basis, to include: critical infrastructure; domestic and international terrorism; precursor crime; white supremacists/anarchists/animal and environmental extremist groups; a UASI liaison; utilities and telecommunications; and financial/identity theft. Training for BRIC employees maximizes their ability to effectively use available analytical tools in support of the various intelligence functions. Additional training is provided to cover facility security, operations and information security, as well as BRIC policies and procedures. BRIC management supports and will adhere to training guidelines set forth in the National Criminal Intelligence Sharing Plan. Furthermore, BRIC personnel will meet the core training standards developed by the Global Information Working Group and Counter Terrorism Training Coordination Working Group. The training philosophy within the BRIC will also focus on building awareness, institutionalizing the importance of criminal intelligence, increasing the value of intelligence employees, fostering relationships among the law enforcement community, and improving the ability to detect and prevent acts of terrorism and other crimes. BRIC personnel have already undergone analytical training from the following groups: ANACAPA Sciences, ESRI, Alpha Group, NESPIN, ROCIC, IALEIA, and IACP.

III.C: Describe what the potential Homeland Security risks of not funding this Investment are. (Not to exceed 500 words)

The overall risk of not funding this Investment is the inability of the Region to detect a potential terrorist attack or the ability to effectively respond to a terrorist attack. Currently intelligence capabilities in the Region are disconnected, where information collected is limited to both singular communities and the law enforcement discipline. More specifically, the greatest detriment the MBHSR would face should funding not be made available for this Investment is the inability for the Region to move forward, in alignment with the State's fusion process plan for statewide information sharing. MOHS sees this Investment as a critical priority for both the Region and the State in meeting the joint goal to effective information sharing and intelligence collection. The BRIC has made significant accomplishments during the previous year in working toward a sound operational and strategic system. Its current state however, still lacks the connectivity required to implement those operational plans, where law enforcement agencies are still faced with staffing and technological challenges that prohibit a smooth, working system. The technological infrastructure needed for regional information sharing and intelligence gathering, analysis, and dissemination is severely limited. The BPD, the MBHSR's largest police department, is relied on for its support in this Investment. If needs are not met to make the appropriate and necessary enhancements to it infrastructure, the Region will remain disconnected.

IV. FUNDING & IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

IV.A: Investment Funding Plan

	FY 2006 Homeland Security Grant Program Request					FY 2006 HSGP Request Total	Other Funding Sources Applied	Grand Total
	SHSP	UASI	LETPP	MMRS	CCP			
Personnel		\$705,000				\$705,000		\$705,000
Planning		\$2,254,000				\$2,254,000		\$2,254,000
Organization								
Equipment*		\$2,565,000				\$2,565,000		\$2,565,000
Training		\$200,000				\$200,000		\$200,000
Exercises								
M&A								
Total		\$5,724,000				\$5,724,000		\$5,724,000

*If you plan to purchase interoperable Communications Equipment, your Investment Justification must include discussion on planning, governance, training, policies, procedures, and/or exercises related to the equipment.

INVESTMENT #

7

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

\$5,724,000

Investment Name: Metro Boston Regional Intelligence Center

IV.B: Identify potential challenges to the effective implementation of this investment (e.g., stakeholder buy-in, sustainability, aggressive timelines). (Not to exceed 300 words)

The overall challenges we face in an effort to complete the implementation of this investment across the Region is: 1) a lack of funding to pay planning and consultant costs, infrastructure enhancements, equipment, training, exercises, overtime and backfill for training and exercises, and staff augmentation; 2) achieving buy-in and support for the BRIC from Chief Executive Officers; 3) reaching agreement on policies and procedures; and 4) implementing connections and accessibility across regional departments.

IV.C: Explain how the identified challenges will be addressed and mitigated. (Not to exceed 300 words)

The first challenge of lack of funding to pay for the development, implementation, and maintenance of the BRIC is mitigated through applying for FY2006 UASI funds and any other funding made available to the Region. As the plans for the BRIC were developed with the understanding that federal grant funding may well cease at some point in the future, MOHS continues to assess other resources, operational and otherwise, to support the costs to maintain the BRIC long-term including the necessary staff augmentation and infrastructure maintenance. However, in order to ensure that this is done, MBHSR is committed to providing funding support to build up the baseline costs, which include planning and consultant costs, infrastructure enhancements, equipment, training, exercises, and overtime and backfill for training and exercises for this investment. Steps have already been taken to gain buy-in from the Region's Jurisdiction Point of Contacts (Committee), which MOHS fully expects to then be communicated to Chief Executive Officers. The Regional Intelligence Advisory Board, led by the Mayor's Homeland Security Advisor (and MOHS Director) will be a critical asset in achieving stakeholder buy-in. The Board's primary function is to ensure that regional information sharing and intelligence gathering is conducted and managed in a way that is not only effective and serves the overall investment mission, but also recognizes the unique structure of the Region's partners. Further, a formal operating policy has been drafted and is being reviewed and updated to ensure inclusion across the Region. Mitigating the technological challenges will require a greater degree of effort and time. Some means to achieve this include coordinating with other non-public safety agencies for resource and technical assistance; using non-paid staff (interns) when appropriate; negotiating with software companies to omit maintenance fees on new technology; and to utilizing the academic community's community service requirements for technical and policy assistance.

IV.D: Describe the management team, including roles and responsibilities, that will be accountable for the oversight and implementation of this investment, and the overall management approach they will apply for the implementation of this investment. (Not to exceed 300 words)

MOHS is leading implementation of this investment in coordination with the BPD. The BRIC operates within the defined governance structure of the BPD under the MOHS. It consists of two co-located entities: The Boston Police Intelligence Unit and the Boston Police Office of Tactical Analysis. The BRIC consists of both sworn and civilian members of the BPD, as well as a multitude of representatives from other UASI entities. The day to day intelligence activities and operations of the BRIC are governed by Boston Police rules and regulations under the community policing philosophy of the BPD, but with an expanded mandate to provide intelligence regionally through the MBHSR as coordinated through the MOHS. Regionally, the participation of UASI cities and towns in the BRIC is governed and defined by Memorandums of Agreement (MOAs) between the MBHSR partners and MOHS. MOHS staff is comprised of a Director, two Assistant Directors, a Finance Manager, and five Discipline Coordinators. The Director directs and oversees all aspects of MOHS and manages communication with the Mayor of Boston, the jurisdictions' Chief Executive Officers, and the JPOCs. The Assistant Directors are responsible for investment development, management, coordination for the MBHSR and oversee the activities of the Discipline Coordinators. The Finance Manager is responsible for the fiscal tasks related to all regional HS grants, which includes budget management and analysis, executing reimburse for overtime and backfill, financial compliance tasks, and payment to vendors. The Discipline Coordinators coordinate planning and communication amongst their respective Discipline Subcommittees, Law Enforcement, Fire Services, Emergency Medical Services, Emergency Management, Public Health, and Health Care; coordinate training for the Region's partners; procure approved equipment needs for the jurisdictions/disciplines; and perform other tasks as assigned by the Assistant Directors.

INVESTMENT #

7

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

\$5,724,000

Investment Name: Metro Boston Regional Intelligence Center

IV.E: Discuss funding resources beyond FY 2006 HSGP that have been identified and will be leveraged to support the implementation and sustaniment of this investment. (Not to exceed 300 words)

Commitment has been provided by partners to cost share through other federal and state resources including: the City of Chicago and the State of Illinois (in partnership and coordination between the Boston UASI and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts' Executive Office of Public Safety), the Office of the Attorney General's Project Safe Neighborhood Grant Program, and technological grants available through the Department of Justice and the National Science Foundation. Additional funding resources will be sought from asset forfeiture funds, partners in the academic community, and business consortiums.

IV.F: Provide a high-level timeline, including milestones and dates, for the implementation of this investment. Possible areas for inclusion are: stakeholder engagement, planning, major acquisitions/purchases, training, exercises, and process/policy updates. Space is provided for up to 10 milestones, but not all 10 spaces may be necessary for the response. ("Milestone" not to exceed 125 characters / approximately 25 words and "Related Activities" not to exceed 500 characters / approximately 100 words)

Milestone #1	Adopt and agree on the BRIC Operating Principals for the Region.	Start Date:	7/1/06
		End Date:	12/31/06
Related Activities	Conduct meetings and facilitated sessions. applied.		
Milestone #2	Execute all Regional MOAs for BRIC participation.	Start Date:	7/1/06
		End Date:	12/31/06
Related Activities	Draft final MOA for regional BRIC stakeholders. Conduct meetings. Provide outreach.		
Milestone #3	Begin hiring process for contractual analysis staff.	Start Date:	7/1/06
		End Date:	10/31/06
Related Activities	Conduct necessary training. Procure staff equipment needs.		
Milestone #4	Execute Contract for technology enhancement project for the BRIC.	Start Date:	7/1/06
		End Date:	6/30/08
Related Activities	Develop statement of work. Issue a request for bid. Review bids. Award contract. Begin work. Complete implementation of network enhancement.		
Milestone #5	Provide staff training for GIS (all sworn and civilian staff).	Start Date:	10/1/06
		End Date:	6/30/07
Related Activities	Schedule training. Track training completed.		
		Start Date:	

INVESTMENT #

7

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

\$5,724,000

Investment Name: Metro Boston Regional Intelligence Center

Milestone #8

End Date:

Related Activities

Milestone #7

Start Date:

End Date:

Related Activities

Milestone #8

Start Date:

End Date:

Related Activities

Milestone #9

Start Date:

End Date:

Related Activities

Milestone #10

Start Date:

End Date:

Related Activities

IV.G: Describe the planned duration for this overall investment. Discuss your long-term sustainability plans for the investment after your FY 2006 HSGP funds have been expended, if applicable. (Not to exceed 300 words)

It is the intent of the MBSHR that the BRIC will continue to serve as the primary conduit for information sharing, intelligence collection, and data analysis, beyond this funding cycle. The BRIC will continue to evolve and expand where costs will be sustained through operational funds, other state and federal grants, private sector and academic business partners, and charitable foundations, as available. The milestones outlined in the FY2006 grant funding period serve as stepping stones in this evolution, where the baseline needs are addressed in order to ensure that the BRIC can in fact continue on a long-term basis.

INVESTMENT #

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

8

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

\$720,000

Investment Name: Community Awareness and Public Participation

I. BACKGROUND

I.A: Provide a summary description of this investment and its purpose. (Not to exceed 200 words)

This investment serves to continue a comprehensive community awareness training and outreach program for the Metro Boston Homeland Security Region (MBHSR). The investment provides public education on terrorism prevention; highlights the importance of targeting terrorism at the state, federal, and community levels; describes how to report suspicious behaviors to law enforcement; and plans residents should have in place in the event of a crisis or terrorist attack. The Region's P3 Program (Prevent, Protect, Prepare) provides three unique yet related curriculums that address the citizen's role in prevention, protecting one's community, and preparing one's family and neighborhood for an all-hazards disaster. This investment will expand the program to all communities in the Region, and engage responders as trainers. The MBHSR will assess existing community programs, identify gaps, integrate programs when applicable, and provide a mechanism for all MBHSR residents to participate. The Mayor's Office of Homeland Security (MOHS) will use FY2006 funds to conduct planning, maintain a public mechanism of information, reimburse trainer overtime, purchase supplies, and augment delivery of the programs to communities in need.

I.B: Explain how the investment will support the implementation of an initiative(s) from the Program and Capability Enhancement Plan, and the achievement of goals and objectives from your State/Urban Area homeland security strategy(ies). (Not to exceed 300 words)

This investment correlates to Information Sharing and Regional Collaboration, outlined in the Commonwealth's Enhancement Plan. As training is conducted, information is reported and gathered from the community and funneled into the information collection system at both the local, regional, and state levels, providing critical information to the fusion process. As community outreach goes beyond a single community, and stretches across the Region, responders across our area benefit from an educated and aware public. The programming is also beneficial to other Homeland Security Regions and their communities in order to "connect the dots". This investment supports the achievement of Urban Area Homeland Security Strategy Goal 1 Objective 1.1 to ensure the MBHSR can actively prevent and deter, as well as prepare for, terrorist attacks and catastrophic events, by providing a comprehensive HS community outreach program. The MBHSR continues to implement this investment to support preparedness and prevention efforts by providing community awareness training for residents and community groups; developing and expanding tools, such as websites, for disseminating information to the public regarding emergency preparedness issues; and continuing to strengthen other existing community programs such as the Citizen Corps, Medical Reserve Corps, and Community Emergency Response Team (CERT). This investment also directly aligns to UASI Strategy Goal 3 Objective 3.6, ensuring that the MBHSR can effectively respond to terrorist attacks and catastrophic events in both the short- and long-term, by working towards a regional risk communication and public awareness plan. This investment enhances public communication/unified response strategies for the Region's communities; develops a strategy for effective risk communication, collectively across disciplines and communities, to the general public; and continues to share information concerning its initiatives via the MBHSR website and monthly newsletter.

I.C: List up to four National Priority(ies) this investment primarily supports.

Expanded Regional Collaboration

Strengthen Information Sharing and Collaboration Capabilities

I.D: List up to six Target Capability(ies) from the Target Capabilities List this investment primarily supports.

Planning

Communications

Community Preparedness and Participation

Citizen Protection: Evacuation and/or In-Place Protection

Emergency Public Information and Warning

II. REGIONALIZATION

II.A: Describe the geographic and demographic area(s) this investment covers. (Not to exceed 275 words)

This investment impacts the entire Region across all disciplines. Boston's UASI Region, approximately 95 square miles, includes the Cities of Boston, Cambridge, Chelsea, Everett, Quincy, Revere, and Somerville, and the Towns of Brookline and Winthrop. The Region was selected in June 2003 based on the following criteria: 1) level of risk faced by a community, based primarily on potential target infrastructure; 2) level and availability of resources a community can bring to bear to assist Boston; 3) a community's role in assisting in an evacuation of Boston in the event of a critical incident; and 4) whether a community is contiguous with Boston. This investment primarily supports Law Enforcement, Fire Services, Emergency Medical Services, Emergency Management, and secondarily supports Public Health, Health Care, Public Works, and General Administration. The resident population of the Region is 1,051,809 according to 2000 US Census Data; however, the daytime population estimates for Boston and Cambridge peg the total regional population as high as 2,560,000 persons. The Region contains a number of critical infrastructures, high-profile targets, and potential threat elements. Several high-profile, annual events draw more than a million spectators and participants into Boston. Major transportation networks exist within the Region. Logan International Airport, a \$6 billion per year critical infrastructure, is located in East Boston. Boston is home to several major transportation hubs, including North Station and South Station. The Port of Boston is the largest container port in New England and is the 22nd largest in the US. In addition, weekly Liquefied Gas (LNG) deliveries transit the Port of Boston and wind up in the Chelsea Creek.

INVESTMENT #

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

8

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

\$720,000

Investment Name: Community Awareness and Public Participation

II.B: Explain how the State/Urban Area is organizing to implement this investment over the identified geographic area(s).
(Not to exceed 300 words)

MOHS works with the UASI communities and regional stakeholders to leverage MBHSR resources that enhance capacities in the areas of prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery from CBRNE incidents and major disasters across the Region. MOHS collaborates with the Jurisdictional Point of Contact (JPOC) Committee (the Metro Boston Regional Homeland Security Advisory Council), and the MBHSR Discipline Subcommittees. The JPOC Committee is comprised of one senior point of contact from each of the nine UASI jurisdictions who were appointed by the jurisdiction's Chief Executive Officer. This committee ensures open and clear communication amongst disciplines in each jurisdiction and represents the jurisdiction's disciplines at the monthly JPOC meetings. The six MBHSR Discipline Subcommittees bring together representatives from Law Enforcement, Fire Services, Emergency Medical Services, Emergency Management, Public Health, and Health Care, to discuss, coordinate, develop plans, and guide implementation of their discipline specific initiatives across the Region. Through the JPOC and Discipline Subcommittee structure, the Region is able to leverage responders across all Regions and disciplines to participate as trainers in this project. Further, direct oversight of the community outreach program development is managed by a Project Subcommittee, established in July 2005, where discussions and decisions are made concerning the content, marketing, and delivery of the community outreach and awareness programming. Membership includes partners within EMS, law enforcement, fire services, emergency management, public health, and government administrative personnel (neighborhood services, etc.). MOHS has also reached out to the SAA in order to explore the possibility of extending the availability and delivery of this training to other regions in the Commonwealth.

II.C: Discuss the collaboration process you have, or will establish, with other regions and jurisdictions (inter- and intra-State) within or beyond the geographic/demographic area of this investment. Discuss when and how you will engage stakeholders from those regions in specific support of this investment. (Not to exceed 500 words)

The MBHSR collaboration processes focus on the distribution of support throughout the Region, as many partners already have full-time jobs. The MBHSR collaborates formally through monthly JPOC Committee and Discipline Subcommittee meetings. Outside the monthly meetings, collaboration occurs through the MBHSR website, emails, phone calls, informal meetings, working group meetings, and meetings within each jurisdiction. MOHS developed the P3 Program in collaboration with the Boston Police Department, Boston Fire-Rescue, Boston EMS, Boston Office of Neighborhood Services, Boston Public Health Commission, Brookline Police Department, and citizens of Boston and Brookline. A local Subcommittee, comprised of individuals from the aforementioned agencies, reviewed monthly progress and approved all Program content. The P3 Program was developed specifically for the MBHSR communities, but during the Program's development, MOHS consulted with the Metro Boston Transportation Authority (MBTA) as the Program's messaging is similar to the MBTA's "See Something, Say Something" campaign. In November 2005 the three curriculums were presented to two citizen focus groups in Boston and Brookline which resulted in several substantive changes to the Program's content. In mid-December 2005 "train-the-trainer" courses were conducted. Thirty-five local trainers from Boston EMS, Boston Fire Department, Boston Police Department, Brookline Police Department, Boston Emergency Management, and the DeValle Institute of Emergency Preparedness are now prepared to present the P3 Program to the public. To rollout the Program to the remaining seven jurisdictions, MOHS will collect input for the P3 Program from the Region's responders through the monthly JPOC and Discipline Subcommittee meetings. The JPOCs and Discipline Subcommittees will work with MOHS to identify responders in the Region to serve as trainers. The Region also hopes to engage other trainers, including those from the private sector and colleges/universities. MOHS has begun discussions with the SAA to extend the training to other regions in the Commonwealth of MA. Following the complete rollout of the Program to Boston and Brookline in Summer 2006, MOHS hopes to engage other stakeholders at the state level, including the MA Emergency Management and MBTA in providing the curriculum. The oversight of this investment is managed by an MOHS Assistant Director, who serves as Project Manager. The MOHS Finance Manager coordinates the execution of equipment procurement and training reimbursement across Boston agencies, as fiduciary, including City Auditing, Office of Budget and Management, Purchasing Division, and Management and Information Systems.

III. IMPACT

III.A: Discuss anticipated impacts of this investment and how the requested funding will help attain/achieve expected impacts. Consider the population and areas affected, and other entities (jurisdictions, disciplines) that could leverage the outcomes and impacts of the solution presented by this investment. (Not to exceed 500 words)

This investment ultimately impacts the ability of the Region to prevent an incident and/or to respond effectively should an incident occur. Through completion of the P3 Program, participants in the Region will know how to recognize and properly report suspicious behavior to law enforcement officials. The Program also serves to educate emergency responder call takers when receiving calls via 911 or non-emergency calls where community residents are reporting suspicious or concerning behaviors. Training curriculum also provides community residents with information on developing family emergency disaster and communication plans, and important knowledge regarding what steps to take in the event of a natural or man made disaster. By having emergency responders from the UASI jurisdictions train the community directly, residents become familiar with their local emergency responders and are more likely to collaborate with their local emergency responders in reporting suspicious behavior and in responding to a natural or man made disaster. Finally, through implementation of the P3 Program across the Region, intelligence gathering functions and programming (for example, through the Boston Regional Intelligence Center) will be improved through streamlined messaging and information flow from the community. The method of delivery is critical to the success of this investment. Each community provides some degree of community outreach and awareness, whether it be fire prevention, crime prevention, or public health awareness. Recognizing these valuable assets, the programming will easily fit into each jurisdiction's existing infrastructure and planning. Further, by streamlining the curriculum across the Region, the information that residents receive is consistent, ensuring that no duplication or redundant programs are running at the same time. The curriculum can be provided as a whole, or in single modules, depending on the needs of the jurisdiction/agency. Based on the fact the Region has a very high commuter population, residents can attend a training/presentation in their own community, or in the community that they work in should it be different. The transparency and fluid nature of the Program serves all communities and emergency responder needs.

INVESTMENT #

8

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

\$720,000

Investment Name: Community Awareness and Public Participation

III.B: Discuss how the implementation of this investment will decrease or mitigate risk. (Not to exceed 500 words)

The implementation of this Investment decreases the risk of an attack, as community participants will be properly trained in identifying and reporting suspicious behavior to emergency responders. As the module on reporting suspicious activity is critical to a "fusion" process of information gathering, information that residents report will be directly linked to law enforcement. With the proper education on what to report and how to report such information, the collection of critical data is enhanced, and thus more valuable to law enforcement in the prevention of any major event. The training also encourages the importance of reporting, where many residents often opt not to report based on concerns that their report will not be taken seriously. By engaging multiple disciplines in this Program, residents are also able to communicate concerns or questions to any of their emergency responders (EMS, fire) should they have reservations about reporting directly to police.

With regard to emergency preparedness, the Program's curriculum assists emergency responders in advance of a major disaster. Knowing that community residents are aware of what preemptive tasks they can take to prepare will undoubtedly aid emergency responders when having to respond to an incident. By encouraging the public to be more informed and to "Be Ready", as well as providing that information to them, the Region can ensure a more coordinated response in the time of a crisis. Lastly, as this Investment reflects MOHS's intent to further develop and rollout the P3 Program to the entire Region, implementation of this Investment decreases the risk of the MBHSR communities receiving conflicting HS information.

With FY2006 funding, the MBHSR will be able to support the continued costs associated with planning and curriculum development, equipment and supplies associated with the Program's delivery, backfill and overtime for emergency responders to attend and become trainers, as well as the ability to sustain the Program over a longer period of time. In addition, some communities have existing CERT and Citizen Corps programs in place which the Region has prioritized to continue. Recognizing the limited availability of funds for these programs in large communities, MBHSR will provide complimentary support with UASI funds to support those existing programs. This is critical, as many of the P3 participants are active members of their local Medical Reserve Corps, Citizen Corps, and CERT teams.

III.C: Describe what the potential Homeland Security risks of not funding this investment are. (Not to exceed 500 words)

The overall risk of not funding this Investment is the inability of the Region to actively and appropriately engage and continue outreach to the community in order to prevent or deter a terrorist attack, and to respond to a crisis should one occur. Without additional funding, the MBHSR is unable to continue to rollout the P3 Program to the remaining seven jurisdictions. Existing costs associated with the continued development, Program upkeep, and delivery is very much outside the capability of the Region's emergency responder agencies. MBHSR has prioritized this Investment, as few agencies are able to lead the way singularly. A lack of funding negatively impacts opportunities and resources for the ongoing and continued training of emergency responders to make the P3 curriculums and outreach opportunities available to the MBHSR communities. As a result, these communities will not receive the same training on recognizing and reporting suspicious behavior and how to react to a natural or man-made disaster, and perhaps not receiving any training on these important topics at all. The less that community residents know results in limited information coming into law enforcement agencies, which is valuable in intelligence gathering and analysis to prevent terrorist attacks.

IV. FUNDING & IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**IV.A: Investment Funding Plan**

	FY 2006 Homeland Security Grant Program Request					FY 2006 HSGP Request Total	Other Funding Sources Applied	Grand Total
	SHSP	UASI	LETPP	MMRS	CCP			
Personnel								
Planning		\$320,000				\$320,000		\$320,000
Organization								
Equipment*		\$150,000				\$150,000		\$150,000
Training		\$250,000				\$250,000		\$250,000
Exercises								
M&A								
Total		\$720,000				\$720,000		\$720,000

*If you plan to purchase interoperable Communications Equipment, your investment justification must include discussion on planning, governance, training, policies, procedures, and/or exercises related to the equipment.

INVESTMENT #

8

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

\$720,000

Investment Name: Community Awareness and Public Participation

IV.B: Identify potential challenges to the effective implementation of this Investment (e.g., stakeholder buy-in, sustainability, aggressive timelines). (Not to exceed 300 words)

The overall challenges we face in an effort to complete the implementation of this Investment across the Region is: 1) a lack of funding to pay for reimbursement of overtime and backfill for emergency responder trainers, equipment, facilities for training, and printing for brochures and guidebooks; 2) achieving buy-in and support for the P3 Program from Chief Executive Officers; 3) ensuring that the curriculum is streamlined across all nine communities for the long-term; and 4) keeping with common tenets of existing programming at the state and federal level including but not limited to Citizen Corps, Medical Reserve Corps, and CERT.

IV.C: Explain how the identified challenges will be addressed and mitigated. (Not to exceed 300 words)

The first challenge of lack of funding to pay for the programming elements is mitigated through applying for FY2006 UASI funds and other upcoming resources and funding made available to the Region. As the Program was developed with the understanding that federal grant funding may well cease at some point in the future, the long-term costs to maintain the Program have been remedied, where the curriculum delivery can be integrated into any emergency responder agency's community outreach training. However, in order to ensure that this is done, MBHSR is committed to providing funding support to build up the baseline costs, which include training all prospective trainers, developing and publishing all programming materials, procuring equipment and supporting the short-term planning costs for this Investment. Steps have already been taken to gain buy-in from the Region's Jurisdiction Point of Contacts (Committee), which MOHS fully expects to then be communicated to Chief Executive Officers. The MBHSR governance structure is in place, including the JPOC Committee and Discipline Subcommittees, to mitigate the challenge of ensuring a streamlined approach to community education and training on preparedness. As community members are continuing to request more information from government and elected officials, MOHS and the MBHSR are confident that this challenge will be overcome. Finally, collaboration with the State, through the SAA, mitigates the challenge of keeping with common tenets of existing programming at the state and federal level. MOHS will continue to coordinate with the identified stakeholders through regular meetings and updates on programming changes, and allow for the growth and development of the products being produced.

IV.D: Describe the management team, including roles and responsibilities, that will be accountable for the oversight and implementation of this Investment, and the overall management approach they will apply for the implementation of this Investment. (Not to exceed 300 words)

MOHS is leading implementation of this Investment; however active training opportunities to the public will be managed by regional agencies. The MOHS staff is comprised of a Director, two Assistant Directors, a Finance Manager, and five Discipline Coordinators. The Director directs and oversees all aspects of MOHS and manages communication with the Mayor of Boston, the jurisdictions' Chief Executive Officers, and the JPOCs. The Assistant Directors are responsible for investment development, project management, coordination for the MBHSR, and oversee the activities of the Discipline Coordinators. The Finance Manager is responsible for the fiscal tasks related to all regional HS grants, which includes budget management and analysis, executing reimburse for overtime and backfill, financial compliance tasks, and payment to vendors. The Discipline Coordinators coordinate planning and communication amongst their respective Discipline Subcommittees, Law Enforcement, Fire Services, EMS, Emergency Management, Public Health, and Health Care: coordinate training for the Region's partners; procure approved equipment needs for the jurisdictions/disciplines; and other tasks as assigned by the Assistant Directors. Specific to this Investment, MOHS used retained consultants to work with MBHSR emergency responders to develop the P3 Program and will continue to use the consultant team as needed. One MOHS Assistant Director serves as project manager for the P3 Program, and works with both the consultant team, the Project Subcommittee, and regional partners on the delivery of each of the Investment elements (training, equipment procurement, and marketing). Regular evaluation of the success of the Program will be coordinated jointly by MOHS and the JPOCs, with input from the Discipline Subcommittees, in order to maintain the Program's impact and value for the community.

INVESTMENT #

8

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

\$720,000

Investment Name: Community Awareness and Public Participation

IV.E: Discuss funding resources beyond FY 2006 HSGP that have been identified and will be leveraged to support the implementation and sustainment of this investment. (Not to exceed 300 words)

Costs set aside by the Region's agencies for existing outreach and education training will be used as needed. MOHS expects that by the end of the FY2006 grant period (24 months), agencies will adopt the P3 Program and will apply resources, such as costs for overtime, supplies, and equipment in order to sustain the Program long-term. The Region will also look to local training institutes, for example the DelValle Institute for Emergency Preparedness, to assist in incorporating the P3 curriculum and others like it into their own training series. Regional partners have already committed in-kind costs, including staff working straight time, and existing supplies and equipment for the delivery of the Program. Federal funding will serve to fill the gaps that currently exist in order to ensure the Program is implemented at a Regional level.

IV.F: Provide a high-level timeline, including milestones and dates, for the implementation of this investment. Possible areas for inclusion are: stakeholder engagement, planning, major acquisitions/purchases, training, exercises, and process/policy updates. Space is provided for up to 10 milestones, but not all 10 spaces may be necessary for the response. ("Milestone" not to exceed 125 characters / approximately 25 words and "Related Activities" not to exceed 500 characters / approximately 100 words)

Milestone #1

Identify full-time project manager and staffing for P3 Program.

Start Date: 6/1/06

End Date: 9/30/06

Related Activities

Develop criteria for project manager and staffing for P3 Program. Reach out to JPOC Committee and Discipline Subcommittees to identify project manager and points of contact for each jurisdiction. Evaluate nominees versus criteria. Select project manager and staffing.

Milestone #2

Deliver "train-the-trainer" sessions to maximize effectiveness (ongoing).

Start Date: 6/1/06

End Date: 6/30/08

Related Activities

Identify "train-the-trainer" schedule. Identify facility for "train-the-trainer". Track "train-the-trainer" attendance.

Milestone #3

Deliver call taker and dispatch training to law enforcement agencies on the P3 Program to the MBHSR.

Start Date: 6/1/06

End Date: 12/31/06

Related Activities

Identify call taker/dispatch training schedule for each jurisdiction. Identify trainers for scheduled training. Identify facility for training. Track training attendance by agency.

Milestone #4

Deliver the P3 Program to the MBHSR.

Start Date: 6/1/06

End Date: 6/30/08

Related Activities

Identify training schedule for each jurisdiction. Identify trainers for scheduled training. Identify facility for training. Track training attendance.

Milestone #5

Reimburse jurisdictions for overtime and backfill costs for trainers (ongoing).

Start Date: 6/1/06

End Date: 6/30/08

Related Activities

Submit forms to MOHS for reimbursement of overtime or backfill for emergency responders trainers.

Procure equipment and supplies for training Program (ongoing).

Start Date: 6/1/06

INVESTMENT #

8

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

\$720,000

Investment Name: Community Awareness and Public Participation

Milestone #8

End Date: 6/30/08

Related Activities

Submit forms to MOHS for procurement of equipment and supplies for training Program.

Milestone #7

Start Date: 6/1/07

End Date: 6/30/08

Related Activities

Update content of P3 Program to incorporate state and federal programs.

Assess existing state and federal programs. Identify gaps in P3 Program. Update curriculum to integrate state and federal programs when applicable.

Milestone #8

Start Date: 6/1/06

End Date: 12/31/06

Related Activities

Rollout tool for P3 Program to disseminate information to the public regarding emergency preparedness issues.

Conduct meetings with stakeholders to solicit input for design of tool. Create implementation plan to develop and rollout tool. Develop tool. Test tool.

Milestone #9

Start Date: 6/1/06

End Date: 6/30/08

Related Activities

Update tool for P3 Program to disseminate information to the public regarding emergency preparedness issues.

Conduct meetings with stakeholders to solicit updates for tool.

Milestone #10

Start Date:

End Date:

Related Activities

IV.G: Describe the planned duration for this overall investment. Discuss your long-term sustainability plans for the investment after your FY 2006 HSGP funds have been expended, if applicable. (Not to exceed 300 words)

The completion of the baseline development of the P3 Program will be accomplished with prior year funding, including brochures, training materials, and curriculum. FY2006 funds are sought to sustain this Program in Boston and Brookline and to roll it out to the remaining seven jurisdictions. MOHS expects that by the end of the FY2006 grant period (24 months), agencies will adopt the P3 Program and will apply resources, such as costs for overtime, supplies, and equipment in order to sustain the Program long-term. The sustainment of the P3 Program long-term will be based on its effectiveness and usefulness to the communities. The Region will also look to local training institutes, for example the DeValle Institute for Emergency Preparedness, to assist in incorporating the P3 curriculum and others like it into their own training series.

INVESTMENT #

9

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

Investment Name: Harbor Security

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

\$6,000,000

I. BACKGROUND

I.A: Provide a summary description of this investment and its purpose. (Not to exceed 200 words)

This Investment supports the implementation of surface and sub-surface technology in combination with regional surveillance technology, providing a holistic approach to protecting the Port of Boston and Boston's inner Harbor. This Investment will incorporate state of the art technology, complemented by all-hazard CBRNE detection and response craft, portable underwater detection devices, remote access data collation capability, and the appropriate protocols and MOAs to permit inter-agency strategic and tactical command, control, and coordination. This Investment includes: 1) completion of Phase Two of the Regional Harbor Surveillance Project, which establishes a network of integrated video surveillance from local, state, and federal agencies providing full coverage of the Harbor and other regional critical infrastructure; 2) procurement and installation of the Port of Boston surface barrier system and underwater detection; and 3) procurement of the MBHSR regional response vessel to support detection and response to incidents in and around the Port. Investment costs will include contractual support; costs for supplies and equipment; and any personnel overtime costs associated with development, training, and exercises.

I.B: Explain how the investment will support the implementation of an Initiative(s) from the Program and Capability Enhancement Plan, and the achievement of goals and objectives from your State/Urban Area homeland security strategy(ies). (Not to exceed 300 words)

This Investment supports the Commonwealth's Expanding Regional Collaboration Initiative; Information Sharing, and CBRNE Preparedness, which includes strengthening CBRNE detection, response and decontamination capabilities. Further, the Harbor Security Investment directly aligns to the Urban Area Strategy's Goal 2, Objective 2.2, which guides the MBHSR's ability to effectively protect the Region from terrorist attacks and catastrophic events by assessing the vulnerability of and hardening critical infrastructure. This Investment supports the achievement of Goal 2 Objective 2.2 through the following steps MBHSR continues to implement: conduct assessments and implement appropriate target-hardening enhancements to critical sites throughout the Region including equipment, policies, procedures, and training; and continue developing plans/activities that will secure major regional assets, to include but not limited to the Boston Harbor.

I.C: List up to four National Priority(ies) this investment primarily supports.

Implement the Interim NIPP

Expanded Regional Collaboration

Strengthen CBRNE Detection, Response, & Decontamination Capabilities

I.D: List up to six Target Capability(ies) from the Target Capabilities List this investment primarily supports.

Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP)

Structural Damage and Mitigation Assessment

Firefighting Operations/Support

CBRNE Detection

Risk Management

Info Gathering & Recognition of Indicators & Warnings

II. REGIONALIZATION

II.A: Describe the geographic and demographic area(s) this investment covers. (Not to exceed 275 words)

The first element of this Investment directly supports all communities within the MBHSR. The second and third elements support the Region's waterfront communities, which includes Winthrop, Everett, Chelsea, Quincy, Boston and Revere. Boston's UASI Region, approximately 95 square miles, includes the Cities of Boston, Cambridge, Chelsea, Everett, Quincy, Revere, and Somerville, and the Towns of Brookline and Winthrop. The Region was selected in June 2003 based on the following criteria: 1) level of risk faced by a community, based primarily on potential target infrastructure; 2) level and availability of resources a community can bring to bear to assist Boston; 3) a community's role in assisting in an evacuation of Boston in the event of a critical incident; and 4) whether a community is contiguous with Boston. The resident population of the Region is 1,051,809 according to 2000 US Census Data; however, the daytime population estimates for Boston and Cambridge peg the total regional population as high as 2,560,000 persons. The Region contains a number of critical infrastructures, high-profile targets, and potential threat elements. Several high-profile, annual events draw more than a million spectators and participants into Boston. Major transportation networks exist within the Region. Logan International Airport, a \$6 billion per year critical infrastructure, is located in East Boston. Boston is home to several major transportation hubs, including North Station and South Station. The Boston Harbor is the largest container port in New England and is the 22nd largest in the US. In addition, weekly Liquefied Gas (LNG) deliveries transit the Boston Harbor and wind up in the Chelsea Creek.

INVESTMENT #

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

9

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

\$6,000,000

Investment Name: Harbor Security

II.B: Explain how the State/Urban Area is organizing to implement this investment over the identified geographic area(s).
(Not to exceed 300 words)

MOHS's charge is to work with neighboring communities and regional stakeholders to leverage MBHSR resources to enhance capacities in the prevention of, preparedness for, response to, and recovery from CBRNE attacks across the Region. The MOHS staff is grant-funded and works full-time to coordinate, manage, assist, and move forward the MBHSR investments and to serve as the fiduciary for the Region's HS grant programming. The MOHS staff works in concert with a central body, the Jurisdictional Point of Contact (JPOC) Committee, comprised of one senior POC from each of the nine jurisdictions. The JPOCs ensure open and clear communication amongst disciplines in their city or town and represent their jurisdiction's disciplines at the monthly JPOC meetings run by MOHS. MBHSR Discipline Subcommittees were established to bring together representatives from each discipline to discuss, coordinate, develop plans, and guide implementation of their jurisdiction's initiatives across the Region. MOHS has worked with its partners to establish six Discipline Subcommittees. Each JPOC appointed representatives from his community to serve on the Discipline Subcommittees. The Subcommittee Representative represents the discipline on behalf of his or her jurisdiction to the Subcommittee through participation in the development and implementation of HS investments that impact the Region. The regional surveillance element is coordinated between MOHS, as the central agency, and involves the Region's law enforcement agencies, represented by the Law Enforcement Subcommittee, MassHighway, Boston Transportation Department (BTD), MA Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA), MA State Police, and the Federal Protective Service (FPS). The Port barrier is managed by MOHS in partnership with the USCG Sector Boston and the Area Maritime Security Committee (AMSC), including but not limited to Massport, MA State Police, Boston Fire, and Boston Police. The MBHSR's regional response vessel is directed by MOHS, Boston Fire, and the Fire Services Subcommittee.

II.C: Discuss the collaboration process you have, or will establish, with other regions and jurisdictions (inter- and intra-State) within or beyond the geographic/demographic area of this investment. Discuss when and how you will engage stakeholders from those regions in specific support of this investment. (Not to exceed 500 words)

The MBHSR collaboration processes focus on the distribution of support throughout the Region, as many partners already have full-time jobs. The MBHSR collaborates formally through monthly JPOC Committee and Discipline Subcommittee meetings. Outside the monthly meetings, collaboration occurs through the MBHSR website, emails, phone calls, informal meetings, and meetings within each jurisdiction. Monthly JPOC Committee meetings are organized and run by MOHS. The meetings are open meetings and are attended by MOHS, the JPOCs, State agency representatives, and MOHS contractors, as needed. Frequent agenda items include administrative updates, MBHSR investment updates, and discipline updates. Monthly Discipline Subcommittee meetings are organized and run by the MOHS Discipline Coordinators and the Subcommittee Lead and are attended by MOHS, the jurisdictions' Discipline Representatives, and state agency representatives. MOHS and the Law Enforcement Subcommittee are leading design and implementation of the Regional Harbor Surveillance Project in collaboration with MassHighway, BTD, MBTA, and FPS. The plan for the network includes each jurisdiction owning and operating its own, independent camera system that will be tied together at a central hub, located temporarily at the FPS. Each jurisdiction will have full control of their system with viewing access to the other jurisdictions' cameras. The MBTA has agreed to allow one of the MBHSR cameras to be located on their facility in Boston and a second camera to overlook the MBTA control center in South Boston. The MBTA has an extensive fiber network in their tunnels which MBHSR is working with MBTA to utilize in the design and implementation of the regional system. MOHS will continue active involvement with the USCG and AMSC to develop and implement the Barrier System/Underwater Detection Project. Additional outreach to state partners is planned to strengthen relationships and ensure regional, state, and local coordination. MOHS works with Boston Fire to oversee the design of the regional response vessel. To ensure the investment is completed properly, MOHS works with Boston agencies on issues concerning bidding, contractual support and resources, procurement, and the development of policies and procedures. For all projects, JPOCs are actively engaged and provided regular updates. More direct support from the JPOCs will be requested on an as needed basis to provide input on investment development and implementation. The MOHS Finance Manager coordinates the execution of equipment procurement and overtime and backfill reimbursement across jurisdictions, as fiduciary, including City Auditing, Office of Budget and Management, Purchasing Division, and Management and Information Systems. Operational support and project management is also provided by MBHSR partners to ensure each element becomes a reality.

III. IMPACT

III.A: Discuss anticipated impacts of this investment and how the requested funding will help attain/achieve expected impacts. Consider the population and areas affected, and other entities (jurisdictions, disciplines) that could leverage the outcomes and impacts of the solution presented by this investment. (Not to exceed 500 words)

The Boston Harbor is the center of the Region's transportation infrastructure. Major interstates run over (bridges) and under (three tunnels) the waterways. Rail transit is also built under the Harbor, and relies heavily on water transport for tourists and commuters coming into the City of Boston and its MBHSR communities. Boston's Logan International Airport is also greatly affected by the Port, as it's surrounded by water on three sides. Domestic and international commercial transport and delivery comes through the Port of Boston daily. Finally, the waterfront is a tremendously popular home to many residential areas in many of the Region's communities. For all of these reasons, the Port of Boston is an attractive target for possible attacks. This investment serves to harden the area in and around the Boston Harbor against threats and hazards. With the implementation of the Regional Harbor Surveillance Project, the Region will install and monitor over 200 cameras throughout the nine MBHSR jurisdictions. The system will improve surveillance and security operations at the Boston Harbor and other sites identified as potential targets throughout the Region. This results in critical regional capabilities and systems being protected and better enables the Region to avoid an incident or prevent an incident from occurring. In addition, the capability exists to further integrate the surveillance system with state and federal partners. Through this investment, the Region will also have in place a barrier system to protect the critical infrastructure and Region's Port assets, including Boston's Logan Airport, the LNG terminal, locations where US Navy vessels dock, and the cruise port area. Like that of the Regional Harbor Surveillance Project, technology is in place to protect the MBHSR's critical areas in and around the Harbor, better enabling the Region to avoid an incident or intervene in order to prevent an incident from occurring. The third project within this investment provides a critically lacking resource for the Port of Boston – a regional response vessel designed to protect the Port area from CBRNE incidents, and more effective firefighting response to any catastrophic incident on the waterfront. The vessel ensures a significant response capability for CBRNE detection, response to events, and assistance to state and regional partners. Like the barrier system, the regional response vessel provides a strong prevention and response tool in protecting the critical infrastructure and Region's assets in and around the Port of Boston.

INVESTMENT #

9

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

Investment Name: Harbor Security

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

\$6,000,000

III.B: Discuss how the implementation of this investment will decrease or mitigate risk. (Not to exceed 500 words)

Overall, the successful implementation of this Investment ensures the Boston Harbor, the center for transportation, is hardened against threats and hazards. The Region currently lacks the regional surveillance capabilities to monitor Harbor traffic that offers an integrated local, state, and federal system. Further, there is no current protection of critical infrastructure assets entering the Port waterway, such as the LNG tankers and military vessels which frequently dock in the area. Through the implementation of the Regional Harbor Surveillance Project, effective security of critical infrastructures throughout the Region will be in place, which decreases the likelihood of a terrorist attack. The barrier system and regional response vessel will proactively protect docked vessels in and around the Port, preventing any violation of it's protected space. The regional response vessel fills a significant gap in the Region's response resources should a catastrophic incident occur in the Harbor or in the neighborhoods located on the Region's waterfront. Having water-based surface detection capabilities, which the Region currently lacks, ensures a greater square mileage is covered. As the vast majority of waterfront property in the MBHSR is residential, rapid response to any incident is absolutely critical. Finally, the collaboration in place across the Region, including MOHS, the JPOC Committee, Discipline Subcommittees, and other state and federal stakeholders decreases the risk of resource ineffectiveness. Together, the MBHSR and state and federal stakeholders continue to collaborate to ensure the most efficient use of stakeholders' time and available funding.

III.C: Describe what the potential Homeland Security risks of not funding this investment are. (Not to exceed 500 words)

Currently, the Boston Harbor has minimal protection for water based attacks. Not funding this Investment will prohibit the ability of local, state, and federal agencies to more effectively protect the Port of Boston, one of the largest in the country. The Port of Boston is visited by a number of vessels annually, including US Navy vessels, and weekly LNG deliveries, and other critical transport vessels. The Region would not be able to fully implement the Regional Harbor Surveillance Project, resulting in only four of the nine jurisdictions establishing a network for video surveillance. In addition the Region would not be able to install the barrier system or procure the regional response vessel. In the event of a terrorist attack, major disaster, or other emergency, infrastructure all along the Port are at risk of being severely impacted. Without the collaboration in place between MOHS, the JPOCs, MBHSR stakeholders, and state stakeholders, resources, including stakeholders' time and available funding, may not be used most efficiently. Stakeholders will be less able to leverage each other's knowledge and experiences, and approaches to harden critical sites would vary.

IV. FUNDING & IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

IV.A: Investment Funding Plan

	FY 2006 Homeland Security Grant Program Request					FY 2006 HSGP Request Total	Other Funding Sources Applied	Grand Total
	SHSP	UASI	LETPP	MMRS	CCP			
Personnel								
Planning		\$3,000,000				\$3,000,000		\$3,000,000
Organization								
Equipment*		\$3,000,000				\$3,000,000		\$3,000,000
Training								
Exercises								
M&A								
Total		\$6,000,000				\$6,000,000		\$6,000,000

*If you plan to purchase interoperable Communications Equipment, your investment justification must include discussion on planning, governance, training, policies, procedures, and/or exercises related to the equipment.

INVESTMENT #

9

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

Investment Name: Harbor Security

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

\$6,000,000

IV.B: Identify potential challenges to the effective implementation of this investment (e.g., stakeholder buy-in, sustainability, aggressive timelines). (Not to exceed 300 words)

The overall challenge to effective implementation of this Investment is a lack of funding to pay for contractual support; costs for supplies and equipment directly related to the development, planning, and implementation; any overtime costs associated with participation of personnel to implement this Investment; and training costs. Another challenge to the completion of this Investment is the aggressive timelines that must be implemented. Procurements for each of the projects that comprise this Investment require fair bidding processes, as mandated by Massachusetts General Law Chapter 30B, which often cause time delays. Lastly, based on timelines, challenges are faced ensuring the operational procedures and agreements are set in place, and each element is transferred to an operational partner for long-term maintenance and sustainment.

IV.C: Explain how the identified challenges will be addressed and mitigated. (Not to exceed 300 words)

Challenges associated with financial support have been discussed with MBHSR partners. Long-term costs for major procurements will be incurred through partners in the Region through operational cost sharing and in-kind resources to ensure the continuity of each element. In the short-term, additional funding has been committed by Boston and the MBHSR for the procurement of the regional response vessel, where federal dollars will be applied to support it in part. Components of the Regional Harbor Surveillance Project, including camera system equipment, have already been procured with non-UASI funding sources. As Phase One of the Regional Harbor Surveillance Project is nearly complete, buy-in from local, state, federal, and private property owners has been mitigated, but will need to be maintained through frequent meetings. Expansion of the system and management of its elements will need to be coordinated and updated. The plan for the network includes each jurisdiction owning and operating its own, independent camera system with viewing access to the other jurisdictions' cameras. Buy-in for the barrier system has been accomplished in partnership between the MBHSR, USCG, and AMSC. Operational planning including policies and procedures is underway, in advance of any procurement, and locations for the barrier system have been agreed upon. MOHS will continue frequent meetings with its partners to maintain stakeholder buy-in. In partnership with Boston agencies, MOHS staff will work closely to ensure an expedited, but fair bidding process. MOHS will work closely with the USCG and AMSC to ensure timelines are met and tasks are completed. Buy-in for the regional response vessel is underway through the partnership between MOHS, Boston Fire, and the Fire Services Subcommittee. The challenge of implementation and operational oversight of the vessel will be overseen by Boston Fire, with regional cooperative agreements encouraged by MOHS. Docking logistics and operational planning will be managed in coordination with Boston Harbor partners.

IV.D: Describe the management team, including roles and responsibilities, that will be accountable for the oversight and implementation of this investment, and the overall management approach they will apply for the implementation of this investment. (Not to exceed 300 words)

MOHS is leading implementation of this Investment. The MOHS staff is comprised of a Director, two Assistant Directors, a Finance Manager, and five Discipline Coordinators. The Director directs and oversees all aspects of MOHS and manages communication with the Mayor of Boston, the jurisdictions' Chief Executive Officers, and the JPOCs. The Assistant Directors handle investment development, management, and coordination for the MBHSR and oversee the activities of the Discipline Coordinators. The Finance Manager is responsible for the fiscal tasks related to all regional HS grants, which includes administering the procurement of equipment for the jurisdictions and the reimburse for overtime and backfill. The Discipline Coordinators coordinate planning and communication amongst their respective Discipline Subcommittees, Law Enforcement, Fire Services, Emergency Medical Services, Emergency Management, Public Health, and Health Care. For the regional surveillance element, MOHS has leveraged the in-kind resources of law enforcement personnel and the Law Enforcement Subcommittee. Contract support for day to day management will be managed within each respective MBHSR law enforcement agency. For the barrier system, MOHS will continue its partnership with the USCG and AMSC and leverage contract support for day to day management in coordination with the USCG. For the regional response vessel, MOHS will leverage Boston Fire senior leaders and the Fire Services Subcommittee, where contract support will be included in the bidding process for day to day management during construction.

INVESTMENT #

9

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

Investment Name: Harbor Security

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

\$6,000,000

IV.E: Discuss funding resources beyond FY 2006 HSGP that have been identified and will be leveraged to support the implementation and sustainment of this investment. (Not to exceed 300 words)

Commitments have already been made by the City of Boston and the MBHSR for these projects through existing HS grant funding as well as operational costs and in-kind support. Cost sharing through local, state, and federal agencies supports long-term sustainability.

IV.F: Provide a high-level timeline, including milestones and dates, for the implementation of this investment. Possible areas for inclusion are: stakeholder engagement, planning, major acquisitions/purchases, training, exercises, and process/policy updates. Space is provided for up to 10 milestones, but not all 10 spaces may be necessary for the response. ("Milestone" not to exceed 125 characters / approximately 25 words and "Related Activities" not to exceed 500 characters / approximately 100 words)

Milestone #1 Complete planning for Phase Two of Regional Harbor Surveillance Project. **Start Date:** 6/1/06
End Date: 9/30/06

Related Activities

Conduct stakeholder meetings. Draft, finalize, and vet Request for Proposal for Phase Two planning and implementation. Review proposals. Select vendor.

Milestone #2 Execute lease agreements for site locations. **Start Date:** 7/1/06
End Date: 12/31/06

Related Activities

Develop plans and procedures for individual systems and for regional system regarding viewing, maintenance, and governance of system. Distribute lease agreements for site locations for signatures.

Milestone #3 Complete surveillance network connectivity across Region. **Start Date:** 1/1/07
End Date: 12/31/07

Related Activities

Install surveillance infrastructure in remaining jurisdictions and install any necessary upgrades to supplement Phase One jurisdictions. Submit forms to MOHS for procurement of equipment. Procure supplementary infrastructure. Install supplementary infrastructure.

Milestone #4 Install barrier system in Boston Harbor. **Start Date:** 12/1/06
End Date: 3/31/08

Related Activities

Conduct stakeholder meetings to select barrier system. Select barrier system based on results of feasibility study. Submit forms to MOHS for procurement of equipment. Procure barrier system. Install barrier system. Track progress.

Milestone #5 Execute contract for development of regional response fire vessel. **Start Date:** 9/1/06
End Date: 3/31/07

Related Activities

Begin bidding process for development of regional response fire vessel (there is an estimated 6 month turnaround time for a bidder to be selected and a contract to be signed). Select bidder. Complete paperwork.

Execute payments to bidder.

Start Date: 3/1/07

INVESTMENT #

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

9

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

\$8,000,000

Investment Name: Harbor Security

Milestone #6

End Date: 5/31/08

Related Activities

Review invoices. Process payment in City's financial system.

Milestone #7

Start Date:

End Date:

Related Activities

Milestone #8

Start Date:

End Date:

Related Activities

Milestone #9

Start Date:

End Date:

Related Activities

Milestone #10

Start Date:

End Date:

Related Activities

IV.G: Describe the planned duration for this overall investment. Discuss your long-term sustainability plans for the investment after your FY 2006 HSGP funds have been expended, if applicable. (Not to exceed 300 words)

Each project under this investment requires a long-term commitment from the Region to ensure success. Cost sharing through local, state, and federal agencies supports long-term sustainability. Commitments have already been made by the City of Boston and the MBHSR for these projects through operational costs and in-kind support. The Regional Harbor Surveillance Project is expected to span approximately 18 months of the 24 month grant period with long-term maintenance and sustainability costs supported by partnering agencies. Costs will support equipment and maintenance, as allowed by the grant guidance, as well as external contractual support for limited time of the project. The barrier system and underwater detection for the Boston Harbor is expected to span the full grant period (24 months) with long-term maintenance and sustainability costs supported by in-kind operational support and other grant sources, as available. The regional response fire vessel will span past the FY2006 grant funding period, and into FY07, should funding be made available. Completion of construction and monthly payments is expected in June 2009. Regular maintenance, mooring, staffing, and oversight will also span past the FY2006 grant funding periods. Additional resources, both federal and local operating, will be sought for long-term sustainability.

INVESTMENT #

10

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

\$3,480,000

Investment Name: Regional Homeland Security Training Program

I. BACKGROUND

I.A: Provide a summary description of this investment and its purpose. (Not to exceed 200 words)

This Investment serves to continue HS training opportunities for the Metro Boston Homeland Security Region's (MBHSR) responders. To date, MBHSR responders have completed a number of area-specific trainings including: incident response and evidence collection to terrorist bombings, prevention and response to suicide bombing incidents, WMD awareness and operations training, and radiological operations training. Based on the Region's success with interagency and multi-discipline training in the past, funds are sought to continue the MBHSR's existing training infrastructure, and to re-certify responders to maintain active knowledge in these areas. In 2003, the Mayor's Office of Homeland Security (MOHS) partnered with the DeValle Institute for Emergency Preparedness to provide WMD training, approved by OGT, and continues to provide new training opportunities to all MBHSR responder disciplines. To ensure continued availability of the Institute's course offerings, MBHSR seeks to maintain support of the Institute's staff, curriculum development and delivery, and equipment and supply needs. Funding will also support costs of other OGT approved training providers.

I.B: Explain how the investment will support the implementation of an Initiative(s) from the Program and Capability Enhancement Plan, and the achievement of goals and objectives from your State/Urban Area homeland security strategy(ies). (Not to exceed 300 words)

This investment supports the Commonwealth's Initiatives 4 through 8, Expanding Regional Collaboration; Statewide Pandemic Preparedness; Improvised Explosive Devices; and CBRNE Detection, respectively. Further, the MBSHR Training Investment directly aligns to the Urban Area Strategy's Goal 1, to ensure the MBHSR can actively prevent and deter, as well as prepare for, terrorist attacks and catastrophic events; and specifically Objective 1.3, to assess and implement sustainable HS training across the Region. This Investment supports these goals and objectives by engaging in training opportunities associated with WMD, CBRNE, and natural disaster needs for responders; comports to training guidance and protocols at the local, state and federal levels to ensure emergency readiness; and with assistance from the DeValle Institute, continues to provide WMD awareness training, and other training needs identified by the MBHSR partners. The goals and objectives associated with this investment, as outlined in the Urban Area Strategy, is also in direct alignment with the Commonwealth's strategic goal of assessing risk to prevent attacks or critical incidents. As outlined in the State Enhancement Plan "training and an increase in the number of personnel trained to detect and identify devices can only enhance (regional collaboration). Further, extending multi-discipline training across the regions lends itself to the support of both the state and national priority of expanded regional collaboration". Overall, through complete and ongoing training for responders, the MBHSR will most effectively ensure proper preparedness, and more importantly, prevention of any major incident.

I.C: List up to four National Priority(ies) this investment primarily supports.

Strengthen CBRNE Detection, Response, & Decontamination Capabilities

Expanded Regional Collaboration

I.D: List up to six Target Capability(ies) from the Target Capabilities List this investment primarily supports.

CBRNE Detection

WMD/Hazardous Materials Response & Decontamination

Explosive Device Response Operations

Onsite Incident Management

Responder Safety and Health

Public Safety and Security Response

II. REGIONALIZATION

II.A: Describe the geographic and demographic area(s) this investment covers. (Not to exceed 275 words)

This investment impacts the entire Region across all disciplines. Boston's UASI Region, approximately 95 square miles, includes the Cities of Boston, Cambridge, Chelsea, Everett, Quincy, Revere, and Somerville, and the Towns of Brookline and Winthrop. The Region was selected in June 2003 based on the following criteria: 1) level of risk faced by a community, based primarily on potential target infrastructure; 2) level and availability of resources a community can bring to bear to assist Boston; 3) a community's role in assisting in an evacuation of Boston in the event of a critical incident; and 4) whether a community is contiguous with Boston. This investment primarily supports Law Enforcement, Fire Services, Emergency Medical Services, Emergency Management, Public Health, and Health Care, and secondarily supports Public Works and General Administration. The resident population of the Region is 1,051,809 according to 2000 US Census Data; however, the daytime population estimates for Boston and Cambridge peg the total regional population as high as 2,560,000 persons. The Region contains a number of critical infrastructures, high-profile targets, and potential threat elements. Several high-profile, annual events draw more than a million spectators and participants into Boston. Major transportation networks exist within the Region. Logan International Airport, a \$6 billion per year critical infrastructure, is located in East Boston. Boston is home to several major transportation hubs, including North Station and South Station. The Port of Boston is the largest container port in New England and is the 22nd largest in the US. In addition, weekly Liquefied Gas (LNG) deliveries transit the Port of Boston and wind up in the Chelsea Creek.

INVESTMENT #

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

10

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

\$3,480,000

Investment Name: Regional Homeland Security Training Program

II.B: Explain how the State/Urban Area is organizing to implement this investment over the identified geographic area(s).
(Not to exceed 300 words)

MOHS works with the UASI communities and regional stakeholders to leverage MBHSR resources that enhance capacities in the areas of prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery from CBRNE incidents and major disasters across the Region. MOHS collaborates with the Jurisdictional Point of Contact (JPOC) Committee (the Metro Boston Regional Homeland Security Advisory Council), and six MBHSR Discipline Subcommittees. The JPOC Committee is comprised of one senior point of contact from each of the nine UASI jurisdictions who were appointed by the jurisdiction's Chief Executive Officer. This Committee ensures open and clear communication amongst disciplines in their jurisdiction and represents their jurisdiction's disciplines at the monthly JPOC meetings. Monthly Discipline Subcommittee meetings are organized and run by the MOHS Discipline Coordinators and the Subcommittee Lead and are attended by MOHS, the jurisdictions' Discipline Representatives, and state agency representatives. Each of the Subcommittees spent and continues to spend a significant amount of time discussing the Region's gaps in training capabilities and needs for HS related training. Following discussions, the Subcommittees reach consensus and develop and submit formal requests for the identified regional trainings to MOHS for approval. Following receipt of approval by MOHS, the Subcommittees coordinate and execute the training within the jurisdictions. The Subcommittees also work across disciplines to identify regional, interdisciplinary training. Because of this structure, training opportunities reach all disciplines within each community within the Region, whereby responders are active in prioritizing their training needs. The Region was recognized by DHS in December 2005 for this coordinated and regional approach to training.

II.C: Discuss the collaboration process you have, or will establish, with other regions and jurisdictions (inter- and intra-State) within or beyond the geographic/demographic area of this investment. Discuss when and how you will engage stakeholders from those regions in specific support of this investment. (Not to exceed 500 words)

The MBHSR collaborates formally through monthly JPOC Committee and Discipline Subcommittee meetings. Outside the monthly meetings, collaboration occurs through the MBHSR website, emails, phone calls, informal meetings, and meetings within each jurisdiction. MOHS staff and MBHSR representatives regularly attend the State's Regional Homeland Security Council meetings, held quarterly. This is valuable in order to ensure cross regional collaboration, particularly as it pertains to training. To date, the MBHSR has continued to communicate with other State Homeland Security Regional Councils on similar projects that serve to meet the Commonwealth's priority HS investments and State Strategy goals and objectives. MBHSR partners have actively participated in other trainings made available by some of the other Regional Homeland Security Regions, of which there are five (including MBHSR). We continue to seek out these additional resources, as well as make similar resources available to others. Senior managers, trainers, and staff from the DelValle Institute for Emergency Preparedness play a major role in training delivery for the MBHSR responders. Since the MOHS and DelValle partnership began in 2003, training opportunities have been provided outside the City of Boston, where classes have been moved to three separate MBHSR locations in order to accommodate the needs of our partner agencies. The MOHS and MBHSR also collaborates with state and federal agencies as needed in development and implementation of the Region's training. MOHS regularly communicates with the SAA Training and Exercise Coordinator to ensure that ODP training requests are properly managed and submitted. Partnerships have been formed with state agencies and show continued success with the Executive Office of Public Safety, Massachusetts Emergency Management Agency, Massport, Massachusetts State Police, Massachusetts Bay Transit Authority (which MOHS staff served on the Transit Strategy Working Group), and Massport Fire and Rescue. The execution of overtime and backfill reimbursement related to training across the jurisdictions requires significant collaboration between MOHS and the MBHSR partners. The Discipline Subcommittees use the JPOCs to sign-off on appropriate training requests and reimbursements. The MOHS Finance Manager coordinates across City of Boston agencies, as fiduciary, including City Auditing and Office of Budget and Management, for administrative support for reimbursements. In addition, MOHS has partnerships with emergency responder agencies in the Region, both at the accounting and finance and operational levels, to ensure project management and reimbursement tasks are handled.

III. IMPACT

III.A: Discuss anticipated impacts of this investment and how the requested funding will help attain/achieve expected impacts. Consider the population and areas affected, and other entities (jurisdictions, disciplines) that could leverage the outcomes and impacts of the solution presented by this investment. (Not to exceed 500 words)

With the availability of UASI funding for training, Discipline Subcommittees will continue to collaborate through the monthly meetings, identify HS training gaps, and execute trainings to mitigate those training gaps for the Region. This level of collaboration ensures emergency responders across jurisdictions and disciplines are trained to respond to CBRNE and WMD incidents in the same manner and provides for greater coordination during any major event. Through the DelValle Institute's WMD training, emergency responders learn to recognize hazards, respond defensively, effectively isolate, decontaminate, and perform triage and medical response. For emergency responders who have completed the DelValle Institute WMD training, funding is sought for refresher courses to maintain training levels and improve training levels to ensure relevance to existing man made or natural threats. For new emergency responders, funding is sought to continue the DelValle Institute's WMD training, ensuring new responders receive the same training as their peers. Trainings on equipment procured with UASI funds also ensure emergency responders are qualified and properly trained to use HS equipment. Finally, through the reimbursement of overtime and backfill, using UASI funding, more emergency responders will be encouraged to complete training classes. This investment is critically important to make sure that disciplines within and across all nine MBHSR communities are equally capable of meeting preparedness and response capabilities.

INVESTMENT #

10

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

Investment Name: Regional Homeland Security Training Program

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

\$3,480,000

III.B: Discuss how the implementation of this Investment will decrease or mitigate risk. (Not to exceed 500 words)

With the availability of UASI funding for training, Discipline Subcommittees will continue to collaborate through the monthly meetings, identify HS training gaps, and execute trainings to mitigate those training gaps for the Region. This level of collaboration decreases the risk of having emergency responders on the street who are not qualified or properly trained to respond to a CBRNE or WMD incident, and therefore decreases the risk of ineffective response. Further, Discipline Subcommittee coordination across jurisdictions and disciplines mitigates the risk of having emergency responders in the Region receive different training on responding to a CBRNE or WMD incident, and again decreases the risk of an ineffective response. The constant evaluation and assessment of training needs by the Discipline Subcommittees mitigates the risk of HS training gaps in the Region. The execution of training on equipment procured with UASI funds decreases the risk of equipment being used improperly or not used at all. The provision of refresher courses mitigates the risk of qualified and trained emergency responders losing knowledge gained through previous training. Finally, having the MBHSR governance structure in place with MOHS as fiduciary of the UASI grant funding decreases the risk of the Region's agencies applying funds not in accordance with regional priorities and state/federal protocols (for example focusing jurisdiction or discipline specific), or not committing enough funding to support regional training priorities.

III.C: Describe what the potential Homeland Security risks of not funding this Investment are. (Not to exceed 500 words)

The Region risks losing the current level of collaboration between the jurisdictions and disciplines through the Discipline Subcommittee structure if the MBHSR Training Investment is not funded. As a significant portion of the Discipline Subcommittees' accomplishments is identifying and completing HS training for the Region, the Subcommittees may not be challenged to continue these tasks, and worse, may not continue to commit the time needed to do so should funding not be made available. As many agencies require in-service training annually, much of the HS related training is conducted in addition to such training. It's critically important to ensure that resources are available to support this priority. Should the regional Training Investment not be maintained, there is a risk that emergency responders in the Region will prioritize differently and in some cases, take conflicting trainings on responding to CBRNE and WMD incidents, or worse, be provided no training at all. This would then risk having emergency responders on the streets that are not qualified or properly trained to respond to a CBRNE or EMD incident in a standardized manner, and therefore risks ineffective response. Should funding cease to support the MBHSR Training Investment, the Region would revert back to an increase in HS gaps, where re-certification, additional training for new employees, and specialized training sessions would not be executed. Related to this is the Region's inability to be trained on equipment procured for prevention, preparedness, and response, causing new equipment to be used improperly or not at all. The Region also risks losing the knowledge gained through HS training completed over the past two years. Finally, by not having funding for MBHSR training, the Region's agencies risk spending money unwisely (for example focusing jurisdiction or discipline specific) or spending no money on HS training for emergency responders.

IV. FUNDING & IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

IV.A: Investment Funding Plan

	FY 2006 Homeland Security Grant Program Request					FY 2006 HSGP Request Total	Other Funding Sources Applied	Grand Total
	SHSP	UASI	LETPP	MMRS	CCP			
Personnel								
Planning		\$1,230,000				\$1,230,000		\$1,230,000
Organization		\$450,000				\$450,000		\$450,000
Equipment*		\$300,000				\$300,000		\$300,000
Training		\$1,500,000				\$1,500,000		\$1,500,000
Exercises								
M&A								
Total		\$3,480,000				\$3,480,000		\$3,480,000

*If you plan to purchase interoperable Communications Equipment, your investment justification must include discussion on planning, governance, training, policies, procedures, and/or exercises related to the equipment.

INVESTMENT #

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

10

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

\$3,480,000

Investment Name: Regional Homeland Security Training Program

IV.B: Identify potential challenges to the effective implementation of this investment (e.g., stakeholder buy-in, sustainability, aggressive timelines). (Not to exceed 300 words)

The overall challenge to effective implementation of HS training across the Region and across disciplines is a lack of funding to pay for training classes and for reimbursement of overtime or backfill for emergency responders to attend the training. Another challenge to the effective implementation of this investment is emergency responders focusing on jurisdiction and discipline specific training needs. A lack of regional focus impacts the ability of the Region's emergency responders to effectively coordinate response to a major event. A third challenge to effective implementation is a lack of support from emergency responder management for their staff to attend prioritized HS training.

IV.C: Explain how the identified challenges will be addressed and mitigated. (Not to exceed 300 words)

To date, the above challenges have been addressed and mitigated through use of the UASI funds and the MBHSR governance structure which is currently in place. The Region has used portions of previous UASI funding cycles to support HS training for the Region across disciplines. This funding has been and will continue to be used to support the cost of training courses and to reimburse overtime and backfill for emergency responders to attend training. The MBHSR governance structure was put in place to ensure collaboration at all levels across the Region and across disciplines. The JPOCs, MOHS, and Discipline Subcommittees will continue to collaborate and identify training gaps and complete needed training to close the gaps. The JPOCs and Discipline Representatives will also continue to collaborate within their jurisdictions to ensure emergency responders management understands the training gaps and supports their staff in attending HS training to close the gaps.

IV.D: Describe the management team, including roles and responsibilities, that will be accountable for the oversight and implementation of this investment, and the overall management approach they will apply for the implementation of this investment. (Not to exceed 300 words)

MOHS and the agencies in the Region are responsible for the oversight of federally supported HS training. The MOHS staff is comprised of a Director, two Assistant Directors, a Finance Manager, and five Discipline Coordinators. The Director directs and oversees all aspects of MOHS and manages communication with the Mayor of Boston, the jurisdictions' Chief Executive Officers, and the JPOCs. The Assistant Directors handle investment development, management, and coordination for the MBHSR and oversee the activities of the Discipline Coordinators. The Finance Manager is responsible for the fiscal tasks related to all regional HS grants, which includes processing reimbursements to the jurisdictions. The Discipline Coordinators coordinate planning and communication, specifically around training, amongst their respective Discipline Subcommittees, Law Enforcement, Fire Services, Emergency Medical Services, Emergency Management, Public Health, and Health Care. Training personnel in each agency and each jurisdiction constantly assess training needs and discuss the needs at the Discipline Subcommittee meetings. The DeValle Institute for Emergency Preparedness' oversight of training courses is primarily centralized through the Boston Public Health Commission, with input and coordination with MOHS. In order to achieve the Region's success to date relevant to past trainings, partner agencies provide lead trainers and instructors to be directly involved in the courses being provided, many of which begin as train-the-trainers which are then provided to the Region's emergency responders as whole. Discipline Coordinators and Assistant Directors oversee much of the operational and all of the administrative tasks associated with the completion of regional training.

INVESTMENT #

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

10

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

\$3,480,000

Investment Name: Regional Homeland Security Training Program

IV.E: Discuss funding resources beyond FY 2006 HSGP that have been identified and will be leveraged to support the implementation and sustainment of this investment. (Not to exceed 300 words)

The vast majority of costs associated with the trainings for the Region are supported directly though federal and state training funding. Some agencies have supported costs with operating budget funds set aside specifically for training, however this is rare given the requirements for in service training. Other grant resources separate from UASI have been applied, including State Homeland Security funding (which MBHSR is not a recipient of due to it's UASI status). The DeValle Institute for Emergency Preparedness uses Center for Disease Control funds to support HS training, which is designed for medical and public health areas of focus. Additional resources are continually being sought from other federal agencies.

IV.F: Provide a high-level timeline, including milestones and dates, for the implementation of this investment. Possible areas for inclusion are: stakeholder engagement, planning, major acquisitions/purchases, training, exercises, and process/policy updates. Space is provided for up to 10 milestones, but not all 10 spaces may be necessary for the response. ("Milestone" not to exceed 125 characters / approximately 25 words and "Related Activities" not to exceed 500 characters / approximately 100 words)

Milestone #1	Close training gaps identified for Law Enforcement personnel across the MBHSR.	Start Date: <input type="text"/>	End Date: <input type="text"/>
Related Activities	Discuss and evaluate each jurisdictions training gaps in Law Enforcement. Identify the regional training gaps. Collaborate with other MBHSR Discipline Subcommittees to determine if similar training gaps exist. Identify training to close the regional gaps. Complete training. Submit forms to MOHS for reimbursement of overtime and backfill for emergency responders to attend training.		
Milestone #2	Close training gaps identified for Fire Services personnel across the MBHSR.	Start Date: <input type="text"/>	End Date: <input type="text"/>
Related Activities	Discuss and evaluate each jurisdictions training gaps in Fire Services. Identify the regional training gaps. Collaborate with other MBHSR Discipline Subcommittees to determine if similar training gaps exist. Identify training to close the regional gaps. Complete training. Submit forms to MOHS for reimbursement of overtime and backfill for emergency responders to attend training.		
Milestone #3	Close training gaps identified for Emergency Medical Services personnel across the MBHSR.	Start Date: <input type="text"/>	End Date: <input type="text"/>
Related Activities	Discuss and evaluate each jurisdictions' training gaps in Emergency Medical Services. Identify the regional training gaps. Collaborate with other MBHSR Discipline Subcommittees to determine if similar training gaps exist. Identify training to close the regional gaps. Complete training. Submit forms to MOHS for reimbursement of overtime and backfill for emergency responders to attend training.		
Milestone #4	Close training gaps identified for Emergency Management personnel across the MBHSR.	Start Date: <input type="text"/>	End Date: <input type="text"/>
Related Activities	Discuss and evaluate each jurisdictions training gaps in Emergency Management. Identify the regional training gaps. Collaborate with other MBHSR Discipline Subcommittees to determine if similar training gaps exist. Identify training to close the regional gaps. Complete training. Submit forms to MOHS for reimbursement of overtime and backfill for emergency responders to attend training.		
Milestone #5	Close training gaps identified for Public Health personnel across the MBHSR.	Start Date: <input type="text"/>	End Date: <input type="text"/>
Related Activities	Discuss and evaluate each jurisdictions training gaps in Public Health. Identify the regional training gaps. Collaborate with other MBHSR Discipline Subcommittees to determine if similar training gaps exist. Identify training to close the regional gaps. Complete training. Submit forms to MOHS for reimbursement of overtime and backfill for emergency responders to attend training.		
	Close training gaps identified for Health Care personnel across the	Start Date: <input type="text"/>	

INVESTMENT #

10

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

\$3,480,000

Investment Name: Regional Homeland Security Training Program

Milestone #8

MBHSR.

End Date:

Related Activities

Discuss and evaluate each jurisdictions training gaps in Health Care. Identify the regional training gaps. Collaborate with other MBHSR Discipline Subcommittees to determine if similar training gaps exist. Identify training to close the regional gaps. Complete training. Submit forms to MOHS for reimbursement of overtime and backfill for emergency responders to attend training.

Milestone #7

Provide refresher courses for WMD operations, radiological operations, and other past trainings.

Start Date:

End Date:

Related Activities

Provide support to the DeValle Institute for Emergency Preparedness in curriculum development and execution; support overtime and backfill costs associated with training.

Milestone #8

Start Date:

End Date:

Related Activities

Milestone #9

Start Date:

End Date:

Related Activities

Milestone #10

Start Date:

End Date:

Related Activities

IV.G: Describe the planned duration for this overall investment. Discuss your long-term sustainability plans for the investment after your FY 2006 HSGP funds have been expended, if applicable. (Not to exceed 300 words)

HS training throughout the Region will continue during the course of this funding period. Sustainment for the MBHSR Training Investment will be sought through both local and state aid, as well as federal grants.

INVESTMENT #

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

11

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

\$3,960,000

Investment Name: Regional Evacuation, Mass Care, and Pandemic Flu Planning and Preparedness

I. BACKGROUND

I.A: Provide a summary description of this investment and its purpose. (Not to exceed 200 words)

The purposes of this Investment are to conduct planning and exercises and procure equipment and supplies to support evacuation, mass care, and pandemic flu planning. In the wake of Hurricanes Katrina and Wilma, the Metro Boston Homeland Security Region (MBHSR) believes it needs to do significant work around regional evacuation planning. In December 2005 Boston unveiled a strengthened evacuation plan that greatly enhanced the City's ability to evacuate its population which includes a system to directly notify residents through automated phone calls, updated traffic management concepts, new evacuation signs, and a new framework for managing evacuation of residents without cars. This Investment expands Boston's evacuation, mass care, and pandemic flu planning to the other eight jurisdictions in the Region. Outcomes include synergy of evacuation routes, regional public notification, intelligent traffic monitoring, evacuation of special populations, expanded regional mass care capacity, enhanced mass care sites, mass care capabilities for non-evacuation situations, and the capability for registration and tracking of evacuees and mass care recipients.

I.B: Explain how the investment will support the implementation of an Initiative(s) from the Program and Capability Enhancement Plan, and the achievement of goals and objectives from your State/Urban Area homeland security strategy(ies). (Not to exceed 300 words)

This Investment supports the Commonwealth's Initiatives of Information Sharing, Interoperable Communications, Regional Collaboration, Statewide Pandemic Preparedness, and Disaster Recovery as outlined in the Enhancement and Capabilities Plan. This Investment directly aligns to Goal 1, ensure the MBHSR can actively prevent and deter, as well as prepare for, terrorist attacks and catastrophic events, Objective 1.1, provide comprehensive HS community outreach initiatives and programs, in the Updated Urban Area Homeland Security Strategy. This Investment supports Goal 1 Objective 1.1 through the development of an examination strategy for effective risk communication to the general public. The Mayor's Emergency Alert Notification System (MEANS) has been implemented in Boston and will be integrated with other jurisdictions' systems through this investment. This Investment also directly aligns to Goal 3, ensure the MBHSR can effectively respond to terrorist attacks and catastrophic events in both the short- and long-term, Objective 3.4, develop and maintain regional response capabilities following a terrorist or catastrophic event, Objective 3.5, work towards coordinated public/private emergency preparedness initiatives in the MBHSR, and Objective 3.6, work towards a regional risk communication and public awareness plan. This Investment supports Goal 3 Objectives 3.4, 3.5, and 3.6 through the following steps the MBHSR continues to implement: enhance regional response and recovery capabilities; enhance existing plans for patient tracking, mass dispensing, and prophylaxis and phased mass casualty incident response capacity; develop and enhance regional response planning across disciplines, including but not limited to mass casualty incidents, mass prophylaxis, patient surge capabilities, and staffing structures; put in place regional equipment stockpiles necessary for the response to a CBRNE/WMD incident and/or natural disaster; and collectively review and assess emergency alert systems across the Region.

I.C: List up to four National Priority(ies) this investment primarily supports.

- Implement the NIMS and NRP
Strengthen Emergency Operations Planning and Citizen Protection
Strengthen Medical Surge and Mass Prophylaxis Capabilities
Strengthen Information Sharing and Collaboration Capabilities

I.D: List up to six Target Capability(ies) from the Target Capabilities List this investment primarily supports.

- Citizen Protection: Evacuation and/or In-Place Protection
Emergency Public Information and Warning
Community Preparedness and Participation
Mass Care (Sheltering, Feeding, and Related Services)
Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP)
Mass Prophylaxis

II. REGIONALIZATION

II.A: Describe the geographic and demographic area(s) this investment covers. (Not to exceed 275 words)

This Investment impacts the entire Region across all disciplines. Boston's UASI Region, approximately 95 square miles, includes the Cities of Boston, Cambridge, Chelsea, Everett, Quincy, Revere, and Somerville, and the Towns of Brookline and Winthrop. The Region was selected in June 2003 based on the following criteria: 1) level of risk faced by a community, based primarily on potential target infrastructure; 2) level and availability of resources a community can bring to bear to assist Boston; 3) a community's role in assisting in an evacuation of Boston in the event of a critical incident; and 4) whether a community is contiguous with Boston. The resident population of the Region is 1,051,809 according to 2000 US Census Data; however, the daytime population estimates for Boston and Cambridge peg the total regional population as high as 2,560,000 persons. The Region contains a number of critical infrastructures, high-profile targets, and potential threat elements. Several high-profile, annual events draw more than a million spectators and participants into Boston. Major transportation networks exist within the Region. Logan International Airport, a \$6 billion per year critical infrastructure, is located in East Boston. Boston is home to several major transportation hubs, including North Station and South Station. The Port of Boston is the largest container port in New England and is the 22nd largest in the US. In addition, weekly Liquefied Gas (LNG) deliveries transit the Port of Boston and wind up in the Chelsea Creek. This Investment covers the Region's special populations including the homebound, elderly, infirmed, deaf, blind, non-English speakers, nursing home residents, and prisoners.

II.B: Explain how the State/Urban Area is organizing to implement this Investment over the Identified geographic area(s).
(Not to exceed 300 words)

The Mayor's Office of Homeland Security's (MOHS) works with the UASI communities and regional stakeholders to leverage MBHSR resources that enhance capacities in the areas of prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery from CBRNE incidents and major disasters across the Region. The MOHS staff is grant-funded and works full-time to coordinate, manage, assist, and move forward the MBHSR Investments and to serve as the fiduciary for the Region's HS grant programming. The MOHS staff works in concert with the Jurisdictional Point of Contact (JPOC) Committee and Discipline Subcommittees. The JPOC Committee is comprised of one senior point of contact from each of the nine jurisdictions, appointed by the jurisdiction's Chief Executive Officer. The JPOCs ensure open and clear communication amongst disciplines in their city or town and represent their jurisdiction's disciplines at the monthly JPOC meetings run by MOHS. MBHSR Discipline Subcommittees were established to bring together representatives from each discipline to discuss, coordinate, develop plans, and guide implementation of their jurisdiction's initiatives across the Region. MOHS has worked with its partners to establish six Discipline Subcommittees. Each JPOC appointed representatives from his community to serve on the Subcommittees. The Subcommittee Representative represents the discipline on behalf of his or her jurisdiction to the Subcommittee though participation in the development and implementation of HS Investments that impact the Region. Most likely, an interdisciplinary, multi-jurisdictional Project Subcommittee with federal, state, and local participation (from the MBHSR JPOCs and Discipline Subcommittees) will be formed to implement this Investment. Members will include public safety entities, public health entities, health care entities, transportation, the American Red Cross, and special populations groups on an ad-hoc basis. The Public Health Subcommittee, in collaboration with schools of public health and food delivery services, will coordinate pandemic flu planning.

II.C: Discuss the collaboration process you have, or will establish, with other regions and jurisdictions (Inter- and Intra-State) within or beyond the geographic/demographic area of this Investment. Discuss when and how you will engage stakeholders from those regions in specific support of this Investment. (Not to exceed 500 words)

The MBHSR collaboration processes focus on the distribution of support throughout the Region, as many partners already have full-time jobs. The MBHSR collaborates formally through monthly JPOC Committee and Discipline Subcommittee meetings. Outside the monthly meetings, collaboration occurs through the MBHSR website, emails, phone calls, informal meetings, and meetings within each jurisdiction. Monthly JPOC Committee meetings are organized and run by MOHS. The meetings are open meetings and are attended by MOHS, the JPOCs, State agency representatives, and MOHS contractors, as needed. Frequent agenda items include administrative updates, MBHSR investment updates, and Discipline updates. The last 30 minutes of the meeting are saved for open discussion. Monthly Discipline Subcommittee meetings are organized and run by the MOHS Discipline Coordinators and the Subcommittee Lead and are attended by MOHS, the jurisdictions' Discipline Representatives, and State agency representatives. In order to maximize effectiveness and output of the Discipline Subcommittees, and to meet programmatic goals and objectives, the MOHS Discipline Coordinators are strategically placed in "host" agencies related to their assigned discipline. Frequent agenda items include discussions of administrative updates, trainings, exercises, equipment procurements, relevant MBHSR Investment updates, and project proposals. MOHS will utilize the JPOCs and Discipline Subcommittees to seek participation in a Project Subcommittee devoted to this Investment. As mentioned above, the Project Subcommittee would be interdisciplinary, and multi-jurisdictional with federal, state, and local participation. Similar to other MBHSR Communications Interoperability Project Subcommittee, the group would meet on a frequent basis to discuss projects that will help the MBHSR enhance its evacuation and mass care plan for the Region. As needed, the Project Subcommittee would assemble and tasks Working Groups. MOHS will utilize the Public Health Subcommittee to coordinate pandemic flu planning for the Region. The Subcommittee will also collaborate with schools of public health and food delivery services in planning. The Discipline and Project Subcommittees use the JPOCs to sign-off on HS equipment procurements and HS related training and exercise reimbursements. The MOHS Finance Manager coordinates the execution of equipment procurement and reimbursements across Boston agencies, as fiduciary, including City Auditing, Office of Budget and Management, Purchasing Division, and Management and Information Systems.

III. IMPACT

III.A: Discuss anticipated impacts of this investment and how the requested funding will help attain/achieve expected impacts. Consider the population and areas affected, and other entities (jurisdictions, disciplines) that could leverage the outcomes and impacts of the solution presented by this Investment. (Not to exceed 500 words)

The overall impact of this Investment is greatly enhanced preparedness for the impacts of an evacuation, a mass care event, or a pandemic flu scenario. An integrated, regional plan is critical. As Boston recently strengthened its evacuation and mass care plans and executed a few exercises to test the plan, the Region has a base plan to use and can build upon the lessons learned in Boston. The plans pre-identify roles and responsibilities during an evacuation which results in more effective response to an incident as immediate actions will be taken to save lives and meet basic human needs. The plans also include frameworks for special populations such as the homebound, elderly, infirmed, deaf, blind, non-English speakers, nursing home residents, and prisoners. Integrated plans for evacuation and mass care results in enhanced coordination of resources for the Region. Results of this regional coordination include an integrated public notification system and intelligent traffic monitoring across the Region. The Region will also implement the capability for registration and tracking of evacuees and mass care recipients resulting in more effective recovery from an incident. This Investment will also expand mass care capacity in the Region. Through joint planning MBHSR emergency responders will conduct in-depth mass care site assessments to determine enhancements that need to be made to mass care sites. Enhancements, such as the addition of backup power, medical supplies caches, and specific supplies at certain mass care sites for special populations, will also result in more effective response to an incident as sites and supplies will be available to save lives and meet basic human needs. Mass care capabilities support non-evacuation situations such as pandemic flu, surge capacity planning, and emergency dispensing of mass prophylaxis. Finally, this Investment supports pandemic flu planning for the Region. Comprehensive regional plans will be in place for epidemiology and surveillance, infection control, clinical guidelines communications with Health Care providers, distributing of antivirals, and mass care dispensing (once a vaccine is developed). In addition, this Investment will support a marketing campaign to educate the public on the Region's pandemic flu planning and what might be asked of the public during a pandemic to ensure cooperation and implement necessary control measure. The regional plans and marketing of the plans will ensure effective response by emergency responders and the public in the event of pandemic flu.

INVESTMENT #

11

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

\$3,960,000

Investment Name: Regional Evacuation, Mass Care, and Pandemic Flu Planning and Preparedness

III.B: Discuss how the implementation of this investment will decrease or mitigate risk. (Not to exceed 500 words)

Very limited plans currently exist to manage the impacts of a regional evacuation, mass care, or pandemic flu event. The City of Boston's emergency preparedness plan was recently strengthened and can serve as a model concept of operations for a regional response, but will benefit from additional development to be most effectively operationalized. Implementation of this investment decreases the risk of ineffective response to an incident, such as pandemic flu, that requires evacuation and/or mass care. Loss of life is minimized by ensuring an integrated, seamless response regionwide. The regional coordination required for implementation of this investment decreases risks for potential lack of coordination and synergy on evacuation routes which currently exists. In addition, the existence of a regional notification system is critical during an evacuation to decrease the risk of ineffective response to an incident. A notification system currently exists for Boston or a portion thereof, but planning to notify evacuation to a number of MBHRS areas at once needs to take place. In addition, this investment will provide a brochure to the public to educate them on the Region's pandemic flu planning. Providing this information to the public decreases the risk of ineffective response to pandemic flu. Finally, the expanded mass care capacity that will result from implementation of this investment decreases the risk of ineffective response to an incident as sites and supplies will be available to save lives and meet basic human needs. Mass care can currently be accomplished on a small-scale; however outstanding needs exist to develop capabilities to handle mass care on a large-scale basis prior to the arrival of federal assets.

III.C: Describe what the potential Homeland Security risks of not funding this investment are. (Not to exceed 500 words)

Not funding this investment results in the persistence of limited plans and capabilities to manage the impacts of regional evacuations, mass care events, and pandemic flu. Without the collaboration of MOHS and the MBHRS governance structure, jurisdictions will likely work independently to develop and or update evacuation, mass care, and pandemic flu plans. The lack of formalization that would exist in regional plans could lead to confusion on the part of jurisdictions that will need to coordinate closely to effect a large-scale evacuation. Response would not be as effective and the Region may risk losing lives and the ability to meet basic human needs. Not funding this investment also results in limited mass care capabilities. The Region would lack a scalable, "ready-to-go" mass care capability at the state and local level which could present challenges during an incident with impact on par with Hurricane Katrina. Response would not be as effective and the Region may risk losing lives and the ability to meet basic human needs.

IV. FUNDING & IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

IV.A: Investment Funding Plan

	FY 2006 Homeland Security Grant Program Request					FY 2006 HSGP Request Total	Other Funding Sources Applied	Grand Total
	SHSP	UASI	LETPP	MMRS	CCP			
Personnel								
Planning		\$2,260,000				\$2,260,000		\$2,260,000
Organization								
Equipment*		\$1,700,000				\$1,700,000		\$1,700,000
Training								
Exercises								
M&A								
Total		\$3,960,000				\$3,960,000		\$3,960,000

*If you plan to purchase interoperable Communications Equipment, your investment justification must include discussion on planning, governance, training, policies, procedures, and/or exercises related to the equipment.

INVESTMENT #

11

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

\$3,960,000

Investment Name: Regional Evacuation, Mass Care, and Pandemic Flu Planning and Preparedness

IV.B: Identify potential challenges to the effective implementation of this Investment (e.g., stakeholder buy-in, sustainability, aggressive timelines). (Not to exceed 300 words)

The overall challenge to effective implementation of this Investment across the Region is a lack of funding to support planning and implementation activities and to procure specialized equipment and supplies to support evacuation, mass care, and pandemic flu response actions. Another challenge is maintaining coordination with all jurisdictions across all disciplines. The Region will need to acknowledge different mindsets and approaches and determine the best way to utilize them in planning and implementation.

IV.C: Explain how the identified challenges will be addressed and mitigated. (Not to exceed 300 words)

To date, the above challenges have been addressed and/or mitigated. The challenge of funding has been mitigated through the use of previous year UASI funding and will continue to be mitigated through the use of FY2006 UASI funding. In-kind MBHSR emergency responder time is available for planning and implementation activities. The challenge of maintaining coordination with all jurisdictions across all disciplines has been addressed to date through the MBHSR governance structure including MOHS, the JPOC Committee, and the Discipline Subcommittee structure. This challenge will be further addressed through the establishment of a Project Subcommittee and Working Groups under the Public Health Subcommittee (for pandemic flu planning) to coordinate on planning and implementation activities. The final challenge to account for critical infrastructure in planning will be addressed through the engagement of infrastructure owners at the Project Subcommittee meetings.

IV.D: Describe the management team, including roles and responsibilities, that will be accountable for the oversight and implementation of this Investment, and the overall management approach they will apply for the implementation of this Investment. (Not to exceed 300 words)

MOHS is responsible for the oversight of regional evacuation and mass care planning. The MOHS staff is comprised of a Director, two Assistant Directors, a Finance Manager, and five Discipline Coordinators. The Director directs and oversees all aspects of MOHS and manages communication with the Mayor of Boston, the jurisdictions' Chief Executive Officers, and the JPOCs. The Assistant Directors handle investment development, management, and coordination for the MBHSR and oversee the activities of the Discipline Coordinators. The Finance Manager is responsible for the fiscal tasks related to all regional HS grants, which includes administering the procurement of equipment for the jurisdictions and the reimburse for overtime and backfill. The Discipline Coordinators coordinate planning and communication, specifically around training, amongst their respective Discipline Subcommittees, Law Enforcement, Fire Services, Emergency Medical Services, Emergency Management, Public Health, and Health Care. MOHS will likely utilize the JPOCs and Discipline Subcommittee Representatives to seek participation in a Project Subcommittee devoted to this Investment. The Project Subcommittee with Working Groups would be interdisciplinary and multi-jurisdictional with federal, state, and local participation and would be responsible for implementing this Investment. The Public Health Subcommittee will coordinate planning for pandemic flu for the Region.

INVESTMENT #

11

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

\$3,960,000

Investment Name: Regional Evacuation, Mass Care, and Pandemic Flu Planning and Preparedness

IV.E: Discuss funding resources beyond FY 2006 HSGP that have been identified and will be leveraged to support the implementation and sustinment of this investment. (Not to exceed 300 words)

FY2004 UASI funds have initiated planning in Boston which will be leveraged for the expansion into the other eight jurisdictions. FY2005 UASI funds will be used to kick-off the intensive evacuation, mass care, and pandemic flu planning effort for the Region. FY2006 UASI funds will be used to validate and continue the regional work. In-kind MBHSR emergency responder time is available for planning and implementation activities. However, it is important to note that many of these individuals have full-time jobs. As such, availability exists, but it is limited.

IV.F: Provide a high-level timeline, including milestones and dates, for the implementation of this investment. Possible areas for inclusion are: stakeholder engagement, planning, major acquisitions/purchases, training, exercises, and process/policy updates. Space is provided for up to 10 milestones, but not all 10 spaces may be necessary for the response. ("Milestone" not to exceed 125 characters / approximately 25 words and "Related Activities" not to exceed 500 characters / approximately 100 words)

Milestone #1	Complete regional evacuation plan.	Start Date: 6/1/06	End Date: 6/30/07
Related Activities	Engage regional and state stakeholders to form Project Subcommittee. Develop Subcommittee charter. Conduct Subcommittee meetings. Assess existing evacuation plans. Identify gaps through engineering analysis and traffic modeling. Develop regional evacuation plan.		
Milestone #2	Integrate regional notification systems.	Start Date: 1/1/06	End Date: 7/31/07
Related Activities	Develop Project Subcommittee Working Group. Conduct Working Group meetings. Identify and assess other jurisdiction's notification systems. Expand MEANS to other jurisdictions and/or integrate MEANS with other jurisdiction's notification systems.		
Milestone #3	Complete regional mass care plan.	Start Date: 6/1/06	End Date: 6/30/07
Related Activities	Engage regional and state stakeholders to form Project Subcommittee. Develop Subcommittee charter. Conduct Subcommittee meetings. Assess existing plans. Identify gaps. Conduct mass care facility site assessments. Develop regional plan.		
Milestone #4	Outfit mass care sites with specialized equipment and supplies to support evacuation.	Start Date: 6/1/06	End Date: 12/31/06
Related Activities	Conduct Subcommittee meetings to identify specialized equipment and supplies. Procure specialized equipment and supplies. Install specialized equipment and supplies.		
Milestone #5	Complete regional pandemic flu plan.	Start Date: 6/1/06	End Date: 5/31/07
Related Activities	Conduct Public Health Subcommittee meetings. Assess existing pandemic flu plans. Identify gaps. Develop regional pandemic flu plan.		
	Deliver regional pandemic flu brochure to public.	Start Date: 6/1/06	

INVESTMENT #

11

State/Territory Name: Massachusetts

FY 2006 Urban Area Name: Boston

FY 2006 HSGP Funding Request:

\$3,960,000

Investment Name: Regional Evacuation, Mass Care, and Pandemic Flu Planning and Preparedness

Milestone #6

End Date: 5/31/07

Related Activities

Conduct Public Health Subcommittee meetings. Draft, vet, and finalize brochure.

Milestone #7

Start Date: 9/1/06

End Date: 3/31/07

Related Activities

Complete evacuation and mass care tabletop exercises.

Develop Project Subcommittee Working Group. Conduct Working Group meetings. Plan tabletop exercises 1, 2, and 3. Conduct tabletop exercises 1, 2, and 3. Refine regional evacuation and mass care plans with lessons learned.

Milestone #8

Start Date: 11/30/06

End Date: 3/31/07

Related Activities

Complete mass care full-scale exercise.

Conduct Working Group meetings. Plan evacuation and mass care full-scale exercise. Conduct exercise. Develop after action report. Refine regional evacuation and mass care plans with lessons learned.

Milestone #9

Start Date: 3/31/06

End Date: 3/31/07

Related Activities

Complete mass casualty incident and prevention and deterrence tabletop exercises.

Conduct Working Group meetings. Plan mass casualty incident and prevention and deterrence tabletop exercises. Conduct casualty incident and prevention and deterrence tabletop exercises. Refine regional mass care plans with lessons learned.

Milestone #10

Start Date: 3/31/07

End Date: 3/31/08

Related Activities

Complete mass casualty incident and prevention and deterrence tabletop exercises.

Conduct Working Group meetings. Plan mass casualty incident and prevention and deterrence tabletop exercises. Conduct casualty incident and prevention and deterrence tabletop exercises. Refine regional mass care plans with lessons learned.

IV.G: Describe the planned duration for this overall investment. Discuss your long-term sustainability plans for the investment after your FY 2006 HSGP funds have been expended, if applicable. (Not to exceed 300 words)

Updates to evacuation, mass care, and pandemic flu plans will take place with compulsory yearly Massachusetts Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan (CEMP) reviews, as these plans are annexes to the CEMP. Sustainability of supplies and provisions for mass care facilities will need to be planned for using out year HSGP and/or available funding from the Region's agencies.